

Ottawa Light Rail Commission

Bing Bing Wang
on Monday, May 9, 2022



77 King Street West, Suite 2020
Toronto, Ontario M5K 1A1

neesonsreporting.com | 416.413.7755

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

OTTAWA LIGHT RAIL COMMISSION

DELOITTE - BING BING WANG

May 9th, 2022

--- Held via Zoom Videoconferencing, with all
participants attending remotely, on the 9th day
of May, 2022, 9:00 a.m. to

1 COMMISSION COUNSEL:

2 Kate McGrann, Co-lead Counsel Member

3 Liz McLellan, Litigation Counsel Member

4

5 PARTICIPANTS:

6 Bing Bing Wang: Deloitte

7 Jamie Yoon and Malina Simmalavong: Deloitte

8 Touche Tohmatsu Ltd.

9

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 Helen Martineau, Stenographer/Transcriptionist,

13 Benjamin Bilgen, Virtual Technician

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| 1 | INDEX OF EXHIBITS | |
|----|-------------------|------|
| 2 | NO. / DESCRIPTION | PAGE |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | NONE MARKED. | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

1 --- Upon commencing at 9:00 a.m.

2 BING BING WANG: AFFIRMED.

3 KATE McGRANN: Good morning, my name
4 is Kate McGrann, I'm one of the co-lead counsel
5 for Ottawa Light Rail Transit Public Inquiry.
6 I'm joined this morning by my colleague, Liz
7 McLellan, who's a member of the Commission's
8 counsel team.

9 The purpose of today's interview is to
10 obtain your evidence, under solemn declaration
11 or oath, for use of the Commission's public
12 hearings. This will be a collaborative
13 interview such that my cocounsel, Ms. McLellan,
14 may intervene to ask certain questions. If time
15 permits your counsel may also ask follow-up
16 questions at the end of the interview.

17 This interview is being transcribed
18 and the Commission intends to enter this
19 transcript into evidence at the Commission's
20 public hearings, either at the hearings or by
21 way of procedural order before the hearings
22 commence. The transcript will be posted to the
23 Commission's public website, along with any
24 corrections made to it, after it is entered into
25 evidence.

1 The transcript, along with any
2 corrections later made to it, will be shared
3 with the Commission's participants and their
4 counsel on a confidential basis before being
5 entered into evidence. You will be given the
6 opportunity to review your transcript and
7 correct any typos or other errors before the
8 transcript is shared with the participant or
9 entered into evidence.

10 Any nontypographical corrections made
11 will be appended to the transcript.

12 Pursuant to section 33(6) of the
13 Public Inquiries Act 2009, a witness at an
14 inquiry shall be deemed to have objected to
15 answer any question asked of him or her upon the
16 ground that his or her answer may tend to
17 incriminate the witness, or tend to establish
18 his or her liability to civil proceedings at the
19 instance of the Crown or of any person. And no
20 answer given by a witness at an inquiry shall be
21 used or be receivable in evidence, against him
22 or her in any trial or other proceedings against
23 him or her thereafter taking place, other than a
24 prosecution for perjury in giving such evidence.

25 As required by section 33(7) of that

1 Act you are hereby advised that you have the
2 right to object to answer to any question under
3 section 5 of the Canada Evidence Act.

4 If at any point during our meeting
5 this morning you need to take a break please let
6 us know and we will pause.

7 To begin with, would you please
8 provide a brief description of your professional
9 experience as it relates to the work that you
10 did on Stage 1 of Ottawa's Light Rail Transit
11 project?

12 BING BING WANG: Sure. So for me, I
13 have more than 20 years of experience in
14 infrastructure sector, and I've been with
15 Deloitte since 2015, that allows me to provide
16 advice on this project.

17 KATE McGRANN: Have you been involved
18 in any light rail transit projects before this?

19 BING BING WANG: I have been involved
20 in light rail transit projects many years ago
21 around 2000.

22 KATE McGRANN: And which projects were
23 those?

24 BING BING WANG: That is the light
25 rail projects in China.

1 KATE McGRANN: One or more?

2 BING BING WANG: One.

3 KATE McGRANN: Was it starting a --
4 like introducing a whole new system like this
5 one or what was that project focused on?

6 BING BING WANG: It's design, build
7 and delivery of a light rail line, similar to
8 this project.

9 KATE McGRANN: And had you been
10 involved in any -- the delivery of any projects
11 by way of a P3 model before?

12 BING BING WANG: Yes. So I have been
13 involved in P3 projects since 2006 in Canada.

14 KATE McGRANN: In Canada?

15 BING BING WANG: Yeah.

16 KATE McGRANN: Were any of the
17 projects that you worked on that were delivered
18 by way of P3 done as design build, finance,
19 maintain?

20 BING BING WANG: Yes. Many projects
21 are done under this delivery model.

22 KATE McGRANN: And generally what kind
23 of projects were they?

24 BING BING WANG: Generally the
25 projects includes, for example, the hospitals,

1 government buildings, special purpose
2 facilities, those type of projects.

3 KATE McGRANN: Had you ever been
4 involved in a DBFM used for a transit project
5 before?

6 BING BING WANG: Yes. So I have been
7 working on a bus transit project.

8 KATE McGRANN: And when did you start
9 working on that project?

10 BING BING WANG: I don't remember the
11 particular year. That was with the City of
12 Barrie transit project.

13 KATE McGRANN: Were you involved in
14 the Barrie bus transit project before you became
15 involved in Stage 1 of Ottawa's LRT project?

16 BING BING WANG: No. Sorry, can you
17 repeat that question? I just want to make sure
18 I've got it.

19 KATE McGRANN: Were you involved in or
20 working on the Barrie bus transit project before
21 you began working on the Stage 1 Ottawa LRT
22 project?

23 BING BING WANG: Yes, that's before.

24 KATE McGRANN: And was that project
25 completed before you began working on the Ottawa

1 light rail transit project?

2 BING BING WANG: Yes.

3 KATE McGRANN: When did you first
4 become involved in working on Stage 1 of the
5 Ottawa LRT project?

6 BING BING WANG: So this project, the
7 QPR part, started in October of 2019, although I
8 was not that much actively involved in the QPR1.
9 My involvement became more active starting in
10 QPR2, which the actual work started in September
11 2020.

12 KATE McGRANN: A couple of questions.
13 It looks like you may be referencing documents
14 either in front of you on your screen or
15 otherwise, is that the case?

16 BING BING WANG: It's just more like a
17 quick notes for myself writing down the dates.

18 KATE McGRANN: Could we get a copy of
19 those notes after this interview is over?

20 JAMIE YOON: Just out of curiosity,
21 Kate, Ms. Wang -- these are notes that she made
22 for herself in preparation for this. I haven't
23 had an opportunity to discuss them with her.

24 Are they required to be produced to
25 you pursuant to the inquiry itself or are you

1 asking for a copy for reference?

2 KATE McGRANN: We're asking for a copy
3 to understand the evidence she's giving us
4 today.

5 U/A JAMIE YOON: We'll take that under
6 advisement.

7 KATE McGRANN: Ms. Wang, your
8 involvement in this project began in 2019, have
9 I got that right?

10 BING BING WANG: Yes.

11 KATE McGRANN: What work did you do
12 with respect to Stage 1 of the project?

13 BING BING WANG: Stage 1 I was just
14 being involved -- it's more like being copied on
15 the correspondence and be aware of, like,
16 roughly, in general the work being done, that is
17 during the QPR1.

