

## Local Food Promotion Program (LFPP) Final Performance Report

The final performance report summarizes the outcome of your LFPP award objectives. As stated in the LFPP Terms and Conditions, you will not be eligible for future LFPP or Farmers Market Promotion Program grant funding unless all close-out procedures are completed, including satisfactory submission of this final performance report.

This final report will be made available to the public once it is approved by LFPP staff. Write the report in a way that promotes your project's accomplishments, as this document will serve as not only a learning tool, but a promotional tool to support local and regional food programs. Particularly, recipients are expected to provide both qualitative and quantitative results to convey the activities and accomplishments of the work.

The report is limited to 10 pages and is due **within 90 days** of the project's performance period end date, or sooner if the project is complete. Provide answers to each question, or answer "not applicable" where necessary. It is recommended that you email or fax your completed performance report to your assigned grant specialist to avoid delays:

LFPP Phone: 202-720-2731; Email: [USDALFPPQuestions@ams.usda.gov](mailto:USDALFPPQuestions@ams.usda.gov); Fax: 202-720-0300

Should you need to mail your documents via hard copy, contact LFPP staff to obtain mailing instructions.

<b>Report Date Range:</b> <i>(e.g. September 30, 20XX-September 29, 20XX)</i>	October 1, 2015 - September 29, 2016
<b>Authorized Representative Name:</b>	John Fisk
<b>Authorized Representative Phone:</b>	703-879-6556
<b>Authorized Representative Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:jfisk@winrock.org">jfisk@winrock.org</a>
<b>Recipient Organization Name:</b>	Wallace Center at Winrock International
<b>Project Title as Stated on Grant Agreement:</b>	Building Food Safety Information Technology for Local Food Success
<b>Grant Agreement Number:</b> <i>(e.g. 14-LFPPX-XX-XXXX)</i>	15-LFPPAR-0045
<b>Year Grant was Awarded:</b>	2015
<b>Project City/State:</b>	National
<b>Total Awarded Budget:</b>	100,000

LFPP staff may contact you to follow up for long-term success stories. Who may we contact?

- Same Authorized Representative listed above (check if applicable).
- Different individual: Name: Jeff Farbman; Email: [jfarbman@winrock.org](mailto:jfarbman@winrock.org); Phone: 703-879-3007

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0581-0287. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 4 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable sex, marital status, or familial status, parental status religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program (not all prohibited bases apply to all programs). Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

1. State the goals/objectives of your project as outlined in the grant narrative and/or approved by LFPP staff. If the goals/objectives from the narrative have changed from the grant narrative, please highlight those changes (e.g. “new objective”, “new contact”, “new consultant”, etc.). You may add additional goals/objectives if necessary. For each item below, qualitatively discuss the progress made and indicate the impact on the community, if any.

i. *Goal/Objective 1: Identify the food safety expectations and requirements of regional food system stakeholders, and introduce FoodLogiQ’s existing supply chain IT solution to at least 5 GroupGAP pilot participants as a tool for compliance.*

a. Progress Made: This objective is complete.

We enrolled 5 members of Wallace Center’s GroupGAP pilot members: ALBA, Upper Peninsula Food Exchange, Organic Valley, Sunny Harvest, and Cherry Capital Foods. We met in November 2015 in Fredericksburg, VA to begin to align the functionality adaptations our technology provider – FoodLogiQ – would need to implement so that the system was compatible with the new GroupGAP protocol. We also facilitated a training with the enrolled pilots, led by the FoodLogiQ team, in which the pilots were instructed on how to use the system, including entering their historical data, and creating workflows that could assist them in managing their GroupGAP program.

b. Impact on Community:

This was the first step in leveraging FoodLogiQ’s significant built software infrastructure. These actions started the process of the two sides of the equation coming together – the pilots (users) and the software programmers – to create a usable system.

ii. *Goal/Objective 2: Migrate 2015 food safety data and documentation to the FoodLogiQ platform while facilitating a rapid feedback loop and iterative product refinement.*

a. Progress Made: This objective is complete.

