

Targets and milestones estimated from Delta 1, Delta 2 and Countrywide proposals as at Dec 2011¹

OVERALL OBJECTIVE/SUPER GOAL: Progress towards the achievement of Millennium Development Goal 1: the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger in Myanmar

Goal	Indicator	Baseline ²	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	Assumptions
To improve the food and livelihood security of poor and vulnerable people in Myanmar	G1: Share of Food Expenditure in Overall Consumption (excluding health expenditure) in target states	76.3% (2005)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	70%	
	Source	IHLCA 2005, IHLCA 2010, IHLCA 2015, FAO/WFP Crop Food Assessment 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016 and Agricultural Census 2010						
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
	G2: % of moderately/severely malnourished children under 5 years of age in target states	44.9% (2005)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	40%	
Source	IHLCA 2005, IHLCA 2010, IHLCA 2015							
Purpose	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016) ³	Assumptions
To sustainably increase food availability and incomes of 2 million target beneficiaries Delta 1 – 207,000 HHS (25/11/11) Delta 2 Bogale – 20,000 HHS Delta 2 Laputta – 15,000 HHS Countrywide – 120,000 HHS TOTAL = 327,000 HHS or 1.5 million	P1: Number and % of target households with increased (agriculture, fishing, livestock, enterprise etc.) incomes Target HHS (Outputs 1 and 2): D1 66,000; CW 45,000; (Total 111,000 HHS) ⁵	0	20,000 hhs (10% of 220,000 hhs)	60,000 hhs (25% of 220,000 hhs)	90,000 hhs (40% of 220,000 hhs)	110,000 hhs (50% of 220,000 hhs)	130,000 hhs (60% of 220,000 hhs)	Fluctuating relationships between the Government and donor governments does not influence LIFT's performance and existence. Political changes positively affect target beneficiaries capability to benefit from increase food, income and nutrition knowledge. The election process does not adversely affect the project implementation. There are no major natural disasters in target areas.
	Source	LIFT Annual Reports, IP evaluations, LIFT evaluations and commissioned studies						
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
	P2: Number and % of target households with at least 5% agricultural productivity gains Target HHS (Outputs 1 and 2): D1 66,000; CW 45,000; (Total 111,000 HHS)	0	20,000 hhs (10% of 220,000 hhs)	60,000 hhs (25% of 220,000 hhs)	90,000 hhs (40% of 220,000 hhs)	110,000 hhs (50% of 220,000 hhs)	130,000 hhs (60% of 220,000 hhs)	
	Source	LIFT Annual Reports, IP evaluations, LIFT evaluations and commissioned studies						
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)⁶	
P3: Number and % of target households	0	40,000 hhs	120,000 hhs	160,000 hhs	200,000 hhs	240,000 hhs		

¹Targets have been extracted from proposals in hand at start of December 2011. These proposals had a total value of \$76m. Targets have then been increased *pro rata* to reflect new projects from increased LIFT funds that are expected to total \$160m. \$10m of this is expected to be spent on research activities (and will not directly impact households). As a result target and milestone estimates from proposals in hand at Dec 2011 have been doubled to reflect an increase in projects from those budgeted at \$76m to include future projects funded under the \$150m envelope (\$160m less \$10m). Many IPs have yet to finalize their targets and are expected to do so in early 2012 after completing inception periods and submitting annual reports for 2011. The targets herein will therefore be revised in early 2012.

²The baseline figures for both the goal level indicators are from IHLCA 2005.

³These milestones reflect both the progressive increase in numbers of farmers reached by partner projects over the years of LIFT implementation and farmers' gradual adoption of new technologies. Farmers are quick to learn and slow to adopt and according to Everett Rogers new technologies &/or improved practices will be adopted by the targeted farmers slowly but gradually. Practices such as seed selection and plant spacing are considered as a new technology, it is not necessary that farmers adopt whole new packages such as System of Rice Intensification (SRI). Experiencing the benefit of new technologies, others will start accepting new technologies and at the end of project it will rise up to 60% among the targeted households.