18 KATE McGRANN: What does "QPR" stand
19 for?

20 BING BING WANG: Quarterly performance
21 review.

22 KATE McGRANN: What is a quarterly
23 perform review?

24 BING BING WANG: That is the report
25 that we produce.

1 KATE McGRANN: And what is the report
2 on?

3 BING BING WANG: The report includes a
4 number of areas that we review, and the approach
5 and the fundings are specified in the reports so
6 we submit it to the City.

7 KATE McGRANN: So is it the case that
8 Deloitte has been retained to provide quarterly
9 performance reports for a certain period of time
10 on Stage 1?

11 BING BING WANG: Yes. Stage 1 is the
12 Stage 1 project, right?

13 KATE McGRANN: Yes.

14 BING BING WANG: Yeah.

15 KATE McGRANN: And other than being
16 copied on emails, with respect to the quality
17 performance reports, did you have any
18 involvement in the work that Deloitte did on
19 Stage 1 of this project?

20 BING BING WANG: Maybe a little bit
21 discussions and -- yeah, not that many
22 activities.

23 KATE McGRANN: Who from Deloitte was
24 predominantly involved in working on Stage 1 of
25 the project?

1 BING BING WANG: Sam Pickering is
2 another partner, he's more active in QPR 1 of
3 the engagement.

4 KATE McGRANN: So he was more involved
5 in the drafting of QPR1?

6 BING BING WANG: Yeah.

7 KATE McGRANN: What about the work
8 that Deloitte did in assessing and advising the
9 City on which procurement delivery method to use
10 for Stage 1?

11 BING BING WANG: That one I don't
12 know. I was not involved in that stage.

13 KATE McGRANN: Who from Deloitte was
14 involved in assisting in the oversight of the
15 construction of the project?

16 BING BING WANG: I don't know.

17 KATE McGRANN: Who from Deloitte was
18 involved in monitoring the trial running of the
19 system that was conducted prior to the public
20 launch of revenue service?

21 BING BING WANG: I don't know, and I
22 don't even know if Deloitte is involved.

23 KATE McGRANN: What do you know about
24 Deloitte's involvement in the project from,
25 let's say 2011 to 2019?

1 BING BING WANG: I don't know because
2 I was not involved in that part of the work.

3 KATE McGRANN: Did you have any
4 involvement in the drafting of a 2015 "Lessons
5 Learned" report?

6 BING BING WANG: No.

7 KATE McGRANN: Are you aware of the
8 existence of that report?

9 BING BING WANG: No.

10 KATE McGRANN: Is there someone named
11 Remo Bucci still working at Deloitte?

12 BING BING WANG: Yes.

13 KATE McGRANN: And do you know
14 anything about their involvement in the project?

15 BING BING WANG: I know he has been
16 working on that project but I don't know the
17 details about his involvement?

18 KATE McGRANN: What role have you
19 played in the project since you became involved
20 in 2019?

21 BING BING WANG: My role is mainly to
22 manage the team to complete the QPR reports.

23 KATE McGRANN: And how many QPR
24 reports have been completed so far?

25 BING BING WANG: Five.

1 KATE McGRANN: How many people are on
2 the team?

3 JAMIE YOON: Do you mean currently or
4 at any given -- just on average? Because I'm
5 sure the team may have switched from
6 time-to-time.

7 KATE McGRANN: Has the composition of
8 the team switched since you began working with
9 the team?

10 BING BING WANG: Yes.

11 KATE McGRANN: Who was on the team
12 when you first began working with the team in
13 2019?

14 BING BING WANG: That was Sam
15 Pickering and Gibril, I forget the family name,
16 he has left the firm, and Swarnima and Gavin Li.
17 There may be a few other team members I'm not
18 aware of.

19 KATE McGRANN: And why wouldn't you be
20 aware of other members of the team?

21 BING BING WANG: Because there may be
22 minor things like, for a short period of time
23 someone work on a particular detail, I may not
24 know all of the details.

25 KATE McGRANN: And tell me how the

1 membership of the team has changed since you
2 began working with it?

3 BING BING WANG: So that team was for
4 QPR1, and then after that was mainly myself, Sam
5 Pickering, Swarnima, Gavin Li, maybe a few other
6 supports. I'm not aware of those. And that's
7 for QPR2 and 3, 4 and 5. And now we have three
8 more junior team members working on that as
9 well.

10 KATE McGRANN: And what are their
11 names?

12 BING BING WANG: Their name is Danny,
13 Megan, and Alimah.

14 KATE McGRANN: The last name was?

15 BING BING WANG: I don't remember the
16 last names.

17 KATE McGRANN: Sorry, so it was three
18 people. Danny, Megan and?

19 BING BING WANG: Alimah.

20 KATE McGRANN: Is the scope of each
21 quarterly performance report the same, or are
22 you looking at different aspects of the system
23 in different reports?

24 BING BING WANG: The general approach
25 are quite consistent from QPR to QPR.

1 KATE McGRANN: And what is the general
2 approach?

3 BING BING WANG: In the report there
4 are different areas, different sectors that we
5 have been looking at. They are all laid out in
6 the report.

7 KATE McGRANN: Okay. Tell me about
8 the general approach that's taken?

9 BING BING WANG: So for each quarter
10 we obtain the monthly performance -- the PMR,
11 performance monitoring reports, the PAR, the
12 payment adjustment reports, and also the daily
13 operating reports, and some other documents as
14 well. And also we had discussions with the City
15 to get their feedback on the general
16 performance, and also the help desk performance.
17 And also we got the Project Agreement, that
18 become the inputs of our QPR review.

19 KATE McGRANN: So the performance
20 monitoring reports, what -- how are those
21 generated?

22 BING BING WANG: They are generated by
23 the private partner.

24 KATE McGRANN: And do you know how
25 they're generated by the private partner?

1 BING BING WANG: I don't know.

2 KATE McGRANN: Do you know if they're
3 automatically generated or if the private
4 partner includes commentary, notes, feedback, et
5 cetera?

6 BING BING WANG: I don't know.

7 KATE McGRANN: And then you mentioned
8 a "PAR" report, what did that stand for?

9 BING BING WANG: A payment adjustment
10 report.

11 KATE McGRANN: And what's that?

12 BING BING WANG: That is based on the
13 performance monitoring report, and also the
14 application of the payment mechanisms specified
15 in the Project Agreement. And that is turned
16 into the payment deduction, payment calculation.

17 KATE McGRANN: The payment adjustment
18 report, how is that created?

19 BING BING WANG: That's also generated
20 by the private partner.

21 KATE McGRANN: How is it different
22 from the performance monitoring report?

23 BING BING WANG: The contents are
24 different.

25 KATE McGRANN: How are they different?

1 BING BING WANG: One is more for the
2 performance data, the other one is the payment
3 adjustments and application -- based on the
4 application of the payment mechanism.

5 KATE McGRANN: Do you know how the
6 payment adjustment report is created?

7 BING BING WANG: It's created by the
8 private partner. I don't know. I don't know if
9 they are automatically generated from a system
10 with or without adjustment. I don't know.

11 KATE McGRANN: What is it that your
12 team does with these two reports?

13 BING BING WANG: So we look at it and
14 we compare it to the requirements in the Project
15 Agreement.

16 KATE McGRANN: And what are you
17 looking for when you compare those two documents
18 to the requirements in the Project Agreement?

19 BING BING WANG: So there are a number
20 of requirements in the -- there are a number of
21 requirements in the Project Agreement. For
22 example, there are thirteen requirements for the
23 PMR -- for the PMR reporting submission and also
24 the contents.

