

Briefing with the Executive Board – 18 April 2019

Talking Points for Director of Performance Management and Monitoring Division

Slide 1: Cover

- Good morning. We are pleased to welcome you to this briefing on WFP's 2018 Annual Performance Report. The 2018 Annual Performance Report builds on the lessons of 2017 and responds to the emerging requirements from donors who request shorter and more focused report but greater detail on performance. The APR demonstrates our progress against the Strategic Plan and reflects to the greatest extent possible the management plan.
- We have critically analysed data from all our systems to give you every piece of evidence and as much information as possible on our performance in 2018.

Slide 2: Annual Performance Report 1968

- I would like to show you the progress we have made on the Annual Performance Report since 1968, when our very first APR was released. It was only three pages long, included a generic overview of the services that are provided, revised provisions and actual expenditures. This is a significant shift from our current 80-page evidence-based report, which includes an in-depth analysis on WFP's reach and coverage, and a detailed analysis on financial resources, prioritization and consequences of funding gaps.

Slide 3: A consultative process: first on the new CRF

- The 2018 Annual Performance Report is a result of extensive consultations with various stakeholders that have supported us to create an engaging document. Not only did we hold consultations with over 60 focal points from different offices, but we also met with directors, donors and EB members to discuss the strategic orientation of the report. This slide shows you the overall timeline, including milestones and communication products we will create to enhance internal and external visibility of the APR. Some key communication materials we are drafting include: a dynamic year-in-review digital story, a quiz to test knowledge of WFP and tweets to disseminate key statistics to external stakeholders.

Slide 4: Reflects the Management Plan

- I would like to highlight that this is the second year the APR reports against the Strategic Plan (2017-2021). This is the first APR that is fully aligned to the Corporate Results Framework, as all country office log frames were aligned to the CRF in 2018. We now have results against our Strategic Objectives which I will describe in more detail later in the presentation.
- The 2018 APR reports against the performance targets set within the Management Plan 2018-2020. On the slide you can see key areas that we are reporting against, including: planned amounts for CBT and food, planned direct beneficiary and rations amounts,

WFP's corporate management performance and resource mobilization.

- However, given that some operations were project-based in 2018, budgetary and financial statements cannot be merged, as seen in WFP's financial statement. This is something we look forward to giving you next year.

Slide 5: Structure of the report

- Several substantial improvements have been made to the overall structure of the report, while still ensuring continuity and comparability with previous versions. The 2018 APR consists of five key sections:
- First, the *introduction* provides an overview of the global context in which WFP operates. Second, *financial resources and prioritization* provides an in-depth analysis of WFP's financial situation and examines the total funding gap and its consequences. Third, *programme performance* highlights WFP's reach, coverage and response in 2018. Fourth, *management performance* analyses the performance of country office functional areas and the support provided by regional bureaux and headquarter offices. And fifth, *lessons learned*, concludes the report by taking stock of best practices over the course of 2018 and looks ahead at priorities for 2019.
- I would now like to brief you about some key highlights found within each section of the report:

Slide 6: Global context

- Looking at the context in which we work, in 2018, 821 million people – or one in nine people in the world – were undernourished. This represents a 6 million increase since 2017 and has brought hunger levels back to where they were a decade ago.
- As you are all aware, 2018 continued to experience a high number of emergencies – with conflict and climate-related emergencies manifested into seven L3 and nine L2s, requiring corporate or regional responses. This is compared to eight L3 and seven L2 emergencies in 2017.

Slide 7: Closer financial analysis

- Looking at WFP's financial situation, the organization increased its contribution revenue by 20 percent – from USD 6.0 billion in 2017 to a record USD 7.2 billion in 2018. Of these, USD 6.3 billion (87 percent) was allocated to WFP's programme category funds. Almost half of the USD 6.3 billion was directed to the Middle East, North Africa, Eastern Europe and Central Asia Region in response to large-scale operations such as Yemen and the Syrian Regional Refugee Response.
- The funding gap stood at 2.8 billion which represents a significant improvement from the USD 3.8 billion gap in 2017. However, inevitably led WFP to suspend or reduce the breadth and scope of its activities.
- While the growth in contribution revenue was critical for meeting the increasing needs, there was a disproportionate concentration in both the source and the allocation of funding. In 2018, the top 10 donors accounted for almost 85 percent of contribution

revenue. The highest funding growth again came from the top donors, on whom WFP remains increasingly reliant.