Pilots used the FoodLogiQ system to enter their audit data into the system. They also entered and uploaded other information, such as workflows and grower product and field information. Pilots met with FoodLogiQ independently and as a group, giving feedback on needed additions and adjustments to the system. The pilots generated a list of 23 software updates, changes or additions to make the software easier or more effective or more useful for their work. FoodLogiQ has now implemented these modifications.

Moreover, due to working with this community closely, FoodLogiQ has made a surprising change in pricing for GroupGAP users, and even created a whole new tier of user that would allow smaller operations a “group pricing” structure, albeit with some advanced features not accessible. This new pricing and user tier will essentially remove almost all barriers to data sharing between GroupGAP entities and buyers, which is the ultimate goal of this work.

b. Impact on Community:

The FoodLogiQ system is now a far more useful tool for GroupGAP users – both due to increased functionality, and decreased price. We believe that FoodLogiQ is now an EXCELLENT fit for GroupGAP entities of all sizes.

iii. Goal/Objective 3: *Promote GroupGAP and the FoodLogiQ platform as a means for effectively demonstrating compliance with buyer expectations and regulatory requirements. Widely disseminate findings among producer, food hub, buyer, and regulator stakeholder groups.*

a. Progress Made: This objective is complete.

FoodLogiQ was present and a topic of discussion at the March, 2016 National Food Hub Conference, where over 420 food hub staff, managers, supporters and larger buyers (such as US Foods) were in attendance. In addition to the half-day closeout and feedback session with FoodLogiQ and the pilot projects, there was FoodLogiQ staff in attendance for the entire 2 ½ day conference. There was also a full 90-minute session introducing GroupGAP to conference attendees, with mention of FoodLogiQ and data sharing, and ½-day intensive session on GroupGAP where data sharing was also a part of the conversation. Moreover, we ran a webinar on February 18, 2016 entitled “GroupGAP: USDA’s New Cooperative Approach to Farmer Food Safety Certification” with an impressive 476 registrants. We have also been making our very large (~9000 member) email list aware of GroupGAP in our (roughly) monthly email updates. Our newsletters have included descriptions of GroupGAP, as well as links to resources such as USDA webinars on GroupGAP, our own webinar, and some advanced practitioner documents housed on our website.

We have also worked closely with partner organization National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition to educate them, and therefore their large number of constituents, on the details of GroupGAP and FoodLogiQ as a useful platform for tracking and reporting.

iv. Goal/Objective 4: *Present the findings of the pilot program to FDA.*

a. Progress Made: This objective is complete, though engagement work is ongoing.

In early 2016, Wallace Center convened a FDA Outreach Working Group in collaboration with National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition (NSAC). Wallace Center and its partners have also been researching, developing, and refining additional initiatives that build capacity for data collection and record keeping by small to mid-scale growers. Based on this body of work, Wallace and NSAC presented a comprehensive set of strategies for outreach and education among the local/regional food sector to FDA in April 2016. While engagement with FDA is continuing, the agency has yet to recognize the training and data collection

strategies proposed as equivalent to (and therefore, meeting the requirements of) federally-recognized approaches.

While we have found little success in our direct engagement with FDA, Wallace has strengthened our continued food safety work with USDA. In 2016, Wallace convened a FSMA Strategy Meeting in Washington DC. Wallace staff, NSAC collaborators, and field practitioners presented the findings and impact of our capacity building work to a cross-cutting group of USDA leadership with representation from AMS, Rural Development, Specialty Crop Inspection, and the Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food initiative. Out of that meeting has come close and continuing work with the USDA FSMA engagement team led by Tricia Kovacs and Melissa Bailey.

Finally, in October 2016, the findings of this program informed Wallace Center's participation at the most recent meeting of the Collaborative Food Safety Forum, a multi-sector working group providing guidance and recommendations to FDA on the implementation of FSMA.

b. Impact on Community:

Wallace continues to work with FDA, USDA, and stakeholders from all industries to ensure that small to midscale growers serving regional markets are equipped with the tools they need to successfully meet market and regulatory food safety requirements.