25 And also from the private sector side

1 there is an online system called "IMRIS", it's
2 keeping the entries of events reported to the
3 help desk.

4 And we took a sample of those events
5 and look at whether or not the records, the
6 time, the contents in turn align with the
7 Project Agreement requirements.

8 And also for the PAR, payment
9 adjustment reports, we look at based on the PMR
10 and when we're calculating the deductions, how
11 the deductions are calculated. So that's what
12 we review.

13 KATE McGRANN: With respect to IMIRS,
14 do you have access to that system?

15 BING BING WANG: We have access.

16 KATE McGRANN: How do you determine --
17 how do you select the sample of IMIRS entries
18 that you use to compare?

19 BING BING WANG: Just randomly select.

20 KATE McGRANN: And if I understand
21 correctly then, you are looking at the IMIRS
22 entries and you're comparing them to the
23 corresponding entries in the PMR, is that right?

24 BING BING WANG: Not really. So the
25 event entered in the IMIRS, because we only look

1 at a sample. And also the PMR is capturing all
2 of the performance during that quarter or during
3 that month. So we're not really comparing
4 individual entries in the IMIRS to the PMR, it's
5 more about we are reviewing the entries in the
6 IMIRS. It's more looking at, okay, does the
7 event description include all the details? And
8 the application of the performance indicator
9 specified in the Project agreement --

10 KATE McGRANN: I'm sorry, I'm going to
11 stop you because it's getting difficult to
12 understand what you're saying. There is an echo
13 in your audio.

14 -- RECESSED AT 9:24 A.M. --

15 -- RESUMED AT 9:25 A.M. --

16 KATE McGRANN: Before we took a break
17 you were describing what it is that you're
18 reviewing when you're looking at the random
19 selection of entries in the IMIRS. So do you
20 mind picking up that answer again?

21 BING BING WANG: Yeah. So basically
22 we're looking through different areas in that
23 online entry in order to look at if the
24 information describing the events includes
25 details? What about the starting time? The

1 response time and rectification time records?

2 And also when they're saying the event
3 is "closed" we looked at the close remarks, and
4 also the application of the performance
5 indicators.

6 KATE McGRANN: When you say you look
7 at the "application of the performance
8 indicators", what do you mean by that?

9 BING BING WANG: So there are
10 performance indicators specified in the Project
11 Agreement. And for events -- if it breached any
12 of the performance indicator it need to be
13 specified in the system, and that will
14 subsequently trigger payment deduction
15 calculation, for example, depending on the
16 particular situation, not necessarily.

17 And we look at, okay, what is the
18 application of the performance indicator given
19 the particular circumstance of a particular
20 event?

21 KATE McGRANN: When you say you're
22 asking yourself what is the application? Are
23 you looking to see whether the correct
24 performance indicator has been identified in
25 IMIRS?

1 BING BING WANG: Yeah.

2 KATE McGRANN: Are you looking at
3 anything else -- are you asking yourself any
4 other questions when you're looking at the
5 application of the performance indicators in
6 IMIRS?

7 BING BING WANG: So it's basically you
8 look at description of the event and then look
9 at the performance indicator to see which one is
10 more applicable to that circumstance.

11 KATE McGRANN: And are there
12 circumstances in which no performance indicator
13 is applicable?

14 BING BING WANG: Yes, there could be
15 the case.

16 KATE McGRANN: Is it fair so say that
17 when you're looking at the random selection of
18 events you're looking, first of all, to see if a
19 performance indicator has been applied?

20 BING BING WANG: We look at generally
21 the application of the performance indicator.

22 KATE McGRANN: And if you find that
23 there is no performance indicator applied where
24 there should have been one, or the wrong
25 performance indicator has been applied, what do

1 you do?

2 BING BING WANG: We identify it in our
3 report.

4 KATE McGRANN: How many IMIRS entries
5 do you generally look at?

6 BING BING WANG: Speaking from memory
7 it's about 200.

8 KATE McGRANN: And do you have a sense
9 of what percentage of the total IMIRS entries
10 for a quarter that might represent?

11 BING BING WANG: I don't remember.

12 KATE McGRANN: Can you give me a rough
13 idea?

14 BING BING WANG: I don't know.

15 KATE McGRANN: Do you know how the 200
16 number is selected?

17 BING BING WANG: That is randomly
18 like -- random pick.

19 KATE McGRANN: I mean, how did you --
20 how did Deloitte choose 200 as the number that
21 it looks at?

22 BING BING WANG: That is agreed with
23 the City.

24 KATE McGRANN: And where is that
25 agreement set out?

1 BING BING WANG: That was in the
2 proposal. And those numbers are also identified
3 in the report as well. Like, how many work
4 orders that we selected as a sample.

5 KATE McGRANN: Other than assessing
6 whether the correct performance indicator has
7 been applied, you mentioned that you're looking
8 at the details of each work order, so the start
9 time, the response time, the rectification
10 needs, the closing comments. What is the
11 purpose of that review?

12 BING BING WANG: Because the IMIRS,
13 that record, is the set of event records that
14 will be used by the parties. So the accuracy
15 and also the details included in the record is
16 very important.

17 So when we're looking at it, for
18 example, if a description of event doesn't
19 include necessary details we will point it out
20 in the report. And also if the closing remarks
21 doesn't include any details, for example, if
22 it's left empty, or simply say "closed", and it
23 actually didn't provide enough information on
24 whether or not the event it's actually resolved,
25 or if it refers to another work order. So those

1 type of findings we identify it in the report.

2 KATE McGRANN: And the benchmark or
3 the standard for what is enough information,
4 where does that come from?

5 BING BING WANG: It's from our
6 experience. It's typically you'd see in the
7 system and how people will -- at least will make
8 whoever reads the record understand the
9 situation.

10 KATE McGRANN: And any reference to
11 requirements in the Project Agreement, or is it
12 simply Deloitte's experience that guides this
13 analysis?

14 BING BING WANG: There are
15 requirements in the PA requesting the record of
16 the events reported to the help desk.
17 Particularly, for example, like how detailed a
18 description should be, or whether or not it
19 includes enough detailed information about the
20 closing. For those type of things it's based on
21 our industry experience.

22 KATE McGRANN: And I guess I'm just
23 wondering, how is the project company to know
24 what will be sufficient in your analysis? So
25 how do they find out what it is they need to do

1 in order to meet the requirements that you're
2 applying? Where would they are look for that?

3 BING BING WANG: So for that one it's
4 our report, we provide findings. And if the
5 private partner reads the report and they see
6 there are examples, for example, when we're
7 saying there's not enough information included
8 in the closing remarks, and they can see we
9 actually have a screenshot for a particular work
10 order to see what that means, and they can use
11 their industry judgment as well.

12 KATE McGRANN: Are your quarterly
13 performance reports delivered to RTG, the
14 private partner?

15 BING BING WANG: I don't know. We
16 submit our reports to the City.

17 KATE McGRANN: Is Deloitte involved in
18 any interactions with the private partner as it
19 prepares the quarterly performance reports?

20 BING BING WANG: No.

21 KATE McGRANN: Is Deloitte involved in
22 any interactions with the private partner
23 following the delivery of the quarterly
24 performance reports about Deloitte's findings in
25 those reports, or otherwise?

1 BING BING WANG: No.

2 KATE McGRANN: Is Deloitte ever
3 provided with feedback or responses from the
4 private partner and asked to revisit its
5 assessment of the topics that are reviewed in
6 the quarterly performance reports?