- I would also like to note that while the absolute amount of flexible funding represented a 9 percent increase from 2017, flexible funding remained at 6 percent of total funding, continuing a trend that has seen the share of flexible contributions decrease. 83 percent of all contributions remained earmarked at the activity level in 2018. Greater funding flexibility and predictability is critical in supporting WFP's integral role in the humanitarian-development-peace nexus and its partnerships for capacity strengthening with national governments. It also helps WFP to realize the full benefits of the IRM and to ensure a more efficient use of WFP's strategic financing tools.

Slide 8: Funding gap consequences

- In this slide you can see some key facts and figures related to the consequences of funding gaps.
- First, countries focusing on capacity strengthening have been less well funded with a contribution revenue of USD 25 million against a budget of USD 72.6 million. For example, the Latin America and the Caribbean region had the second highest funding gap in 2018 at 45 percent. With the exception of Colombia, all countries in this region had needs-based plans of less than USD 50 million in 2018. The region as a whole has the smallest budget in WFP and includes relatively few direct deliveries, focusing more on capacity-strengthening activities.

- Second, smaller operations with few or no direct deliveries have been less well funded compared to WFP's largest operations. For example, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had the fourth largest funding gap and a final 2018 budget of USD 49 million. WFP had to suspend food assistance to approximately 195,000 kindergarten children and reduce the ration provided to vulnerable children under five, and to pregnant and lactating women with fragile food and nutrition security.
- Third, low visibility protracted crises often face funding challenges which caused WFP to stretch available resources. For example, in Ethiopia, due to persistent funding constraints, WFP has not been able to provide full rations to refugees in camps since late 2015. Refugees received rations 20 percent less than the standard entitlements, but in May and June 2018, WFP was forced to increase ration cuts to 40 percent in order to stretch available resources.

Slide 9: Cost per ration

- As just explained, funding gaps and delayed arrival of contributions have consequences in the cost per ration and the size of the distributed rations.
- We have used the cost per ration as a metric both in the Management Plan and the APR for a few years now. What's new in 2018 is that with the transition to the IRM we have been able to develop a more detailed and accurate methodology to assess this metric. As you can see, the actual cost per ration in 2018 is not far from the planned figures – based on implementation plans – that

were included in the Management Plan, with the exception of the focus area “resilience”, where most of the activities that suffer chronic underfunding are included.

- The calculation, however, is only based on the number of rations, not their size. When country offices face funding shortfalls and pipeline breaks, rations are reduced in terms of size, number of days of assistance, or both. Of course, reduced rations cannot possibly achieve the same results that full rations do. On average, the size of the actual distributed ration was 63 percent of the planned ration.
- We are still conducting detailed analysis on the cost and size of rations distributed in 2018 and you will see more details in the final report.

Slide 10: KPI 1 – overall progress in CSP implementation

- This is one of the three corporate indicators that we introduced in the revised CRF approved last November. What we are displaying here is the baseline, which is calculated using the data of around 60 country offices which had enough data by 31 december.
- The indicator shows, on its right side, the impact of the resourcing situation and the context of the country in the size of the operation, by measuring, of all the outcome and output indicators in the CSP logframes, what proportion of them had some implementation. In other words, the proportion of results that WFP has actively pursued in 2018, given available resources and operational constraints. Output implementation is slightly higher than outcome – this shows how in the majority of CSPs, for which 2018 was the first year, implementation is relatively high, and

where there might be some strategic outcomes partially prioritised, the intention is to start as much as possible of the portfolios. It is likely that, should funding gaps persist, we will see lower levels of implementation, particularly in some areas.

- The left side of the graph refers to, of those outcomes and outputs that were implemented, which ones achieved targets or were on track; so it refers to the quality of our operations. You can see that in general, output achievements are lower than outcome achievements: this gives you the idea that we are reaching targets in most of our activities, but we are achieving them for smaller groups of beneficiaries. This is likely to have a long-term impact in CSPs results.
- We will continue to present you this indicator in the future, so we are able to establish trends on both sides: the impact of funding gap and the long-term progress of CSPs.