2. Impact on Community:

This project enabled many farmers, and dozens of food hubs (who represent an average of 40 farmers each) to learn about GroupGAP as a way to meet regulatory and buyer requirements to sell into the wholesale markets they wish to access. We believe that GroupGAP is a significant step in leveling the burden of food safety that is placed on growers

3. Quantify the overall impact of the project on the intended beneficiaries, if applicable. Include further explanation if necessary.

- i. Number of direct jobs created: 0
- ii. Number of jobs retained: 5 food safety responsible workers
- iii. Number of indirect jobs created: 0
- iv. Number of markets expanded:
- v. Number of new markets established: countless – any wholesale buyer who requires GAP certification, and transparency
- vi. Although this project is upstream of the market process, so additional sales is difficult to quantify, food hubs must have willing buyers, and this project helps to realize that end.
- vii. Number of farmers/producers that have benefited from the project: 100 (GroupGAP certified growers associated with the 5 pilots)

4. Did you expand your customer base by reaching new populations such as new ethnic groups, additional low income/low access populations, new businesses, etc.? If so, how?

All of our outreach mechanisms, including the conference, our mailing list, and webinars included members of underserved populations, as well as many personnel in consulting, nonprofit, and government roles who support underserved populations. Webinars are one place where we can extract some data to begin to address this, and we find that our webinars most often have new people attending – people who have never before attended a webinar, and many who are not on our mailing list. This is due to our excellent communications structure, which generates many subsequent shares on local and regional partners’ newsletters, websites, social media, etc.

5. Discuss your community partnerships.

viii. Who are your community partners?

For this project we have been working closely with FoodLogiQ and our funded pilots: ALBA, Upper Peninsula Food Exchange, Organic Valley, Sunny Harvest, and Cherry Capital Foods. We also communicate regularly with a larger community of our GroupGAP pilots, another 6 groups, representing approximately 50 growers. Together these groups represent farmers in all regions of the country. Our community continues to expand as more GroupGAP implementers contact us seeking assistance.

ix. How have they contributed to the results you’ve already achieved?

Our pilots have, by working with FoodLogiQ, assisted in the creation of a tool that will be invaluable to numerous food hubs, farmer cooperatives, and other groups that pursue and adopt GroupGAP. .

x. How will they contribute to future results?

Some of the pilots will continue to use FoodLogiQ for their next year of data collection, storage, organization and presentation to buyers. Moreover most of our pilot participants are committed to outreach and education around GroupGAP, as well as using FoodLogiQ as an excellent tool for data management and sharing.

6. did you use contractors to conduct the work? If so, how did their work contribute to the results of the LFPP project?

We employed the services of Mt Ag Enterprises. Its principal, Steve Warshawer has been invaluable in liaising between the pilots and software developers, ensuring that each party is able to understand the perspective and needs of the other. FoodLogiQ itself, although engaged as a service provider has also been a flexible and earnest partner in this work. They have taken an existing industry tool and adapted it for greater use by the local and regional food sector to reduce a barrier to market entry.

7. Have you publicized any results yet?\* Yes

i. If yes, how did you publicize the results? FoodLogiQ issued a press release about our work together. As mentioned above, Wallace Center has been open and transparent about all of our GroupGAP work, including this. We also ran our large public webinar featuring pilots who implemented GroupGAP.

ii. To whom did you publicize the results? Our group of 9,000 food system stakeholders, as well as our community of practice of 1,200 food hubs and food hub supporters.

xi. How many stakeholders (i.e. people, entities) did you reach? See above.

\*Send any publicity information (brochures, announcements, newsletters, etc.) electronically along with this report. Non-electronic promotional items should be digitally photographed and emailed with this report (do not send the actual item).

8. Have you collected any feedback thus far about your work? Yes
- i. If so, how did you collect the information? We have been in frequent contact with our pilots, including a ½-day long private session at the National Food Hub Conference.
  - ii. What feedback have you collected thus far (specific comments)?  
“This is awesome” – Phil Britton, Cherry Capital Foods, in reference to the potential seen in the FoodLogiQ tool.  
“Although we appreciate the utility of this software, we will be choosing to use our own internal systems for the coming year.” Annake Ramsey, Organic Valley  
“We would like to start using this product to do traceability of our product,” Benjamin Bartley, La Montanita Cooperative Distribution Center. NOTE: La Montanita CDC was not a paid pilot, but due to the arrangement with FoodLogiQ, we were able to comply with this request at no additional cost to the project, continuing to expand the benefits of the project.