7 BING BING WANG: No.

8 KATE McGRANN: So you mentioned that
9 in preparing these reports you get the PMRs,
10 the PARs, daily operating reports and then
11 other documents. What other documents are used
12 as inputs for the quarterly performance reports?

13 BING BING WANG: We also get invoices
14 as well. And also there are a number of term
15 sheets signed by the parties, or in discussion
16 by parties about the service level. And there
17 are also random documents provided by the City.

18 KATE McGRANN: Could you tell me a bit
19 more about the term sheets that you receive?

20 BING BING WANG: So at a different
21 point in time the City and private partner they
22 reach agreements on certain changes, especially
23 on the service levels, which become amendments
24 to the Project Agreement.

25 KATE McGRANN: And just for the sake

1 of the record, and by that I mean people who
2 will be reading this after our conversation is
3 over, when you refer to the "private partner"
4 are you referring to Rideau Transit Group, RTG?

5 BING BING WANG: Yes.

6 KATE McGRANN: How many term sheets
7 have been entered into, to your knowledge?

8 BING BING WANG: I'm speaking from
9 memory.

10 KATE McGRANN: Uhm-hmm.

11 BING BING WANG: Two or three.

12 KATE McGRANN: In terms of inputs to
13 the quarterly performance reports, we've spoken
14 about the documents that you've referred to, you
15 said also discussions with the City. What kinds
16 of discussions with the City are had that are
17 included in the analysis and the quarterly
18 performance reports?

19 BING BING WANG: So there is a section
20 in the City -- there is a section in the report
21 talking about the help desk performance, and in
22 that one there is a list of tracking items. So
23 that's the major topic we discussed with the
24 City.

25 KATE McGRANN: What is the nature of

1 the discussion? What are you talking about?

2 BING BING WANG: Based on our
3 experience with this project and what about
4 these items.

5 KATE McGRANN: I don't follow that
6 answer. I'm a little farther away from this
7 than you are so help me understand what kind of
8 things you're talking about?

9 BING BING WANG: I'm just basically
10 speaking from memory so that's why it's very
11 hard for me to refer to any details.

12 So it's basically in the Project
13 Agreement talking about the help desk services,
14 there are a number of requirements. And then we
15 just discuss those one by one with the City and
16 get their feedback. And that's basically based
17 on their experience with the project.

18 KATE McGRANN: So are you basically
19 asking the City about whether the help desk
20 requirements have been met?

21 BING BING WANG: Yes.

22 KATE McGRANN: And what kind of
23 evidence did they give you in response to your
24 questions about the help desk requirements and
25 whether they've been met?

1 BING BING WANG: They -- because the
2 help desk performance is also linked to the
3 records and IMIRS, so especially when talking
4 about records, the application of the
5 performance indicators and also some of those
6 items, it's actually, as I recall, our finding
7 from review of the work orders. But other
8 things, things like okay, What help desk
9 services have been provided? What has not? And
10 that's something -- we rely on the City's
11 inputs.

12 KATE McGRANN: And do they bring
13 documentation to back-up the responses they're
14 providing to you? So notes, or emails, or
15 records to show, this is a service that we
16 engage with from the help desk and, here, we can
17 show you this is how it went?

18 BING BING WANG: No.

19 KATE McGRANN: And is the purpose of
20 those conversations with the City to assess
21 whether the help desk services have been
22 provided, in compliance with the Project
23 Agreement for that quarter?

24 BING BING WANG: Sorry, would you mind
25 repeating?

1 KATE McGRANN: Yes, no problem.

2 What I'd like to know is what is the
3 purpose of the conversations with the City about
4 the help desk? Are you trying to determine
5 whether the help desk requirements in the
6 Project Agreement have been met?

7 BING BING WANG: Yes. And also to
8 identify the findings in that tracking section
9 in the report.

10 KATE McGRANN: When you say "identify
11 the findings in that tracking section of the
12 report", what do you mean by that?

13 BING BING WANG: So, for example, in
14 the report you would see, according to the City,
15 for example, the private partner has adjusted
16 their help desk protocol, for example. And, for
17 example, no training or no written updates were
18 provided. Don't quote me on this detail, but
19 these type of comments.

20 KATE McGRANN: It's my understanding
21 that the help desk was initially run by the
22 City, OC Transpo, and relatively early on in
23 revenue service a change was made such that the
24 help desk was then run by RTM, are you aware of
25 that?

1 BING BING WANG: I was not aware of
2 this change.

3 KATE McGRANN: So to your knowledge
4 the help desk has always been run by who?

5 BING BING WANG: Private partner.

6 KATE McGRANN: And that is RTG?

7 BING BING WANG: Sorry, the
8 project-co.

9 KATE McGRANN: After the quarterly
10 performance report is completed by you and the
11 members of your team is it delivered to the
12 City?

13 BING BING WANG: Yes.

14 KATE McGRANN: And who specifically at
15 the City is it delivered to?

16 BING BING WANG: The City key contact
17 person for us her, name is Connie?

18 KATE McGRANN: Do you know what
19 Connie's last name?

20 BING BING WANG: No.

21 KATE McGRANN: It's okay.

22 And do you receive any questions,
23 comments or feedback from the City on your
24 quarterly performance reports?

25 BING BING WANG: Yes. So we issue a

1 draft report to her and she will provide
2 additional inputs back to us, and then we
3 incorporate -- we address those additional
4 inputs and issue her a revised version of the
5 report.

6 KATE McGRANN: And does the -- is this
7 report presented to anybody at the City by
8 Deloitte?

9 BING BING WANG: No.

10 KATE McGRANN: Does Deloitte engage in
11 any communication with the City about the
12 report, other than receiving feedback on the
13 draft from Connie?

14 BING BING WANG: Not really.

15 KATE McGRANN: And is Deloitte
16 involved at all in what the City does with the
17 quarterly performance reports?

18 BING BING WANG: No.

19 KATE McGRANN: So once you've sent the
20 final version over that's it as far as your work
21 on that report is done? You don't do anything
22 further with it?

23 BING BING WANG: Yeah. Because once
24 we finish the report it becomes the inputs to
25 the City, and how they use it we're not involved

1 in.

2 KATE McGRANN: You're not involved in
3 the City's use of the report at all?

4 BING BING WANG: No.

5 KATE McGRANN: Is one of the purposes
6 of the quarterly performance reports to
7 calculate the deductions to the payment -- the
8 monthly maintenance payments that the City is to
9 make to RTG?

10 BING BING WANG: That one is based on
11 the performance monitoring report, that we have
12 seen the things on the record; and also the
13 calculation in the payment adjustment report;
14 and then eventually reflected in the invoice.
15 So our review is more like among these different
16 sets of documents.

17 KATE McGRANN: So are you looking at
18 the calculation that's been done by somebody
19 else to verify it, or is Deloitte performing the
20 calculation of the deductions to be made to the
21 monthly maintenance payments for the first time?

22 BING BING WANG: No. We didn't
23 calculate the deduction for the first time.
24 It's more looking at the payment adjustment
25 report, which is project-co's calculation, and

1 also the payment amount and deductions included
2 in the invoice, which is also issued by the
3 project-co, and then referring back to the
4 performance monitoring reports, which includes
5 the performance information to do our review.
6 Our role is more of a review, we're not the
7 first-hand calculation of the payments or the
8 deductions.

9 KATE McGRANN: So is it the case
10 that -- what are you doing in your review then?

11 BING BING WANG: We look at the
12 performance data included in the performance
13 monitoring reports and apply payment mechanism
14 calculation. And then we look at the payment
15 amount and also the deductions, and then look at
16 the invoice. So it's really a review process.