beneficiaries ⁴	with increased and/or diversified food consumption Target HHS: D1 140,000 from Outputs 1 and 2); CW 107,000 from Outputs 1, 2 and 4; (Total 247,000 HHS)		(10% of 400,000 hhs)	(30% of 400,000 hhs)	(40% of 400,000 hhs)	(50% of 400,000 hhs)	(60% of 400,000 hhs)	Economic growth is positive and markets function effectively.
		Source LIFT Annual Reports, IP evaluations, LIFT evaluations and commissioned studies						
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)⁷	
	P4: Number and % of target beneficiaries with an increase in food security by at least one month ⁸ Target HHS: D1 140,000 from Outputs 1 and 2); CW 107,000 from Outputs 1, 2 and 4; (Total 247,000 HHS)	0	40,000 hhs (10% of 400,000 hhs)	120,000 hhs (30% of 400,000 hhs)	160,000 hhs (40% of 400,000 hhs)	200,000 hhs (50% of 400,000 hhs)	240,000 hhs (60% of 400,000 hhs)	
		Source LIFT Annual Reports, IP reports and evaluations, IHLCA 2010, 2015, LIFT evaluations and commissioned studies						
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)⁹	
P5: Number and % of target households with increased assets (gender disaggregated) Target HHS: D1 66,000; CW 52,000; (Total 118,000 HHS)	0	25,000 hhs (10% of 240,000 hhs)	50,000 hhs (20% of 240,000 hhs)	70,000 hhs (30% of 240,000 hhs)	100,000 hhs (40% of 240,000 hhs)	120,000 hhs (50% of 240,000 hhs)		
	Source LIFT Annual Reports, IP reports and evaluations, LIFT evaluations and commissioned studies							
INPUTS (US\$)	Donors (USD)	Government (GBP)	Other (GBP)	Total (USD)				
OUTPUT 1	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	Assumptions
Increased agricultural production and incomes supported through improved production and post-harvest technologies, improved access to inputs and markets	O1.1 Number and % of target households aware of new/improved agriculture technologies or techniques Target HHS: D1 48,000; CW 45,000; (Total 93,000 HHS)	0	70,000 hhs (40% of 180,000 hhs)	90,000 hhs (50% of 180,000 hhs)	110,000 hhs (60% of 180,000 hhs)	125,000 hhs (70% of 180,000 hhs)	140,000 hhs (80% of 180,000 hhs)	No political interference in funding allocations. There are no natural disasters. Policy environment (land and production rights) is not infringed. Funds are released in time (based on seasonality) Local administration is supporting the activities of implementing partners. There is no major pest or disease outbreak in the project area. Unseasonal conditions (draught, flood) do not adversely affecting production.
		Source LIFT Annual Reports, IP reports and evaluations, LIFT evaluations						
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
	O1.2 Number and % of target households who adopt/use improved agricultural practices (list: rice, horticulture, livestock, etc) Target HHS: D1 48,000; CW 45,000; (Total 93,000 HHS)	0	35,000 hhs (20% of 180,000 hhs)	50,000 hhs (30% of 180,000 hhs)	70,000 hhs (40% of 180,000 hhs)	90,000 hhs (50% of 180,000 hhs)	100,000 hhs (60% of 180,000 hhs)	
	Source LIFT Annual Reports, IP reports and evaluations, LIFT evaluations							
	Indicator	Baseline¹⁰	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Milestone 3	Milestone 4	Target (2016)¹¹	

⁵ Targets are based on actual figures from the completed Delta 1 sub-program and projected targets from the Countrywide sub-program. Targets for the Delta 2 sub-program are assumed to be covered under Delta 1; Delta 2 was a smaller program which continued many of the same villages in two of the Delta 1 townships.

⁶ Milestones and targets have been set in line with the milestones and targets set for indicator P1.

⁴ The LIFT baseline survey found that the average household size was 4.8 members. Given that many of households receiving support in Delta 2 would also have received support in Delta 1, the totals for target households have been conservatively estimated by summing Delta 1 and Countrywide targets only. The target households include those supported through CBO capacity building, nutrition and environmental awareness training so may not all gain benefits in terms of food availability or incomes. Therefore the target has been set in the statement of purpose at a more modest 2 million (not double 1.5m).

⁷ Agricultural inputs going to the targeted households will contribute to increased production. Increased production will ensure increase in number of food secure months. It is hoped that at least 10% of the targeted households will be food secure for at least one more month by 2012 in comparison to baseline.

⁸ Access to and utilization of food by the targeted households will be measured. MAHFP (Months of Adequate Household Food Provisioning) and Household Dietary Diversity Score methods of FANTA will be used for measuring households' access to and utilization of food.

