

**3.8 Deputy T.A. Vallois of St. Saviour of the Minister for Economic Development regarding the additional wireless telegraphy licence fee income of £360,527:**

Further to Ministerial Decision MD-E-2009-0162, could the Minister advise how the additional wireless telegraphy licence fee income of £360,527 was identified within the Economic Development Department, why there was no awareness of this for the 2009 Business Plan budget and how £160,527 of these monies will support the pressures in the finance industry due to the global financial crisis?

**Senator A.J.H. Maclean (The Minister for Economic Development):**

The 2009 E.D.D. (Economic Development Department) Business Plan was agreed by the States in December 2008. It was not until February 2009 that my department was contacted by the responsible U.K. department about this unexpected payment. It resulted after changes to the funding mechanism for the regulator, Ofcom. As the responsible department for broadcasting, Economic Development received £360,527 along with other Crown Dependencies and devolved administrations. These funds were treated as a windfall income outside of the budget process. An allocation was agreed with the Treasury. Our initial view on distribution of this funding is captured in MD-E-2009-0162; however, following discussions with Treasury officials, in light of the budgetary pressures and rapidly changing economic conditions, a revised distribution was agreed and confirmed by Ministerial Decision; £200,000 was therefore transferred to Home Affairs to support unfunded court and case costs; £75,000 was transferred to the Chief Minister's Department to fund the Financial Services Advisory Board Risk Review; £75,000 was given as an additional grant to Jersey Finance to commission a detailed analysis of the implications of a new E.U. (European Union) directive that could have impact on Jersey's funds industry. Finally, the balance of £10,527 was used to fund activity across Economic Development that was unfunded in the E.D.D. 2009 Business Plan. Thank you.

**3.8.1 Deputy T.A. Vallois:**

Could the Minister explain why that form of breakdown could not be provided on the full report on the Ministerial Decision?

**Senator A.J.H. Maclean:**

As far as I am aware, the initial decision gave a breakdown, or headline, of the amounts that were being allocated. Further decisions that come under further M.D.s (Ministerial Decisions); there was the Home Affairs one, which was MD-HA-2009-215, that had the detail in it. The Chief Minister's allocation, which was MD-CM-2009-130, also had the details in it, as indeed did the additional grant to Jersey Finance, which was MD-E-2009-108. So all the information, as far as I am aware, is fully available.

**3.8.2 The Deputy of St. Mary:**

I just want to know how this matches up with transparency; that we are expected to hunt around through Ministerial Decisions in this department and that department when it could be in one place where the windfall occurred?

**Senator A.J.H. Maclean:**

All I can say, the information is available. If the Deputy would like it dispensed in a different format then I am more than happy to listen to his concerns.

**3.8.3 Senator S.C. Ferguson:**

Does the Minister not think that it would have been helpful to have cross-referenced his decision with the decisions by the other departments so that it was a quick and easy matter to identify the various decisions? Will he consider, or will he agree, to doing this in future?

**Senator A.J.H. Maclean:**

Again, I do not think that the information was that difficult to ascertain, but if the Senator feels that the information could be better displayed then I am certainly happy to have a conversation with her and gain a clearer understanding as to how she feels that might be achieved.

**3.8.4 Deputy T.A. Vallois:**

I believe in the full report it states that these monies were received every 5 years. Could the Minister explain why they were not acknowledged, therefore, in 2009 due to them being received by the department every 5 years?

**Senator A.J.H. Maclean:**

As far as I am aware, the 5-year indication is not entirely accurate; in fact, it is we believe an annual determination. But in fact this particular sum of funding was not and has not in the past been paid. It was unexpected. We believe it came about from the devolution process where the true cost of the licence fees based against the funding from the U.K. Government to Ofcom, which comes from the U.K. Government's consolidated fund, led to this additional funding being identified by the U.K. Government. It was indeed, as I have earlier said, a windfall payment for Jersey and, clearly, we are very thankful to have received it.