Slide 11: Reporting on corporate targets based on CRF discussions

- There have been a series of discussions on corporate targets as a part of the revised CRF. Here are a few examples of actual figures for some of the indicators already reported in the 2018 APR. More details will be provided in the following slides.
- As explained during the corporate target discussions, from 2019, achievements of all the WFP Global Indicators will be reported against its targets, which are based on need-based planning trends. In addition, resource-based planning figures will be reflected in the APR when available since figures for some indicators are not yet available.

Slide 12: Key figures breakdown

- In this slide, you can see some key figures in terms of our outreach in 2018.
- In 2018, WFP directly assisted 86.7 million beneficiaries in 83 countries using in-kind food and, increasingly, CBTs. This includes 84.9 m people assisted through operations and 1.8 m people assisted through trust funds. In terms of residence status, it includes 14.7 million refugees - 37 percent more than in 2017 - and 3.4 million returnees and 13.1 million internally displaced persons. Children – 26.8 million girls and 25.4 million boys – remain the primary recipient of WFP assistance. They represented 62 percent of total beneficiaries.
- The beneficiary figure went down slightly in 2018. However, the use of CBTs continued to increase, reaching USD 1.7 billion in 2018 (1.4b in 2017). The food assistance totaled 3.9 million mt (roughly the same level as in 2017), which indicate each beneficiary received more transfers in 2018. What we need to consider as the main drivers of the overall decrease in the beneficiary numbers are the downscale of WFP's operation in Iraq the complete deactivation of the Horn of Africa emergency in 2018.

Slide 13: School feeding, nutrition and FFA in numbers

- As you can see, WFP assisted 16.4 million school children through its school feeding activities in 59 countries. WFP global data demonstrates strong results on all key education-related indicators, i.e. retention rates, enrolment rates and attendance

rates. Approximately 93 percent of countries with sufficient data reported strong progress in 2018

- In 2018, WFP assisted 3.2 million beneficiaries through school feeding in L3 and L2 emergencies. WFP-supported school feeding programmes provided food and a platform for community resilience, social cohesion and stability.
- For example, WFP's school feeding programme launched in Yemen in 2018 assisted 394,000 children in primary and secondary schools. In addition to alleviating children's short-term hunger, school feeding provided an incentive to encourage regular school attendance despite on-going conflict.
- WFP nutrition-specific interventions reached 15.8 million beneficiaries. Nutrition-specific activities included: i) treatment programmes for vulnerable groups suffering from acute malnutrition including children ages 6 to 59 months, PLWs, and people living with HIV/AIDs and/or tuberculosis; ii) acute malnutrition prevention programmes; iii) stunting prevention programmes; and iv) programmes addressing micronutrient deficiencies.

WFP also continued to integrate social and behaviour change (SBCC) communication into nutrition programmes globally, reaching 4.2 million people through WFP-supported nutrition messaging and counselling. It also made substantial progress in SBCC capacity building and trained 350 WFP staff and partners at SBCC workshops held in five regional bureaux.

- Lastly, WFP utilized its FFA programme and partnered with governments and non-governmental and community organizations to provide food assistance, technical support, and guidance to 55 countries.

- Let's take a closer look at FFA outputs in the next slide.

Slide 14: Focus on food assistance for assets outputs

- WFP's FFA programme aimed to address food-insecure households' immediate food needs, while supporting the construction or rehabilitation of the productive assets of vulnerable communities and households.
- The large amounts of assets we constructed or rehabilitated had positive impacts on women's empowerment, nutrition and landscapes. As can be seen in this figure, actual achievements were almost as planned for 2018.
- I would now like to briefly present you with some of our key achievements in four L3 operations that galvanized worldwide interest.

Slide 15: Focus on L3s: Bangladesh

- In Bangladesh, WFP provided unconditional resource transfers to over 900,000 Rohingya refugees. WFP supported host communities with livelihood projects, including targeted programmes such as school feeding and capacity strengthening initiatives.
- Together with UNHCR and IOM, WFP established a site maintenance and engineering project for Cox's Bazar. The project allowed at-risk households to move to dry and level land in advance of the monsoon season. Bridges and roads were also built to ensure access to humanitarian supplies during the rains.