⁹ Assuming that increase in number of food secure months will be followed by increase in household assets. During baseline, annual and endline surveys, both productive and non-productive assets will be assessed.

			(2012)	(2013)	(2014)	(2015)		
	O1.3 Number and % of households in LIFT supported villages accessing credit from low interest micro finance groups, or village savings and loans associations, for agriculture Target HHs: D2B 15,000; D2L 9,000; CW 45,000; (Total 69,000 HHs) for credit for all purposes¹²	13%	60,000 hhs (15% of 400,000 hhs)	80,000 hhs (20% of 400,000 hhs)	90,000 hhs (22.5% of 400,000 hhs)	100,000 hhs (25% of 400,000 hhs)	110,000 hhs (27.5% of 400,000 hhs)	
		Source LIFT Annual Reports, IP reports and evaluations, LIFT evaluations						
INPUTS (US\$)	Donors (USD)	Government (GBP)	Other (GBP)	Total (USD)				RISK RATING
OUTPUT 2	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	Assumptions
Targeted households supported in non-agricultural livelihood activities and/or trained in livelihood skills for employment	O2.1: % of trained people who establish enterprises ¹³ (gender disaggregated) Target HHs establishing enterprises: D1 13,000; CW 17,000; (Total 30,000 HHs)	0	40% (60% of them are women)	50% (60% of them are women)	60% (60% of them are women)	60% (60% of them are women)	75% (60% of them are women)	No political interference in funding allocations.
		Source LIFT Annual Reports, IP reports and evaluations, LIFT evaluations						Economic environment allows beneficiaries to use skills and credit.
		Source LIFT Annual Reports, IP reports and evaluations, LIFT evaluations						Markets exist for the goods produced.
	O2.2: Number and % of households in LIFT supported villages accessing credit from low interest micro finance groups, or village savings and loans associations, for non-agricultural livelihoods ¹⁴ Target HHs: D2B 15,000; D2L 9,000; CW 45,000; (Total 69,000 HHs) for credit for all purposes	3%	15,000 hhs (4% of 400,000 hhs)	20,000 hhs (5% of 400,000 hhs)	25,000 hhs (6% of 400,000 hhs)	30,000 hhs (7% of 400,000 hhs)	35,000 hhs (9% of 400,000 hhs) (60% of borrowers are women)	Local authority is in favour of organising community groups.
		Source LIFT Annual Reports, IP reports and evaluations, LIFT evaluations						
		Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
	O2.3: % of targeted households with increase in income from non-agricultural activities and vocational training Target HHs: D1 13,000; CW 17,000; (Total 30,000 HHs)	0	15,000 hhs (15% of 60,000 hhs)	20,000 hhs (30% of 60,000 hhs)	25,000 hhs (40% of 60,000 hhs)	30,000 hhs (50% of 60,000 hhs)	35,000 hhs (60% of 60,000 hhs)	
		Source LIFT Annual Reports, IP reports and evaluations, LIFT evaluations						
INPUTS (US\$)	Donors (USD)	Government (GBP)	Other (GBP)	Total (USD)				RISK RATING
OUTPUT 3	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Milestone 3	Milestone 4	Target (2016)	Assumptions

¹⁰ The LIFT baseline study found that 642 households out of 4,000 had taken out loans using low interest micro credit in the previous 12 months – this included loans for agricultural as well as non-agricultural activities. The largest lender PACT has targeted provision of approximately 80% of its loans for crop production and livestock activities with only 20% going to non-agricultural activities.

¹¹ This target will be revised once LIFT's micro finance window has been formulated. The 110,000 hhs is 80% of 140,000 hhs (140,000 hhs is double the number targeted by D2 and CW IPs and covers both agriculture and non-agriculture). This represents nearly 30% of the 400,000 hhs (from which the estimated 2 million beneficiaries belong).

¹² Assume 80% credit is for agriculture.

¹³ Micro and small enterprises refer to family run and local small businesses often unregistered, in group or individually established with a small amount of money. In LIFT, selected beneficiaries will be provided with vocational training and cash grants/micro credit for starting the enterprise.

¹⁴ See footnote explanations for Indicator O1.3.