17 KATE McGRANN: And if you form the
18 conclusion that the calculations done by RTG are
19 incorrect, what -- do you then perform what you
20 believe to be the correct calculation?

21 BING BING WANG: So we specify the
22 difference in our report. If we don't know the
23 reason we would say, the reason behind this
24 discrepancy is unclear. But for us we just
25 point out the difference.

1 KATE McGRANN: The difference between
2 what and what?

3 BING BING WANG: The difference
4 between -- for example, it could be the
5 difference between different sets of the
6 products, of the documents. For example, for
7 availability ratio, in one set of the documents
8 it may show this number but when it's turning
9 into, for example, the payment adjustment report
10 it becomes another number. So there may be some
11 manual adjustments in it. We just point out the
12 discrepancies, but we may not know all of the
13 reasons behind that, but we point out that in
14 our report; it's part of our finding.

15 KATE McGRANN: So using the average
16 kilometre ratio example, is it the case that you
17 are looking at numbers reported in the
18 performance monitoring reports, comparing that
19 to the PAR and identifying where there's been a
20 change?

21 BING BING WANG: That's only one part
22 of the review. Of course when you're looking at
23 different sets of documents you will also look
24 at things like escalation, the base payment
25 calculation and the deductions as well.

1 KATE McGRANN: But sticking with the
2 average kilometre ratio example for a second,
3 just to understand what you're doing on that
4 part, is it the case that you're looking at
5 what's shown in the performance monitoring
6 report, comparing that to the PAR, and when you
7 find a discrepancy, pointing that out?

8 BING BING WANG: I'm not sure if we
9 particularly have that as a discrepancy, but we
10 do look at the performance monitoring reports
11 and the calculations in the payment adjustment
12 reports.

13 KATE McGRANN: And are you comparing
14 the two of them?

15 BING BING WANG: Because one is the
16 inputs of the calculation of the other.

17 KATE McGRANN: I see.

18 BING BING WANG: So it's not a
19 line-by-line comparison, but -- because this set
20 of documents are all linked.

21 The performance monitoring reports
22 first, because that's the record or the summary
23 of the performance. And then you go into the
24 payment adjustment based on the payment
25 mechanism regime. And then whatever -- it's

1 eventually turned into the official invoice. So
2 this three sets of documents, one inform in the
3 production of the other one.

4 KATE McGRANN: I see. As part of your
5 work. Or the work that your team does more
6 generally, are you recalculating the deductions
7 that ought to be made to the monthly maintenance
8 payments based on the conclusions you've reached
9 in your review?

10 BING BING WANG: So we did calculation
11 but it's all based on the records on the
12 documents and what the payment deductions would
13 be. So -- but we also understand that there may
14 be disputes between the City and project-co in
15 terms of, for example, interpretation of payment
16 mechanism terms or application of performance
17 indicators.

18 So for those type of disputes our
19 review, or our tracking list is based more on
20 the documents produced, knowing that there may
21 be disputes going on separately between the City
22 and project-co.

23 KATE McGRANN: Where there is a
24 potential dispute between the City and
25 project-co does that change the approach to the

1 work that Deloitte is doing?

2 BING BING WANG: No.

3 KATE McGRANN: So when you say, "where
4 there are disputes between the City", I think I
5 have this right, your work is based more on the
6 documents. Do I have that right?

7 BING BING WANG: Yeah, exactly.

8 KATE McGRANN: So how is that
9 different from the work you do when there isn't
10 a potential dispute?

11 BING BING WANG: So we look at in
12 their document when there is a dispute, and
13 depending on the dispute sometimes the deduction
14 amount is included, sometimes it could be
15 resolved. So we really just base it on the
16 particular document and the record in the
17 document to do our review.

18 KATE McGRANN: Is it the case that
19 Deloitte is advised where there is a dispute or
20 a potential dispute as part of the work that
21 it's doing?

22 BING BING WANG: Our team is not
23 involved in the advice.

24 KATE McGRANN: I understand. How do
25 you know, when you're doing the work for the

1 quarterly performance report, whether something
2 is the subject of a dispute between the City and
3 the private partner, RTG?

4 BING BING WANG: So for events that
5 have disputes there is a mark it's under
6 dispute.

7 KATE McGRANN: So it's indicated to
8 you in the documentation you receive where there
9 is a dispute?

10 BING BING WANG: Yeah.

11 KATE McGRANN: Other than the language
12 of the Project Agreement and Deloitte's own
13 experience, which you've referenced, has
14 Deloitte been provided with any other
15 information to inform its interpretation of the
16 Project Agreement requirements as they relate to
17 the work done on the quarterly performance
18 report?

19 BING BING WANG: We refer to the
20 Project Agreement itself.

21 KATE McGRANN: Other than the Project
22 Agreement, have you been provided with any other
23 information to inform your interpretation of the
24 Project Agreement requirements?

25 BING BING WANG: No.

1 KATE McGRANN: Does the City ever
2 advise you its view of how the Project Agreement
3 requirements should be interpreted?

4 BING BING WANG: Sorry?

5 KATE McGRANN: Does the City ever
6 advise you its view as to how the Project
7 Agreement requirements should be interpreted?

8 BING BING WANG: No. At least during
9 the QPR 2 and later we didn't have that
10 discussion.

11 KATE McGRANN: And with respect to QPR
12 1 -- I'm just wondering why you define this as
13 "QPR 2 and onwards"? Is it because of the
14 timing of your involvement?

15 BING BING WANG: Exactly. It's
16 because I was not that actively involved in
17 QPR 1. I can't be sure whether or not a
18 conversation took place.

19 KATE McGRANN: Now, have I got it
20 right that you and your team don't have any
21 involvement in the disputes, in any disputes
22 between the City and the private partner?

23 BING BING WANG: No. At least our
24 team didn't provide -- we were not involved in
25 the dispute process.

1 KATE McGRANN: And I think you said
2 that your team did not provide any advice to the
3 City with respect to the disputes?

4 BING BING WANG: Yeah. When I was
5 saying "our team", means the QPR team, the
6 quarterly review report team.

7 KATE McGRANN: Are there other
8 individuals or teams at Deloitte that are
9 working on Stage 1 now that aren't part of the
10 QPR team?

11 BING BING WANG: I believe Gavin Li
12 may provide some basic analysis work for Remo,
13 other than that I don't know.

14 KATE McGRANN: And when you say "for
15 Remo", is that Remo Bucci?

16 BING BING WANG: Yes.

17 KATE McGRANN: And what is -- to the
18 extent that you can describe it, what is Remo
19 Bucci's work on Stage 1 at this point in time?

20 BING BING WANG: I don't know.

21 KATE McGRANN: Are you involved in any
22 work on Stage 2 of Ottawa's Light Rail Transit
23 project?

24 BING BING WANG: No.

25 KATE McGRANN: To your knowledge, is

1 anybody at Deloitte involved in work on Stage 2?

2 BING BING WANG: I don't know. Maybe.
3 I don't know.

4 KATE McGRANN: Let's take a ten minute
5 break now. It's 9:58.

6 -- RECESSED AT 9:58 A.M. --

7 -- RESUMED AT 10:09 A.M. --

8 KATE McGRANN: You had mentioned
9 before that if there was a dispute between the
10 City and RTG it would be indicated on the
11 records that you received. To your knowledge,
12 has there ever been an amendment or a change to
13 the interpretation of any of the provisions in
14 the Project Agreement that you're looking at
15 when you're working on the quarterly performance
16 reports?