Slide 16: Focus on L3s: Sahel

- In the Sahel, in May 2018, WFP activated a pre-emptive L3 response – the first in its history – due to the forecast of a critical lean season with over 5.8 million food insecure people. Resilience-building programmes were scaled up in five priority countries – Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, and Niger - prone to recurrent shocks.
- The emergency response included: unconditional food assistance through in-kind and CBT; and malnutrition prevention and treatment activities.
- The emergency response was deactivated in November as the situation stabilized. Early planning, the activation of the pre-emptive L3 emergency and internal advance mechanisms to finance the initiation of the response enabled WFP to manage resources more efficiently to reach more than 3 million vulnerable people (89% of the 3.5 million planned).

Slide 17: Focus on L3s: South Sudan

- In South Sudan, the food and nutrition situation continued to deteriorate amidst protracted conflict and ongoing economic crisis, with 6.1 million people – 59 percent of the population – estimated to be facing ‘Crisis’ and ‘Emergency’ acute food insecurity, at the peak of the lean season (July – August). In response, WFP expanded its coverage to reach 5.3 million beneficiaries.

- While the main focus in 2018 continued to be providing life-saving food assistance, in areas of relative stability, WFP supported communities and households to rebuild livelihoods. WFP also expanded both its Food Assistance for Assets and School Feeding programmes, to cover 40 percent more beneficiaries in FFA and 38 percent more schools in comparison to 2017.
- WFP and cooperating partners also ensured the availability of food in inaccessible areas by strategically propositioning 132,000 mt of commodities in 50 warehouses across the country, reaching 94 percent of its annual target.

Slide 18: Focus on L3s: DRC

- In DRC, WFP scaled up its food and nutrition assistance in six L3 provinces of Kasai, Ksai Central, Ituri, North Kivu, South Kivu and Tanganyika, reaching over 3.7 million people.
- The country also grappled with its second Ebola outbreak, for which WFP provided logistical services and food assistance to more than 150,000 people.
- In North Kivu, WFP and partners reached 41,000 conflict-affected children (predominantly returnees) in 74 schools through a home-grown school feeding programme. Attendance in assisted schools reached 92.6 percent in 2018 and retention 95 percent (up from 90.8 percent in 2017). Home-grown school feeding also helped to promote the development of inclusive local supply chains.

Slide 19: KPI 2 – effective emergency preparedness and response

- We are now looking at the second KPI that was introduced by the rCRF, which intends to measure corporate performance in both preparedness and emergency response: how is WFP fulfilling its mandate in emergencies, beyond the results achieved.
- The indicator is composed by five standards, and you can see that in 2018 we achieved 3 of them, notably two standards in response and one of the standards in preparedness.
- Three L2/L3s declared in 2018, and our corporate mechanisms worked well on them. In terms of preparedness, FASTER, which is our flagship training – both for WFP and partners – on emergency preparedness, also achieved targets. With this training, we intend to create a critical mass of staff that can be deployed when an emergency is declared. The two preparedness indicators that are falling behind are the implementation of the Emergency Preparedness Package at country office, which was revamped at the end of 2017, and still being roll out in some country offices; and the internal process for making funds available for country offices with a dire preparedness need. Both areas are indeed in focus for improvements in 2019.

Slide 20: Cross-cutting issues

- In this slide you can see the progress we have made in four cross-cutting areas: accountability to affected populations, protection, gender and environment. As you are aware, WFP's achievement of its planned outputs and outcomes depends on integrating these

elements into the planning, design, implementation and monitoring of projects.