		(2012)	(2013)	(2014)	(2015)				
Sustainable natural resource management and environmental rehabilitation supported to protect local livelihoods	O3.1: Number of households participating in improved resource management or rehabilitation activities ¹⁵ Target HHS: D1 no information; D2B 6,000; D2L 1,500; CW 12,000; (Total 19,500 HHS)	0	8,000 hhs	16,000 hhs	24,000 hhs	32,000 hhs	40,000 hhs	No political interference in funding allocations. Levels of support to targeted households are large enough to meet needs	
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)		
	O3.2: Number of participants trained in sustainable resource management or rehabilitation topics (sex disaggregated) who think the training was useful Target HHS: D1 no information ; D2B target not yet available; D2L 2,500; CW target not yet available;	0	To be determined	To be determined	To be determined	To be determined	To be determined		To be determined
	Source	LIFT Annual Reports, IP reports and evaluations, LIFT evaluations							
	Source	IP reports and LIFT Annual Reports							
Source	Baseline survey, LIFT commissioned studies, LIFT annual report								
INPUTS (US\$)	Donors (USD)	Government (GBP)	Other (GBP)	Total (USD)				RISK RATING	
OUTPUT 4	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	Assumptions	
Effective social protection measures that increase the incomes, enhance the livelihood opportunities or protect the livelihoods assets of chronically poor households.	O4.1: Number and % of households supported by CfW activities that think the intervention was timely and effective. Target HHS: D1 55,000; CW 55,000; (Total 110,000 HHS)	0	30,000 hhs (15% of 220,000 hhs involved in CfW)	60,000 hhs (30% of 220,000 hhs involved in CfW)	100,000 hhs (45% of 220,000 hhs involved in CfW)	140,000 hhs (65% of 220,000 hhs involved in CfW)	180,000 hhs (80% of 220,000 hhs involved in CfW)	No political interference in funding allocations. Levels of support to targeted households are large enough to meet needs	
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)		
	O4.2: % of households supported with cash/asset transfer who are able to invest in productive activities/assets that increase their income Target HHS: D1 66,000 (mainly input provision or cash for inputs); CW 20,000; (Total 86,000 HHS)	0	50,000 hhs (30% of 170,000 hhs)	70,000 hhs (40% of 170,000 hhs)	90,000 hhs (50% of 170,000 hhs)	110,000 hhs (60% of 170,000 hhs)	120,000 hhs (70% of 170,000 hhs)		
	Source	LIFT Annual Report, IP reports, and LIFT commissioned studies and evaluations							
	Source	LIFT Annual Report, LIFT Commissioned Studies							
Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)			
O4.3: % of households who are able to reduce the number of food insecure months or days. Target HHS: D1 55,000; CW 55,000; (Total 110,000 HHS) mainly CfW	0	20,000 hhs (10% of 220,000 hhs)	50,000 hhs (20% of 220,000 hhs)	80,000 hhs (35% of 220,000 hhs)	110,000 hhs (50% of 220,000 hhs)	140,000 hhs (65% of 220,000 hhs)			
Source	LIFT surveys/evaluations, IP evaluations, LIFT annual reports								
INPUTS (US\$)	Donors (USD)	Government (GBP)	Other (GBP)	Total (USD)				RISK RATING	

¹⁵ These will be the future beneficiaries although benefits from these activities will typically take some years to be realized.

OUTPUT 5	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016) ¹⁷	Assumptions
Capacity of civil society strengthened to support and promote food and livelihoods security for the poor.	O5.1 Number of local NGOs better skilled in technical issues ¹⁸ and project and financial management ¹⁹	0	25	30	35	40	45	CBOs and LNGOs are allowed to form and meet regularly and support livelihoods and food security initiatives
	LIFT Annual Reports, LIFT project monitoring data obtained through implementing partners' M&E systems							
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
	O5.2: % of trained CBOs applying training in LIFT funded activities Target CBOs: D1 3,500; CW 7,500; (Total 11,000 CBOs) ²⁰	0	6,000 CBOs (30% of 20,000 CBOs)	7,000 CBOs (35% of 20,000 CBOs)	8,000 CBOs (40% of 20,000 CBOs)	9,000 CBOs (45% of 20,000 CBOs)	10,000 CBOs (50% of 20,000 CBOs)	
	Source LIFT Annual Reports, LIFT commissioned studies							
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
O5.3: Number of changes in technical or project management made by local NGOs in LIFT funded activities	0							
Source LIFT Annual report, Narrative report from IPs								
INPUTS (US\$)	Donors (USD)			Total (USD)				RISK RATING
OUTPUT 6	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	Assumptions
M&E evidence and commissioned studies are used to inform programme and policy development	O6.1: % (and number) of commissioned studies that are discussed by Fund Board and lead to actioned change of strategic direction	0	50% (3)	70% (7)	80% (10)	80% (13)	80% (16)	No political interference in funding allocations. Activities supported by the Fund are coherent and lessons can be consolidated to have an impact on policy and implementation. An appropriate Nationally-Owned Strategic Framework outside the Delta is developed.
	Source LIFT Annual Report, Mid-term Evaluation, Fund Board Minutes							
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
	O6.2: Number of strategic issues identified through IP programme activities, discussed by Fund Board and lead to actioned change of strategic direction	0	3	5	8	11	14	
	Source LIFT Annual Report, Mid-term Evaluation, Fund Board Minutes							
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
O6.3: Number events (forum, workshop, thematic discussion group) that promote communication and best practices	0	15	20	30	40	50		
Source LIFT Annual Report								
INPUTS (US\$)	Donors (USD)	Government (GBP)	Other (GBP)	Total (USD)				RISK RATING
OUTPUT 7	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016) ²¹	Assumptions