17 BING BING WANG: So my understanding
18 is that whatever have been agreed upon by the
19 City and project-co will be reflected in the
20 actual document.

21 KATE McGRANN: What actual document?

22 BING BING WANG: The documents that we
23 mentioned, the PMR, the PAR and the invoice.
24 Although many items they are in dispute, they
25 haven't achieved a conclusion and they just mark

1 it.

2 KATE McGRANN: But to the extent that
3 there has been a conclusion to the dispute that
4 resulted in a change, for example, to the
5 interpretation of a requirement, like a KPI,
6 that change is indicated directly in the source
7 documents that are delivered to Deloitte?

8 BING BING WANG: It won't say that
9 it's dispute resolved if the -- like some, for
10 example, disagreement between the parties they
11 reach conclusion, then it's just that they
12 remove that mark.

13 KATE McGRANN: They just remove the
14 dispute mark?

15 BING BING WANG: Yeah. So basically
16 the documents that we received is the foundation
17 of our review.

18 KATE McGRANN: And I'm just wondering,
19 first of all, to your knowledge have the parties
20 come to any agreement to change the
21 interpretation of any of the requirements for --
22 that you are looking at? So the KPIs, for
23 example?

24 BING BING WANG: Not the KPI -- not
25 the document Project Agreement itself, the

1 Project Agreement changes are only captured in
2 those term sheets.

3 KATE McGRANN: And in terms of the
4 application of the payment deduction mechanism,
5 to your knowledge have the parties reached any
6 agreement about any changes to how that
7 mechanism is applied?

8 BING BING WANG: For that one I may
9 not be the best person to advise on the status
10 of that, but my understanding is that it's still
11 in discussion.

12 KATE McGRANN: I only got a couple of
13 words, do you mind repeating that answer?

14 BING BING WANG: No problem. What I
15 was saying is that I may not be the best person
16 to comment or to advise on the status of the
17 City's and project-co's discussion, but my
18 understanding is it's still ongoing.

19 KATE McGRANN: So as far as you know,
20 for the work that you and your team are doing,
21 there have been no changes to the requirements
22 to be applied to the documents that you're
23 reviewing?

24 BING BING WANG: No.

25 KATE McGRANN: And if there were any

1 changes agreed how would you expect to be
2 notified of that?

3 BING BING WANG: If there would be a
4 change -- so our review is based on Project
5 Agreement. So if there's any change to the
6 Project Agreements we will know, which basically
7 so far is through those term sheets. Other than
8 that -- because we really refer to the Project
9 Agreement requirements.

10 KATE McGRANN: Who do you report to,
11 if anybody, with respect the work that you're
12 doing on this project?

13 BING BING WANG: You mean -- within
14 Deloitte we have the practice leader, but the
15 leader is not involved in the daily delivery of
16 our services.

17 So for particular issues typically I
18 would discuss with my team members and that's
19 pretty much it.

20 KATE McGRANN: And for all intents and
21 purposes you are in charge of the work done to
22 prepare the quarterly performance reports? If
23 there are any issues they come to you and you
24 deal with them?

25 BING BING WANG: Yes. And in addition

1 to me we have the quality assurance process
2 within the Deloitte team, and Sam Pickering is
3 the QA partner on the deliverables.

4 KATE McGRANN: And what would that
5 involve? What does he do?

6 BING BING WANG: So he basically will
7 review the report before it's finalized.

8 KATE McGRANN: And what does he review
9 it against?

10 BING BING WANG: He just reads through
11 the entire document and sees anything that --
12 like if they see -- if he sees any issue or if
13 he has any comments.

14 KATE McGRANN: And in terms of
15 directions for your work, I take it you're
16 following what was agreed to in a proposal that
17 Deloitte provided to the City for this work?

18 BING BING WANG: Yeah.

19 KATE McGRANN: And does the City ever
20 issue any changes in its directions for the work
21 that it wants Deloitte to do?

22 BING BING WANG: No.

23 KATE McGRANN: Ms. McLellan, do you
24 have any follow-up questions based on what we
25 discussed this morning?

1 LIZ McLEELAN: No.

2 KATE McGRANN: And, counsel, do you
3 have any follow-up questions that you wanted to
4 ask?

5 JAMIE YOON: I don't, thank you.

6 KATE McGRANN: That ends our questions
7 for you for now. Thank you very much for your
8 time. We can go off the record.

9 -- Completed at 10:15 a.m.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2
3 I, HELEN MARTINEAU, CSR, Certified
4 Shorthand Reporter, certify;

5 That the foregoing proceedings were
6 taken before me at the time and date therein set
7 forth;

8 That the statements of the presenters
9 and all comments made at the time of the meeting
10 were recorded stenographically by me;

11 That the foregoing is a certified
12 transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.

13
14 Dated this 9th day of May, 2022.

15
16 

17
18 PER: HELEN MARTINEAU
19 CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
20
21
22
23
24
25

WORD INDEX

< 1 >

1 6:10 8:15, 21
9:4 10:12, 13
11:10, 11, 12, 19,
24 12:2, 10
41:12, 17 42:9,
19
10:09 43:7
10:15 48:9

< 2 >

2 41:9, 13
42:22 43:1
20 6:13
200 23:7, 15, 20
2000 6:21
2006 7:13
2009 5:13
2011 12:25
2015 6:15 13:4
2019 9:7 10:8
12:25 13:20
14:13
2020 9:11
2022 1:4, 12
49:14

< 3 >

3 15:7
33(6) 5:12
33(7) 5:25

< 4 >

4 15:7

< 5 >

5 6:3 15:7

< 9 >

9:00 1:12 4:1
9:24 20:14
9:25 20:15
9:58 43:5, 6
9th 1:4, 11
49:14

< A >

a.m 1:12 4:1
20:14, 15 43:6,
7 48:9
access 19:14, 15
accuracy 24:14

achieved 43:25
Act 5:13 6:1, 3
active 9:9 12:2
actively 9:8
41:16
activities 11:22
actual 9:10
43:20, 21
addition 46:25
additional 33:2,
3
address 33:3
adjusted 31:15
adjustment
16:12 17:9, 17
18:6, 10 19:9
34:13, 24 36:9
37:11, 24
adjustments
18:3 36:11
advice 6:16
39:23 42:2
advise 41:2, 6
45:9, 16
advised 6:1
39:19
advisement 10:6
advising 12:8
AFFIRMED 4:2
after 4:24 9:19
15:4 28:2 32:9
ago 6:20
agreed 23:22
43:18 46:1
47:16
Agreement
16:17 17:15
18:15, 18, 21
19:7 20:9
21:11 23:25
25:11 27:24
29:13 30:23
31:6 40:12, 16,
20, 22, 24 41:2,
7 43:14 44:20,
25 45:1, 6 46:5,
9
agreements
27:22 46:6
align 19:6
Alimah 15:13, 19
allows 6:15
amendment
43:12

amendments
27:23
amount 35:1, 15
39:14
analysis 25:13,
24 28:17 42:12
anybody 33:7
43:1 46:11
appended 5:11
applicable
22:10, 13
application
17:14 18:3, 4
20:8 21:4, 7, 18,
22 22:5, 21
30:4 38:16 45:4
applied 22:19,
23, 25 24:7
45:7, 22
apply 35:13
applying 26:2
approach 11:4
15:24 16:2, 8
38:25
areas 11:4
16:4 20:22
asked 5:15
27:4
asking 10:1, 2
21:22 22:3
29:19
aspects 15:22
assess 30:20
assessing 12:8
24:5
assessment
27:5
assisting 12:14
assurance 47:1
attending 1:11
audio 20:13
automatically
17:3 18:9
availability 36:7
average 14:4
36:15 37:2
aware 10:15
13:7 14:18, 20
15:6 31:24 32:1
< B >
back 33:2 35:3
back-up 30:13
Barrie 8:12, 14,
20

