

FMLFPP PERFORMANCE MEASURES

OUTCOME 1: DEVELOP BUSINESS PLANS AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES



All applicants must identify at least one outcome and indicator from the list below that will be addressed through their grant projects. Applicants will need to establish baseline numbers and/or estimate realistic target numbers for the outcome(s) and indicator(s) they select. Below are outcomes and indicators and some guidelines on how to collect data on the outcomes and indicators.



INDICATOR 1.1 NUMBER OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES CONDUCTED

Data Collection Tip

Data on feasibility studies can be collected by establishing counts of the number of studies conducted within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant.



INDICATOR 1.2 NUMBER OF THE FOLLOWING IDENTIFIED THROUGH NEEDS ASSESSMENT OR FEASIBILITY STUDIES

- 1.2a: New markets
- 1.2b: Unmet consumer needs
- 1.2c: Barriers to local foods
- 1.2d: Unserved populations
- 1.2e: Supply chain gaps
- 1.2f: Partnership opportunities, and/or
- 1.2g: Other identified needs

Data Collection Tip

Data on 1.2a-1.2f can be collected by tracking counts of the required data throughout the progression of the needs assessment or feasibility study.





INDICATOR 1.3 NUMBER OF PROJECTS

- 1.3a: Deemed viable after conducting feasibility study
- 1.3b: Deemed not viable after conducting feasibility



Data Collection Tip

Data for 1.3a-1.3b can be collected by establishing counts of viable/ non-viable projects upon conclusion of feasibility studies.



INDICATOR 1.4 NUMBER OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT PLANS CREATED



Data Collection Tip

Data on number of business development plans created can be collected by establishing counts of plans developed within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant.



OUTCOME 2: FACILITATE REGIONAL FOOD CHAIN COORDINATION AND INCREASE CAPACITY OF DIRECT-TO-CONSUMER ENTITIES

INDICATOR 2.1

TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTNERSHIPS AND/OR COLLABORATIONS ESTABLISHED BETWEEN PRODUCERS/PROCESSORS AND LOCAL/REGIONAL SUPPLY NETWORKS ____.

- 2.1a: Of those established, the number formalized with written agreements (i.e. MOU's, signed contracts, etc.)
- 2.1b: Of those established, the number of partnerships with underserved organizations

Data Collection Tip

Data on partnerships established can be collected by establishing counts of partnerships formed informally (noting in-person handshake agreements and partnerships formed via phone, email, etc.), and formally (noting number of MOU's or contracts signed). Stakeholders should refer to the definition of underserved organizations to accurately report counts of agreements made with this population.



INDICATOR 2.2

OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATIONS IDENTIFIED IN 2.1, THE NUMBER THAT REPORTED

- 2.2a: Expanded/improved regional food systems
- 2.2b: Higher profits
- 2.2c: More efficient transportation
- 2.2d: Improved marketing channels
- 2.2e: And/or other mid-tier value chain enhancements

Data Collection Tip

Data on 2.2a-2.2e can be collected from relevant partners formed after receiving services supported by the grant. Stakeholders should establish baselines of the required metrics prior to the establishment of the partnership and/or collaboration and noting whether an increase or decrease of that metric occurred. 2.2b can be reported on a per-constituent level (i.e., if two partners in one partnership both experience higher profits, they can both be counted under this sub-indicator). Reporting on 2.2a and 2.2c-2.2e should be reported on a partnership-level (i.e., the resulting improved metric is reported on a per-partnership basis, rather than each constituent within a partnership reporting separately). Improvement can be measured by increased volume and/or capacity to move volume, increased speed, waste reduction, decreased distance between point of production and point of sale, decreased time spent, higher quality technology/infrastructure, etc. Efficiency can be measured by evaluating the ratio of inputs (labor, time, resources, etc.) to outputs (product).