¹⁶ Indicators for Output 5 are being revised to better align with LIFT's capacity development strategy (which is under development at time of writing).

¹⁷ In the delta, 35 Local NGOs are engaged in implementation. At least 10 more new Local NGOs will be working in non-delta areas. So the target is kept as 45.

¹⁸ Technical issues will cover Gender, Farmer Field Schools, Grain Banks, Livestock Banks, Revolving Fund Management, Animal Husbandry, System of Rice Intensification etc.

¹⁹ LIFT will work with IPs and their local partners to standardize approaches to assessing capacity development using participatory qualitative assessment.

²⁰ As at February 2012, IPs for Delta 2 and Countrywide planned to cover 69 townships and 3,580 villages between them. The target therefore suggests approximately 3 CBOs supported in each village.

²¹ Targets have been set based on the experience from 3DF.

Funds are allocated in line with Fund Board policies and are accounted for in a transparent manner	O7.1: FB policy and strategy is clearly articulated and followed by the Fund Manager	0	90%	95%	100%	100%	100%	Fund Board members allocate sufficient human resource capacity to LIFT No political interference in funding allocations. Fund priorities reflect international best practice and learning. Transparent and open relationship among Fund Board, Fund Manager and Implementing Partners. Fund Manager supportive and engaging with Fund Board policies. No new IPs are contracted after 2013 (three year projects)
	Source	Fund Board Minutes of meeting, Fund Manager updates on follow-up on tasks and policies						
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
	O7.2: % of clear Fund Board recommendations implemented by the Fund Manager within given deadlines	0	90%	95%	100%	100%	100%	
	Source	Fund Board Minutes of meeting, Fund Manager updates on recommendations						
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
	O7.3: % and number of audit areas (both FM and IPs) rate as 'high priority' by auditors	3 (FM), 2 (per IP)	0 for all parties	0 for all parties	0 for all parties	0 for all parties	0 for all parties	
	Source	Fund Board Minutes of meeting, Fund Manager updates on recommendations						
	INPUTS (US\$)	Donors (USD)	Government (GBP)	Other (GBP)	Total (USD)			
OUTPUT 8	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)²²	Assumptions
Fund flow and IP performance are monitored and evaluated	O8.1: % of funds released by Fund Board is in line with the IP MoAs	0	85%	87%	87%	87%	87%	Fund Manager has M&E capacity and effective M&E system in place. Political situation does not interfere the fund flow process
	Source	LIFT Annual Reports						
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
	O8.2: % of Implementing Partners for whom the Fund Manager completes an M&E system review	0	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
	Source	Fund Manager M&E review, LIFT Annual Reports						
	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1 (2012)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Milestone 3 (2014)	Milestone 4 (2015)	Target (2016)	
O8.3: % of Implementing Partners for whom the Fund Manager completes a Financial system review ²³	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
INPUTS (US\$)	Donors (USD)	Government (GBP)	Other (GBP)	Total (USD)				RISK RATING

²² During the start-up phase in 2009 and early 2010 the necessary requirements for fund release were not in place. The first two scheduled payments (which is 44 out of estimated total 350 payments: 13% of the total) could not be released on time due to start up problems. Hence the target is set as 87%.

²³ FMO will commission audits of non-UN partners each year for IPs who received LIFT funds in the previous year.