base 36:24
39:15
based 17:12
18:3 19:9
25:20 29:2, 16
34:10 37:24
38:8, 11, 19
39:5 46:4 47:24
basic 42:12
basically 20:21
22:7 29:9, 12,
16, 18 44:15
46:6 47:6
basis 5:4
began 8:21, 25
10:8 14:8, 12
15:2
believe 35:20
42:11
benchmark 25:2
Benjamin 2:13
best 45:9, 15
Bilgen 2:13
BING 1:3 2:6
4:2 6:12, 19, 24
7:2, 6, 12, 15, 20,
24 8:6, 10, 16,
23 9:2, 6, 16
10:10, 13, 20, 24
11:3, 11, 14, 20
12:1, 6, 11, 16,
21 13:1, 6, 9, 12,
15, 21, 25 14:10,
14, 21 15:3, 12,
15, 19, 24 16:3,
9, 22 17:1, 6, 9,
12, 19, 23 18:1,
7, 13, 19 19:15,
19, 24 20:21
21:9 22:1, 7, 14,
20 23:2, 6, 11,
14, 17, 22 24:1,
12 25:5, 14
26:3, 15, 20
27:1, 7, 13, 20
28:5, 8, 11, 19
29:2, 9, 21 30:1,
18, 24 31:7, 13
32:1, 5, 7, 13, 16,
20, 25 33:9, 14,
18, 23 34:4, 10,
22 35:11, 21
36:3, 21 37:8,
15, 18 38:10
39:2, 7, 11, 22
40:4, 10, 19, 25
41:4, 8, 15, 23
42:4, 11, 16, 20,
24 43:2, 17, 22
44:8, 15, 24
45:8, 14, 24
46:3, 13, 25
47:6, 10, 18, 22
bit 11:20 27:18
breached 21:11
break 6:5
20:16 43:5
brief 6:8
bring 30:12
Bucci 13:11
42:15
Bucci's 42:19
build 7:6, 18
buildings 8:1
bus 8:7, 14, 20
< C >
calculate 34:7,
23
calculated 19:11
calculating
19:10
calculation
17:16 21:15
34:13, 18, 20, 25
35:7, 14, 20
36:25 37:16
38:10
calculations
35:18 37:11
called 19:1
Canada 6:3
7:13, 14
captured 45:1
capturing 20:1
case 9:15 11:7
22:15 35:9
36:16 37:4
39:18
certain 4:14
11:9 27:22
CERTIFICATE
49:1
Certified 49:3,
11, 19
certify 49:4
cetera 17:5
change 31:23
32:2 36:20
38:25 43:12

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>44:4, 6, 20 46:4, 5 changed 15:1 changes 27:22 45:1, 6, 21 46:1 47:20 charge 46:21 China 6:25 choose 23:20 circumstance 21:19 22:10 circumstances 22:12 City 8:11 11:6 12:9 16:14 23:23 26:16 27:17, 21 28:15, 16, 20, 24 29:15, 19 30:20 31:3, 14, 22 32:12, 15, 16, 23 33:7, 11, 16, 25 34:8 38:14, 21, 24 39:4 40:2 41:1, 5, 22 42:3 43:10, 19 47:17, 19 City's 30:10 34:3 45:17 civil 5:18 close 21:3 closed 21:3 24:22 closing 24:10, 20 25:20 26:8 cocounsel 4:13 Co-lead 2:2 4:4 collaborative 4:12 colleague 4:6 come 25:4 44:20 46:23 commence 4:22 commencing 4:1 comment 45:16 commentary 17:4 comments 24:10 31:19 32:23 47:13 49:9 COMMISSION 1:2 2:1 4:18</p> | <p>Commission's 4:7, 11, 19, 23 5:3 communication 33:11 company 25:23 compare 18:14, 17 19:18 comparing 19:22 20:3 36:18 37:6, 13 comparison 37:19 complete 13:22 completed 8:25 13:24 32:10 48:9 compliance 30:22 composition 14:7 conclusion 35:18 43:25 44:3, 11 conclusions 38:8 conducted 12:19 confidential 5:4 Connie 32:17 33:13 Connie's 32:19 consistent 15:25 construction 12:15 contact 32:16 contents 17:23 18:24 19:6 conversation 28:2 41:18 conversations 30:20 31:3 copied 10:14 11:16 copy 9:18 10:1, 2 correct 5:7 21:23 24:6 35:20 corrections 4:24 5:2, 10 correctly 19:21 correspondence 10:15</p> | <p>corresponding 19:23 COUNSEL 2:1, 2, 3 4:4, 8, 15 5:4 48:2 couple 9:12 45:12 course 36:22 created 17:18 18:6, 7 Crown 5:19 CSR 49:3 curiosity 9:20 currently 14:3 < D > daily 16:12 27:10 46:15 Danny 15:12, 18 data 18:2 35:12 date 49:6 Dated 49:14 dates 9:17 day 1:11 49:14 DBFM 8:4 deal 46:24 declaration 4:10 deduction 17:16 21:14 34:23 39:13 45:4 deductions 19:10, 11 34:7, 20 35:1, 8, 15 36:25 38:6, 12 deemed 5:14 define 41:12 deliverables 47:3 delivered 7:17 26:13 32:11, 15 44:7 delivery 7:7, 10, 21 12:9 26:23 46:15 DELOITTE 1:3 2:6, 7 6:15 11:8, 18, 23 12:8, 13, 17, 22 13:11 23:20 26:17, 21 27:2 33:8, 10, 15 34:19 39:1, 19 40:14 42:8 43:1 44:7</p> | <p>46:14 47:2, 17, 21 Deloitte's 12:24 25:12 26:24 40:12 depending 21:15 39:13 describe 42:18 describing 20:17, 24 DESCRIPTION 3:2 6:8 20:7 22:8 24:18 25:18 design 7:6, 18 desk 16:16 19:3 25:16 28:21 29:13, 19, 24 30:2, 8, 16, 21 31:4, 5, 16, 21, 24 32:4 detail 14:23 31:18 detailed 25:17, 19 details 13:17 14:24 20:7, 25 24:8, 15, 19, 21 29:11 determine 19:16 31:4 difference 35:22, 25 36:1, 3, 5 different 15:22, 23 16:4 17:21, 24, 25 20:22 27:20 34:15 36:5, 23 39:9 difficult 20:11 directions 47:15, 20 directly 44:6 disagreement 44:10 discrepancies 36:12 discrepancy 35:24 37:7, 9 discuss 9:23 29:15 46:18 discussed 28:23 47:25</p> | <p>discussion 27:15 29:1 41:10 45:11, 17 discussions 11:21 16:14 28:15, 16 dispute 38:24 39:10, 12, 13, 19, 20 40:2, 6, 9 41:25 43:9, 24 44:3, 9, 14 disputes 38:14, 18, 21 39:4 40:5 41:21 42:3 document 39:12, 16, 17 43:20, 21 44:25 47:11 documentation 30:13 40:8 documents 9:13 16:13 18:17 27:11, 17 28:14 34:16 36:6, 7, 23 37:20 38:2, 12, 20 39:6 43:22 44:7, 16 45:22 doing 35:10 37:3 39:1, 21, 25 45:20 46:12 draft 33:1, 13 drafting 12:5 13:4 < E > early 31:22 echo 20:12 emails 11:16 30:14 empty 24:22 ends 48:6 engage 30:16 33:10 engagement 12:3 enter 4:18 entered 4:24 5:5, 9 19:25 28:7 entire 47:11 entries 19:2, 17, 22, 23 20:4, 5, 19 23:4, 9</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