INDICATOR 2.3

TOTAL NUMBER OF STAKEHOLDERS TRAINED ON HOW TO DEVELOP OR SUSTAIN A DIRECT-TO-CONSUMER ENTERPRISE

- 2.3a: Of those trained, the number that are new/beginning producers

Data Collection Tip

Data on number of stakeholders trained can be collected by establishing counts of those that attended training, technical assistance, or educational programs within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant. Counts of attendees can be collected via sign in sheets, online registrations, completion of pre/post-educational surveys, etc. Stakeholders should refer to the definition of new/beginning farmers to accurately report on this data.



INDICATOR 2.4

NUMBER OF STRATEGIC PLANS DEVELOPED OR UPDATED

Data Collection Tip

Data on number of developed strategic plans can be collected by establishing counts of plans developed within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant.



INDICATOR 2.5

TOTAL NUMBER OF NEW DIRECT PRODUCER-TO-CONSUMER MARKET ACCESS POINTS ESTABLISHED ___. OF THOSE, THE NUMBER THAT WERE

- 2.5a: Farmers Markets
- 2.5b: Roadside stands
- 2.5c: Agritourism
- 2.5d: Grocery stores
- 2.5e: Wholesale market/buyers
- 2.5f: Restaurants
- 2.5g: Agricultural cooperatives
- 2.5h: Retailers
- 2.5i: Distributors
- 2.5j: Food hubs
- 2.5k: Shared-use kitchens
- 2.5l: School food programs
- 2.5m: Community-supported agriculture (CSAs)
- 2.5n: Other



Data Collection Tip

Data on number of new direct producer-to-consumer market access points can be collected by establishing counts within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant.

OUTCOME 3: DEVELOP THE MARKET FOR LOCAL/REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS



INDICATOR 3.1

NUMBER OF STAKEHOLDERS THAT GAINED TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE ABOUT PRODUCING, PREPARING, PROCURING, AND/OR ACCESSING LOCAL/REGIONAL FOODS. OF THOSE, THE NUMBER THAT WERE

- 3.1a: Farmers Markets
- 3.1b: Roadside stands
- 3.1c: Agritourism
- 3.1d: Grocery stores
- 3.1e: Wholesale market/buyers
- 3.1f: Restaurants
- 3.1g: Agricultural cooperatives
- 3.1.5h: Retailers
- 3.1i: Distributors
- 3.1j: Food hubs
- 3.1k: Shared-use kitchens
- 3.1l: School food programs
- 3.1m: Community-supported agriculture (CSAs)
- 3.1n: Other

Data Collection Tip

Measuring the number of delivery systems/ market access points who gained knowledge about how to procure or access local foods will vary depending on recipient activities and types of stakeholders engaged. The "Data Collection Considerations" section within the Program Evaluation Framework outlines methods for measuring knowledge gain through surveys, separate studies, measuring digital traffic, and tracking transactions and/or returning customers. Recipients who are required to collect this data will identify an appropriate method for establishing baseline and updated knowledge-related data to report on this indicator.



INDICATOR 3.2

TOTAL NUMBER OF DELIVERY SYSTEMS/ MARKET ACCESS POINTS THAT INCREASED ENGAGEMENT WITH LOCAL/REGIONAL PRODUCERS ___. OF THOSE, THE NUMBER THAT WERE

- 3.2a: Farmers Markets
- 3.2b: Roadside stands
- 3.2c: Agritourism
- 3.2d: Grocery stores
- 3.2e: Wholesale market/buyers
- 3.2f: Restaurants
- 3.2g: Agricultural cooperatives
- 3.2h: Retailers
- 3.2i: Distributors
- 3.2j: Food hubs
- 3.2k: Shared-use kitchens
- 3.2l: School food programs
- 3.2m: Community-supported agriculture (CSAs)
- 3.2n: Other

Data Collection Tip

Measuring engagement with local/regional producers will vary depending on recipient activities and types of stakeholders engaged. The "Data Collection Considerations" section within the Program Evaluation Framework outlines methods for measuring increased engagement through surveys, separate studies, measuring digital traffic, and tracking transactions and/or returning customers, etc. Recipients who are required to collect this data will identify an appropriate method for establishing baseline and updated engagement-related data to report on this indicator.