- To advance the *Accountability to affected populations* cross-cutting area, WFP is increasingly using complaints and feedback mechanisms (CFMs) to provide basic programmatic information to its beneficiaries. A comprehensive corporate approach to CFMs was piloted in 2018, including a standardized set of CFM processes and tools. In addition to lessons learned and best practices identified during the pilot, WFP developed a specific indicator that captures affected populations' suggestions for improving programmes and activities. I am pleased to say that 74 percent of project activities for which beneficiary feedback was documented, analysed and integrated into programmes made improvements.
- To advance the *gender* cross-cutting area, 21 WFP country offices participated in the Gender Transformation Programme. This resulted in country offices progressing from a gender baseline assessment to the development and implementation of an improvement plan, and on to a final assessment which measures their achievements against the 39 benchmarks on which the Gender Transformation Programme is based.
- To advance the *protection* cross-cutting area, in Bangladesh for example, WFP analysis of context and protection indicated a correlation between gender-based violence risks such as rape and sexual assault and movement within and around camps. WFP consequently increased distribution points from four in late 2017 to 21 in 2018, organized separate lines for women and girls, and employed women volunteers.

- To advance the *environment* cross-cutting area, WFP developed a comprehensive set of environmental and social standards and a risk screening tool. The latter was developed to ensure that environmental and social risks are identified during activities' initial design phase and contribute to eliminating or mitigating environmental risks.
- I would now like to provide you with key achievements for each of our strategic objectives.

Slide 21: Overall performance by Strategic Objective (SO1)

- The colour green means that WFP has either achieved its target or is on-track to achieve the target. Amber means WFP has made some progress but desired targeted have not been met or progress towards desired targets is deemed slow. Red means WFP has made very slow progress, no progress at all or has regressed. And lastly, grey means insufficient data is available to be able to monitor organization-wide progress.
- As you can see on the slide, we have made good progress on Strategic Objective 1: end hunger by protecting access to food. Notably, over 3 million metric tons of food and approximately USD 1.2 billion in cash-based transfers were distributed in 2018.
- Overall, WFP made moderate progress in achievements on food consumption score; in many cases, progress was hindered by ongoing conflict and access issues. In addition, WFP met or was on track to meet targets for improving food consumption nutrition, diversifying diets and reducing the use of negative

coping strategies. This is the first time we have managed to analyse the food consumption score – nutrition at global level.

Slide 22: Overall performance by Strategic Objective (SO2)

- WFP has made moderate progress on Strategic Objective 2: improve nutrition. However, nutrition indicators measured under Strategic Objective 1, which complement other interventions, showed strong progress in 2018.
- Effectiveness of MAM treatment programmes are assessed through recovery rates, non-response to treatment, and mortality rates. In 2018, MAM treatment outcome indicators demonstrated a moderate overall performance. Challenges faced by MAM treatment programmes performance included: ongoing conflict, household distance to treatment centres, capacities of staff at health clinic staffs', or resource constraints.
- The Minimum Dietary Diversity Score for Women, used to measure performance of stunting programmes, showed overall progress towards achievements of results. This is the second year we have managed to collect and analyse this indicator.

Slide 23: Overall performance by Strategic Objective (SO3)

- WFP has also made moderate progress on Strategic Objective 3: achieve food security.
- Indicators demonstrate that WFP's 2018 interventions produced positive outcomes directly related to WFP activities' implementation. For example, 80 percent of countries with the indicator "percentage of targeted smallholder farmers reporting

increased production of nutritious crops” met their annual targets.

- However, other outcome indicators, which have a weaker correlation to WFP operations, e.g. indicators related to market opportunities, did not record significant progress.

Slide 24: Overall performance by Strategic Objective (SO4)

- WFP’s work in support of the SDGs implementation was not fully captured through SO 4’s outcome indicators. The main indicator that we could have used to report in this SO is the Zero Hunger Capacity Scorecard, which was found too complex by many country offices. As you know, this indicator was replaced in the revised CRF approved last November.
- In addition, a too small number of countries included other relevant indicators in their log-frames and reported against them, limiting our ability to conduct a broader institutional performance assessment. With the revised CRF now including a menu of simpler indicators, and it being in force from the past 1 of January, we should be able to report on capacity strengthening in the future.
- However, some important work was done, including the expansion of its South-South and triangular cooperation, which is reflected in the increasing numbers of WFP country offices engaging in South-South cooperation. In fact, 94 percent of CSPs approved in 2018 include South-South and triangular cooperation as a means for strengthening host government capacities to achieve SDG 2 targets.