9. Budget Summary:

- xii. As part of the LFPP closeout procedures, you are required to submit the SF-425 (Final Federal Financial Report). Check here if you have completed the SF-425 and are submitting it with this report:   
**(Our SF-425 was submitted under different cover on 11/17/2016 to Zeomi Santiago)**
- xiii. Did the project generate any income? **NO**
  - a. If yes, how much was generated and how was it used to further the objectives of the award?

10. Lessons Learned:

- i. Summarize any lessons learned. Draw from positive experiences (e.g. good ideas that improved project efficiency or saved money) and negative experiences (e.g. what did not go well and what needs to be changed).  
There are several key learnings from the execution of this project.  
We worked through many of the details of the project and relevant outcomes with all contractors (MT Ag Enterprises and FoodLogiQ) during the proposal process. This made execution smooth.

Having face to face time with the group was absolutely crucial. These folks are extremely busy, and scattered across the US. By coming together twice in person we were able to spend needed focused time really working through issues in a deep way. Our frequent phone check-ins were a needed complement to the face to face time.

And finally, although we have “learned” this lesson over and over, this project really illustrated, so clearly, that the right partners make all the difference. We demanded quite a bit from our food hub / GroupGAP practitioners, and they were very willing subjects. Moreover, FoodLogiQ was an excellent partner, showing true dedication and flexibility, even as a completely for-profit company. And MT Ag Enterprises continued to demonstrate subject matter expertise as well as a dedication to the success of the project.

- ii. If goals or outcome measures were not achieved, identify and share the lessons learned to help others expedite problem-solving:  
Actually, our project ran very smoothly – we accomplished all objectives in a timely manner.
- iii. Describe any lessons learned in the administration of the project that might be helpful for others who would want to implement a similar project:  
Although there are (pretty much) no other organizations who would be in a position to run a project VERY similar to this, the most crucial piece of advice (other than those lessons learned in 10.i) is that if you intend to work with a software provider that you develop a close and understanding relationship before the project starts. It is very, very difficult to fully flesh out all possible incompatibilities between an existing software package and a scope of work proposed. But ensuring that the software provider 1) is capable 2) has institutional capacity and 3) a vested interest in supporting the work / market you are working on and 4) has a solid code base they are working from, is crucial to project success, ESPECIALLY if time and/or financial resources are limited.

#### 11. Future Work:

- xiv. How will you continue the work of this project beyond the performance period? In other words, how will you parlay the results of your project's work to benefit future community goals and initiatives? Include information about community impact and outreach, anticipated increases in markets and/or sales, estimated number of jobs retained/created, and any other information you'd like to share about the future of your project.  
This work is one absolutely crucial step in bringing small, and local food producers into the next generation of markets for many of them – larger scale retail, restaurant and distributors. These buyers have consumer and corporate pressure to procure the product, but also have food safety teams and lawyers who require transparency in their supply chain. This project provides the route for those producers entering these markets under GroupGAP an industry-accepted technical solution to solve the problem of transparency.  
However GroupGAP, a program that the Wallace Center at Winrock International has assisted USDA in launching for the past 6 years, continues to need other supports, including increased buyer acceptance, and increased knowledge of the program for those who are searching for a solution to access these lucrative markets. Wallace Center is continuing to work on these fronts, including a recently awarded LFPP project. We believe that we will reach 10,000 producers with information about GroupGAP, and by doing buyer outreach, we believe we will significantly expand the market for those producers who do achieve a GroupGAP certification.
- xv. Do you have any recommendations for future activities and, if applicable, an outline of next steps or additional research that might advance the project goals?  
GroupGAP startup costs are relatively high. We would like to see more Groups formed, and many require government support to begin their journey down the GroupGAP path. We would like to see AMS, Rural Development and Risk Management make significant investments to enable more groups to start up, including costs associated with internal auditor training, Quality Management System development, and producer training.