INDICATOR 3.3

NUMBER OF NEW TOOLS/TECHNOLOGIES DEVELOPED TO IMPROVE LOCAL/REGIONAL FOOD PROCESSING, DISTRIBUTION, AGGREGATION, OR STORAGE

- 3.3a: Number of stakeholders trained to use new tools/technologies

Data Collection Tip

Data on 3.3-3.3a can be collected by establishing counts of developed food processing, distribution, aggregation, and storage tools/technologies and stakeholders that completed training courses, programs, etc. to use these new tools/technologies within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant.



INDICATOR 3.4

NUMBER OF DELIVERY SYSTEMS/MARKET ACCESS POINTS THAT REPORTED INCREASED OR IMPROVED

- 3.4a: Processing
- 3.4b: Distribution
- 3.4a: Storage
- 3.4a: Aggregation of locally/regionally produced agricultural products

Data Collection Tip

Data on number of developed strategic plans can be collected by establishing counts of plans developed within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant.





INDICATOR 3.5

TOTAL NUMBER OF DELIVERY SYSTEMS/ MARKET ACCESS POINTS THAT ESTABLISHED AND/OR EXPANDED LOCAL/REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE OFFERINGS ____. OF THOSE, THE NUMBER THAT WERE

- 3.5a: Farmers Markets
- 3.5b: Roadside stands
- 3.5c: Agritourism
- 3.5d: Grocery stores
- 3.5e: Wholesale market/buyers
- 3.5f: Restaurants
- 3.5g: Agricultural cooperatives
- 3.5h: Retailers
- 3.5i: Distributors
- 3.5j: Food hubs
- 3.5k: Shared-use kitchens
- 3.5l: School food programs
- 3.5m: Community-supported agriculture (CSAs)
- 3.5n: Other



Data Collection Tip

Data on expanded product or service offerings can be collected by establishing baselines of product or service line offerings at the beginning of the grant period and tracking product line expansion within the organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant.



INDICATOR 3.6

NUMBER OF DELIVERY SYSTEMS/MARKET ACCESS POINTS THAT REPORTED INCREASED

- 3.6a: Revenue
- 3.6b: Sales, and/or
- 3.6c: Cost savings

Data Collection Tip

Data on 3.6a-3.6c can be collected by establishing baselines of the required data at the beginning of the grant period and noting if there was an increase in any of the metrics within the organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant. Sales and revenue data can be tracked by noting change in dollar amounts, percentages, or a combination of volume and average price. Stakeholders are not required to report a numeric value, so reluctance to share financial data should not impact this reporting requirement.



OUTCOME 4: INCREASE VIABILITY OF LOCAL/REGIONAL PRODUCERS AND PROCESSORS



INDICATOR 4.1

NUMBER OF PRODUCERS/PROCESSORS WHO GAINED KNOWLEDGE ABOUT NEW MARKET OPPORTUNITIES



Data Collection Tip

Measuring the number of producers/processors who gained knowledge about new market opportunities will vary depending on recipient activities and types of stakeholders engaged. The "Data Collection Consideration" section within the Program Evaluation Framework outlines methods for measuring knowledge gain through surveys, separate studies, measuring digital traffic, and tracking transactions and/or returning customers. Recipients who are required to collect this data will identify an appropriate method for establishing baseline and updated knowledge-related data to report on this indicator.



INDICATOR 4.2

NUMBER OF PRODUCER/PROCESSORS THAT REPORTED INCREASED ENGAGEMENT WITH NEW DELIVERY SYSTEMS OR MARKET ACCESS POINTS



Data Collection Tip

Measuring engagement with delivery systems/access points will vary depending on recipient activities and types of stakeholders engaged. The "Data Collection Considerations" section within the Program Evaluation Framework outlines methods for measuring increased engagement through surveys, separate studies, measuring digital traffic, and tracking transactions and/or returning customers. Recipients who are required to collect this data will identify an appropriate method for establishing baseline and updated engagement-related data to report on this indicator.