Slide 25: Overall performance by Strategic Objective (SO5)

- WFP's 2018 results analysis of Strategic Objective 5, partner for SDG results, was also inconclusive as country offices did not plan nor implement most of the Strategic Objective 5 indicators. Despite this, WFP participated in numerous critical initiatives to strengthen partnerships with fellow UN agencies and other partners.
- For example, WFP significantly contributed to the wider humanitarian community through common services provision. Specifically, the WFP-led Logistics Cluster supported 606 organizations, of which 78 percent were NGOs. In addition, the United Nations Humanitarian Response Depot (UNHRD), managed by WFP, sent emergency relief items and equipment worth USD 58 million to 93 countries for 35 partner organizations.
- I would know like to present some of the management performance assessment included in the APR:

Slide 26: KPI 3 – overall achievement of management performance standards

- This is the third corporate indicator included in the revised CRF, which shows the performance of different functional areas (so, the different units in the country office, regional bureau and here in Rome), which collaborate to implement the CSPs. This is the baseline, constructed with 2018 data, that we will continue using in future reporting.
- Overall, you can see that most of the areas are in the medium to high performance, but there is space for improvement. The best-

off areas are security, where we measure the minimum common measures that all offices need to comply with; information technology; and Finance, where we look into the percentage of transactions that involve financial risks for WFP. Supply chain, where we look at losses and the efficiency of our transport arrangements, is also in the green zone; this indicator is easily affected by access issues and other operational constraints, so our baseline is quite high in this functional area.

- The lower performances are to be found in some of the functional areas that have been harder hit by the IRM: human resources, where we have the only indicator in red, on mandatory training compliance, although the overall performance is in the moderate area. Budget and programming, as well as Programme itself are also showing low performance attributable to changes in internal processes, to which most of our staff is still getting used to as we complete the IRM transition.
- Administration is also an area where performance is in the moderate area; the administration function covers a wide variety of services, from office management to travel, light vehicle management and environmental footprint of our offices. As you know, many of these areas are work in progress and definitely we will see improvement from this baseline in the future.
- Finally, the management area includes two indicators: gender representation, to which solid progress was made by many country offices in 2018, as part of WFP's commitments, and the number of internal audit recommendations. Although the overall number of recommendations has increased in 2018, most of our country offices were very diligent in taking action in the recommendations addressed to them, reducing the pending

actions from their side. We will have a word on the overall number of recommendations a little later on the presentation.

Slide 27: Pillar A: Strategy and Direction

- Next, we will look into some of the main achievements in terms of the support work that regional bureaux and headquarter divisions do. As you will remember from the Management Plan, the support provided by regional bureaux and headquarters is organized into five pillars, to which budget is allocated.
- We will be focusing on pillars A, D and E, which correspond to strategy and direction, partnerships and resource mobilisation and independent oversight. The main results of pillars B and C, which refer respectively to direct support to operations and policy and training, have a direct impact in the performance of the functional areas which we just saw in the precedent slide.
- Pillar A refers to strategy and direction, and includes the work that all our senior staff does in their respective areas of work, as well steering of the organisation and in the implementation of critical initiatives. The IRM is of course, one of such initiatives; we have been consistently achieving our milestones – and as of 1st January 2019, we had all country offices in the IRM system; by the end of 2019, all offices will have a CSP or an ICSP.
- The implementation of EB approved policies also falls under this pillar. Our divisions in Rome spend a substantial amount of staff a time and resources in the development and implementation of policies; compared to 2017, we have progress in some areas of policy implementation, such as evidence seeking and monitoring and evaluation arrangements, while some areas, such as allocation of financial and human resources are weaker.

Slide 28: Pillar D: Advocacy, partnerships and resource mobilization

- Under pillar D, we carry out most of our resource mobilisation activities – we have tackled this issue in the earlier parts of this presentation. But much more work is done under this pillar – for example, the coordination with UN partners, and the management of the global clusters for which WFP is lead or co-lead. 2018 has seen a general improvement on the satisfaction of users in ETC and logistics cluster, and while we await for the results of the Food security cluster, which is co-led with FAO, we also see that the 2017 results for this cluster user satisfaction achieve targets.
- These results have behind the work of numerous colleagues here in Rome and mostly in the field, and we particularly proud of the improvement of the results of the logistics and ETC clusters in protracted emergencies, which show that continuation of the level of service is as important as in the surge.

