

**Question No: 83**

**Question: Budget 1991-92**

**Date: 12/11/91**

**Member: Mr EDE**

**To: TREASURER**

1. What are the details of the \$30 000 carryover for consultancies into the 1991-92 budget.
2. Is there a 15% increase in the Accounting Services budget compared to the 1990-91 budget; if so, why is this so, given the staff reduction from 27 to 24.
3. Is there a 47% increase in the allocation for the management in 1991-92; if so, why.
4. What are the funding allocations for Railnorth.
5. What are the details of interest receipts in 1990-91.
6. What are the projected figures of interest receipts for 1991-92.
7. Is the nominal Power and Water Authority corporate contribution for 1991-92 exactly the same as for 1990-91; if so, why.
8. What is the explanation for the 1991-92 accounting adjustment of \$5m in Power and Water Authority charges.

**ANSWER**

1. Carryover for consultancies expenditure relates to -

Railnorth \$24 000  
NT Treasury Executive Conference \$ 6 000.

2. Yes, there is a 14.6% increase in Accounting Services budget for 1991-92 compared to the budget for 1990-91. The increase is due to -

An increase in FID which is paid direct to Treasury and has no net effect on the budget (\$200 000). Full year effect on JES and National Wage Case. A 4% inflation factor for all non-wage costs.

3. The question does not make sense as currently worded. There must be a typographical error.

4. The funding allocation for Railnorth in 1991-92 is limited to the carryover from 1990-91 consultancies of \$24 000 (see response to Question 1).

5. Actual interest receipts in 1990-91 were -

Interest on Cash Balances \$14 655 000  
TLMC Interest Recovery \$ 943 000.

6. Projected interest receipts for 1991-92 are -

Interest on Cash Balances \$11 000 000  
TLMC Interest Recovery \$ 1 500 000

7. The Power and Water Authority Corporate Management Contribution has been introduced in 1991-92 to reflect service provided by the Department of Transport and Works on behalf of the Power and Water Authority. Although this arrangement was not in place for a full year in 1990-91, the same amount was attributed as having occurred during 1990-91 to assist in comparing the budgets over the past 2 years.

8. The \$5m was the result of an expectation that PAWA could more tightly manage creditors, stocks and, more particularly, debtors. A reduction in the level of debtors (ie customers owing PAWA money) was expected to be the main source of the \$5m.