INDICATOR 4.3

NUMBER OF PRODUCERS/PROCESSORS THAT IMPLEMENTED NEW OR IMPROVED OPERATIONAL METHODS



Data Collection Tip

Data on number of producers/processors that implemented new/improved production or processing methods can be collected by establishing counts within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant. Improvement can be measured using: increased volume (and/or capacity, increased efficiency (evaluating the ratio of inputs (labor, time, resources, etc.) to outputs (product), speed, waste reduction, decrease time spent, etc.), and other relevant metrics.



INDICATOR 4.4

NUMBER OF VALUE-ADDED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS DEVELOPED

Data Collection Tip

Data on developed value-added agricultural products can be collected by establishing counts of developed value-added products within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant.



INDICATOR 4.6

NUMBER OF PRODUCERS/PROCESSORS THAT REPORTED A REDUCTION IN ON-FARM FOOD WASTE THROUGH NEW BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES AND MARKETING

Data Collection Tip

Data on food waste can be collected by establishing baselines of on-farm food waste and noting whether there was a decrease in waste within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant.



INDICATOR 4.5

NUMBER OF PRODUCERS/PROCESSORS THAT REPORTED SELLING NEW LOCAL/REGIONAL FOOD PRODUCTS

- 4.5a: Number that reported selling new value-added products
- Number of delivery systems/market access points that reported increased



Data Collection Tip

Data on developing and selling new local/regional food products and/or new value-added products can be collected by noting expansion of product lines to include new local/regional and value-added products within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant.



INDICATOR 4.7

NUMBER OF PRODUCERS/ PROCESSORS THAT REPORTED INCREASED

- 4.7a: Revenue
- 4.7b: Sales, and/or
- 4.7c: Cost savings due to local/regional food, operational, and/or value-added product activities



Data Collection Tip

Data on 4.7a-4.7c can be collected by establishing baselines of the required data at the beginning of the grant period and noting if there was an increase in any of the metrics within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant. Sales and revenue data can be tracked by noting change in dollar amounts, percentages, or a combination of volume and average price. Producers/processors are not required to report a numeric value, so reluctance to share financial data should not impact this reporting requirement.



INDICATOR 4.8 NUMBER OF LOCAL/REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL JOBS

- 4.8a: Created or
- 4.8b: Maintained

Data Collection Tip

Data on local/regional agricultural jobs created or maintained can be collected by establishing baselines of the number of jobs at the beginning of the grant period. Growth (or maintenance) can be discerned by monitoring local/regional agricultural job numbers after receiving services supported by the grant. Local/regional agricultural jobs should be monitored through the organizations' payroll. Stakeholders should refer to the definition of jobs, which discerns between "created" and "maintained," to accurately report this data. Recipients can determine jobs according to the number of full-time employees (FTEs) within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations. FTEs can be calculated based on the average number of hours worked by an FTE per year or per month, depending on what's most appropriate for a recipients' project (e.g., if a recipient employs mostly seasonal workers or has subrecipients that only participate in the project or report on project involvement for a certain number of months, they may choose to calculate FTEs per month). See below for suggested calculation options.

Calculating FTEs per year:

Generally, 2,080 hours per year is standard; however, recipients can refer to state/local policy codes to approximate standard FTE hours.
 Step 1: Determine number of labor hours resulting from project activities for the year.
 Step 2: Divide result of step 1 by the total standard FTE count of hours per year.

Calculating FTEs per month:

Step 1: Determine the number of FTEs who work 30+ hours per week per month during the measurement period.
 Step 2: Determine the total part-time and seasonal hours worked per week per month during the previous year and divide by 120.
 Step 3: Add up the subtotal in steps 1 and 2, then divide by 12 to determine the number of FTEs.