Slide 29: Pillar E: Governance and independent oversight

- Pillar E includes activities and services related with the EB and independent oversight: the evaluation and audit functions.
- In terms of implementation of EB follow up actions, we started measuring this indicator back in 2017 and we are indeed seeing progress on how the recommendations are being implemented, signaling the responsiveness of WFP as an organization. Starting from the top side of the graph, you can see the progress in addressing recommendations showed by the blue bars – the

darker ones are 2018. Often, recommendations to headquarter divisions require development of policies or similarly long processes, but you can see with the progression of the blue bars that in general, we are diligent in taking action.

- The number of audit recommendations for WFP overall has increased, as I mentioned before in relation to KPI 3. This is partly because number of audits and therefore recommendations have increased, following more resources allocated to audit function. We have passed from 30 high risk recommendations to 44; 16 of the existing ones were closed, but 30 new ones were issued, so the indicator shows mixed progress.

Slide 30: Senior management priorities

- Finally, you might also remember that at the corporate level, we also have a set of KPIs set on an annual basis by our senior management, towards which we present you results in the APR. Here you can see three of them.
- In terms of prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse and prevention of sexual harassment and abuse of power, we are measuring a part of prevention, as well as a part of the response. While we develop further and stronger indicators that can speak to the prevention culture in the organisation, we are indirectly focusing on employees awareness via the mandatory trainings in these two topics. As you can see, we are not yet at the 100% target. In terms of handling the reported cases, of all the cases reported and substantiated in SEA and SHA, 100% of the investigations were ongoing by the end December 2018, while some less than half of the SH ones were to be started at the same date. To note that there has been an increase of both types of

reported cases in the last year – more details of these can be found in the Inspectors General Report and in WFP report on disciplinary matters.

- As was discussed just yesterday in the Joint working group on PSEA, we will be looking into adding other indicators on prevention, such as the % of country offices with PSEA focal points and the channels through which cases can be reported. You will be able to see this in the APR itself.
- In terms of digitalization, what you see there is an estimation of the beneficiaries that we have reached through SCOPE and other similar platforms – this is one of the indicators that WFP will be using in the coming years to report on one of the ED's priorities, digitalization, which is crucial to improve the quality of operations and the service we deliver to them and to the governments we work with.
- Finally, in terms of UN coordination, in 2018 we achieved all our targets, and we have slightly decreased the performance against the gender UNSWAP targets – these areas would also be areas of focus in 2019.

Slide 31: Innovation

- As you are aware, WFP's Innovation Division (including the Innovation Accelerator in Munich) identifies bold, compelling solutions to address the needs of the people we serve. Mobile applications, new nutrition and farming approaches, artificial intelligence, blockchain, other frontier technologies and innovative business models have the potential to strengthen food systems, shorten humanitarian response times, deliver assistance

more efficiently and make funds stretch further. The Division helps WFP foster a culture of innovation, in which it is encouraged to develop and rapidly test new ways of working – leveraging data and technology to empower beneficiaries and offer assistance in ways that were not previously possible.

- For example, Dalili, WFP's first mobile app that connects beneficiaries with information on real-time prices, enabled Syrian refugees in Lebanon to acquire geo-targeted information on nearby shops and food prices.
- Empact, a unique programme that puts income opportunities in the global digital economy within reach of young adults affected by war or economic crisis, provided digital skills through a tailored, focused training programme to more than 2,400 students in Lebanon and Iraq.
- Lastly, WFP's deployment of blockchain technology made cash-based transfers more effective, protected beneficiary data and increased cost efficiency. In Jordan, for example, WFP saved 98% in financial transaction fees, which equaled about US\$40,000 per month.

Slide 32: Focus on our achievements

- Moving forward we aim to develop two to three thematic reports that deep-dive into key topics in APR. These reports will complement the APR and ACR, will be tailored towards the wider EB membership, donors, WFP staff and academia and will be used

as an advocacy product to raise awareness of specific initiatives. We will provide additional details on thematic reports in the subsequent EB session.

Slide 33: Thank you

- Thank you for your time, we hope this presentation was useful and look forward to presenting the 2018 APR in the EB session in June.