INDICATOR 4.9 TOTAL NUMBER OF NEW PRODUCERS WHO WENT INTO LOCAL/REGIONAL FOOD PRODUCTION. OF THOSE, NUMBER WHO ARE

- 4.9a beginning farmers/ranchers
- 4.9b socially disadvantaged farmers/ranchers
- 4.9c family farmers/ranchers
- 4.9d veteran farmers/ranchers

Data Collection Tip

Data on new producers who went into local/regional food production can be collected from producers that began offering local/regional products after receiving services supported by the grant. Recipients should note at the beginning of the grant period which non-local/regional food producers were targeted to expand their crop offerings to include local/regional food.



OUTCOME 5: IMPROVE FOOD SAFETY OF LOCAL/REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

INDICATOR 5.1

NUMBER OF STAKEHOLDERS THAT GAINED KNOWLEDGE ABOUT PREVENTION, DETECTION, CONTROL, AND/OR INTERVENTION FOOD SAFETY PRACTICES, INCLUDING RELEVANT REGULATIONS TO MITIGATE RISK (AND TO IMPROVE THEIR ABILITY TO COMPLY WITH THE FOOD SAFETY MODERNIZATION ACT (FSMA) AND/OR MEET THE STANDARDS FOR ALIGNED THIRD PARTY FOOD SAFETY AUDITS SUCH AS HARMONIZED GAP/GHP)

Data Collection Tip

Measuring the number of stakeholders that gained knowledge about prevention, detection, control, and intervention food safety practices will vary depending on recipient activities and types of stakeholders engaged. The "Data Collection Considerations" section within the Program Evaluation Framework outlines methods for measuring knowledge gain through surveys, separate studies, measuring digital traffic, and tracking transactions and/or returning customers. Recipients who are required to collect this data will identify an appropriate method for establishing baseline and updated knowledge-related data to report on this indicator. Note that recipients should not double-count between those who gained knowledge through diverse mediums, those who received food safety certifications (recommended indicator 5.4), and those formally trained (recommended indicator 5.3).

INDICATOR 5.2

NUMBER OF STAKEHOLDERS THAT

- 5.2a: Established a food safety plan
- 5.2b: Revised or updated their food safety plan

Data Collection Tip

Data on stakeholders that adopted best practices, technologies, or innovations can be collected by establishing counts of stakeholders that incorporated a new best practice, technology or innovation within their new or existing pest and disease control processes after receiving services supported by the grant.





INDICATOR 5.3
NUMBER OF SPECIALTY CROP
STAKEHOLDERS WHO IMPLEMENTED NEW/
IMPROVED PREVENTION, DETECTION,
CONTROL, AND INTERVENTION PRACTICES,
TOOLS, OR TECHNOLOGIES TO MITIGATE
FOOD SAFETY RISKS (AND/OR TO IMPROVE
THEIR ABILITY TO COMPLY WITH THE FOOD
SAFETY MODERNIZATION ACT (FSMA) AND/
OR MEET THE STANDARDS FOR ALIGNED
THIRD PARTY FOOD SAFETY AUDITS SUCH AS
HARMONIZED GAP/GHP)

Data Collection Tip

Data on stakeholders trained in early detection and rapid response can be collected by establishing counts of stakeholders that completed training programs, courses, etc. within an organization, in collaboration with other organizations, and/or on behalf of other partner organizations after receiving services supported by the grant. Recipients reporting on this indicator should not double-count between stakeholders who gained knowledge (recommended indicator 5.1). Stakeholders trained in third-party food safety certifications can serve as an appropriate proxy. Data on third-party food safety certifications can be collected by establishing baseline counts at the beginning of the grant period of stakeholder food safety certifications and noting whether growth or maintenance occurs consistent with estimates and grant program activities.



INDICATOR 5.4
NUMBER OF PREVENTION, DETECTION,
CONTROL, OR INTERVENTION PRACTICES
DEVELOPED OR ENHANCED TO MITIGATE
FOOD SAFETY RISKS

Data Collection Tip

Data on the development of new tools or strategies is available directly from stakeholder directing development.



INDICATOR 5.5
NUMBER OF STAKEHOLDERS THAT USED
THESE GRANT FUNDS TO

- 5.5a: Purchase
- 5.5b: Upgrade food safety equipment



Data Collection Tip

Data on number of stakeholders who purchased or upgraded food safety equipment can be collected by establishing counts of equipment purchases and upgrades made by stakeholders after receiving services supported by the grant.

OUTCOME 6: INCREASE CONSUMPTION AND CONSUMER PURCHASING OF LOCAL/REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS



INDICATOR 6.1

TOTAL NUMBER OF CONSUMERS WHO GAINED KNOWLEDGE ABOUT LOCAL/REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ____ OF THOSE, THE NUMBER OF

- 6.1a: Adults and
- 6.1b: Children

Data Collection Tip

Measuring the number of consumers who gained knowledge about local/regional agricultural products will vary depending on recipient activities and types of stakeholders engaged. The “Data Collection Considerations” section within the Program Evaluation Framework outlines methods for measuring knowledge gain through surveys, separate studies, measuring digital traffic, and tracking transactions and/or returning customers. Recipients who are required to collect this data will identify an appropriate method for establishing baseline and updated knowledge-related data to report on this indicator.



INDICATOR 6.2

TOTAL NUMBER OF CONSUMERS WHO PURCHASED MORE LOCAL/REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ____ OF THOSE, THE NUMBER OF

- 6.2a: Adults and
- 6.2b: Children

Data Collection Tip

Measuring the number of consumers who consumed more local/regional agricultural products will vary depending on recipient activities and types of stakeholders engaged. The “Data Collection Considerations” section within the Program Evaluation Framework outlines methods for measuring consumption change through surveys, separate studies, measuring digital traffic, and tracking transactions and/or returning customers. Recipients who are required to collect this data will identify an appropriate method for establishing baseline and updated consumption-related data to report on this indicator.



INDICATOR 6.3

NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL LOCAL/REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT CUSTOMERS COUNTED



Data Collection Tip

Data on number of additional local/regional agricultural product customers can be collected by establishing customer “head count” baselines at the beginning of the grant period and noting whether growth occurs consistent with estimates and grant program activities.



INDICATOR 6.4

NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS EXECUTED FOR LOCAL/ REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Data Collection Tip

Data on number of additional local/regional agricultural product transactions can be collected by establishing transaction count baselines at the beginning of the grant period and noting whether growth occurs consistent with estimates and grant program activities. Recipients might also track average price per transaction, to ensure that overall consumption is increasing, rather than merely more frequent, smaller transactions. Business transactions encompass both online and in-person transactions.



INDICATOR 6.5

INCREASED SALES MEASURED IN

- 6.5a dollars
- 6.5b percent change, or
- 6.5c combination of volume and average price as a result of enhanced marketing activities



Data Collection Tip

Sales data can be tracked by noting change in dollar amount, percentage, or a combination of volume and average price. Data on increased sales can be collected from relevant producers or other stakeholders engaged by the grant recipient as part of the established project. Recipients should compare baseline sales to sales data after their marketing campaign is concluded. Recipients can encourage producers or other stakeholders to share sales data in the following ways:

Education: Educate producers on how their data is being used, the purpose of the data collection, importance of data collection, etc.

Transparency: Increase transparency through the use of clear, easy to understand contracts, data-use agreements, etc. Ensure producers/ stakeholders fully understand the contract prior to signing.

Trust: Build trust with producers/stakeholders by highlighting shared core values, interests, commitments to common causes and the mutual benefits of sharing information (show direct, tangible benefits to producers, such as financial sustainability, training, etc.).

Other Best Practices: If possible, recipients can develop privacy policies to keep producer/ stakeholder identities anonymous. AMS should work with recipients to facilitate trust building and educate recipients on how sales data is used by AMS.