entry 20:23
errors 5:7
escalation 36:24
especially
27:22 30:3
establish 5:17
event 19:25
20:7 21:2, 20
22:8 24:13, 18,
24
events 19:2, 4
20:24 21:11
22:18 25:16
40:4
eventually
34:14 38:1
evidence 4:10,
19, 25 5:5, 9, 21,
24 6:3 10:3
29:23
exactly 39:7
41:15
example 7:25
18:22 21:15
24:18, 21 25:17
26:6 31:13, 15,
16, 17 36:4, 6, 9,
16 37:2 38:15
44:4, 10, 23
examples 26:6
EXHIBITS 3:1
existence 13:8
expect 46:1
experience 6:9,
13 25:6, 12, 21
29:3, 17 40:13
extent 42:18
44:2

< F >
facilities 8:2
fair 22:16
family 14:15
farther 29:6
feedback 16:15
17:4 27:3
29:16 32:23
33:12
final 33:20
finalized 47:7
finance 7:18
find 22:22
25:25 37:7
finding 30:6
36:14

findings 25:1
26:4, 24 31:8, 11
finish 33:24
firm 14:16
first-hand 35:7
focused 7:5
follow 29:5
following 26:23
47:16
follow-up 4:15
47:24 48:3
foregoing 49:5,
11
forget 14:15
form 35:17
forth 49:7
foundation
44:16
front 9:14
fundings 11:5

< G >
Gavin 14:16
15:5 42:11
general 10:16
15:24 16:1, 8, 15
generally 7:22,
24 22:20 23:5
38:6
generated
16:21, 22, 25
17:3, 19 18:9
Gibril 14:15
give 23:12
29:23
given 5:5, 20
14:4 21:18
giving 5:24
10:3
Good 4:3
government 8:1
ground 5:16
Group 28:4
guess 25:22
guides 25:12

< H >
hard 29:11
hearings 4:12,
20, 21
Held 1:10
Helen 2:12
49:3, 18
help 16:16
19:3 25:16

28:21 29:7, 13,
19, 24 30:2, 8,
16, 21 31:4, 5,
16, 21, 24 32:4
hospitals 7:25

< I >
idea 23:13
identified 21:24
24:2
identify 23:2
25:1 31:8, 10
identifying
36:19
IMIRS 19:13, 17,
21, 25 20:4, 6,
19 21:25 22:6
23:4, 9 24:12
30:3
important 24:16
IMRIS 19:1
include 20:7
24:19, 21
included 24:15
26:7 28:17
35:1, 12 39:14
includes 7:25
11:3 17:4
20:24 25:19
35:4
incorporate 33:3
incorrect 35:19
incriminate 5:17
INDEX 3:1
indicated 40:7
43:10 44:6
indicator 20:8
21:12, 18, 24
22:9, 12, 19, 21,
23, 25 24:6
indicators 21:5,
8, 10 22:5 30:5
38:17
individual 20:4
individuals 42:8
industry 25:21
26:11
inform 38:2
40:15, 23
information
20:24 24:23
25:3, 19 26:7
35:5 40:15, 23
infrastructure

6:14
initially 31:21
inputs 16:18
27:12 28:12
30:11 33:2, 4,
24 37:16
Inquiries 5:13
Inquiry 4:5
5:14, 20 9:25
instance 5:19
intends 4:18
intents 46:20
interactions
26:18, 22
interpretation
38:15 40:15, 23
43:13 44:5, 21
interpreted 41:3,
7
intervene 4:14
interview 4:9,
13, 16, 17 9:19
introducing 7:4
invoice 34:14
35:2, 16 38:1
43:23
invoices 27:13
involve 47:5
involved 6:17,
19 7:10, 13 8:4,
13, 15, 19 9:4, 8
10:14 11:24
12:4, 12, 14, 18,
22 13:2, 19
26:17, 21 33:16,
25 34:2 39:23
41:16, 24 42:21
43:1 46:15
involvement 9:9
10:8 11:18
12:24 13:4, 14,
17 41:14, 21
issue 32:25
33:4 47:12, 20
issued 35:2
issues 46:17, 23
items 28:22
29:4 30:6 43:24

< J >
Jamie 2:7 9:20
10:5 14:3 48:5
joined 4:6
judgment 26:11

junior 15:8

< K >
Kate 2:2 4:3, 4
6:17, 22 7:1, 3,
9, 14, 16, 22 8:3,
8, 13, 19, 24 9:3,
12, 18, 21 10:2,
7, 11, 18, 22
11:1, 7, 13, 15,
23 12:4, 7, 13,
17, 23 13:3, 7,
10, 13, 18, 23
14:1, 7, 11, 19,
25 15:10, 14, 17,
20 16:1, 7, 19,
24 17:2, 7, 11,
17, 21, 25 18:5,
11, 16 19:13, 16,
20 20:10, 16
21:6, 21 22:2,
11, 16, 22 23:4,
8, 12, 15, 19, 24
24:5 25:2, 10,
22 26:12, 17, 21
27:2, 8, 18, 25
28:6, 10, 12, 25
29:5, 18, 22
30:12, 19 31:1,
10, 20 32:3, 6, 9,
14, 18, 21 33:6,
10, 15, 19 34:2,
5, 17 35:9, 17
36:1, 15 37:1,
13, 17 38:4, 23
39:3, 8, 18, 24
40:7, 11, 21
41:1, 5, 11, 19
42:1, 7, 14, 17,
21, 25 43:4, 8,
21 44:2, 13, 18
45:3, 12, 19, 25
46:10, 20 47:4,
8, 14, 19, 23
48:2, 6
keeping 19:2
key 32:16
kilometre 36:16
37:2
kind 7:22 29:7,
22
kinds 28:15
knowing 38:20
knowledge 28:7
32:3 42:25

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>43:11 44:19 45:5 KPI 44:5, 24 KPIs 44:22</p> <p>< L > laid 16:5 language 40:11 launch 12:20 leader 46:14, 15 Learned 13:5 left 14:16 24:22 Lessons 13:4 level 27:16 levels 27:23 Li 14:16 15:5 42:11 liability 5:18 LIGHT 1:2 4:5 6:10, 18, 20, 24 7:7 9:1 42:22 line-by-line 37:19 linked 30:2 37:20 Litigation 2:3 Liz 2:3 4:6 48:1 looked 21:3 looking 15:22 16:5 18:17 19:21 20:6, 18, 22 21:23 22:2, 4, 17, 18 24:7, 17 34:17, 24 36:17, 22 37:4 43:14 44:22 looks 9:13 23:21 LRT 8:15, 21 9:5</p> <p>< M > made 4:24 5:2, 10 9:21 31:23 34:20 38:7 49:9 maintain 7:19 maintenance 34:8, 21 38:7 major 28:23 Malina 2:7 manage 13:22 manual 36:11 mark 40:5</p> | <p>43:25 44:12, 14 MARKED 3:4 Martineau 2:12 49:3, 18 McGrann 2:2 4:3, 4 6:17, 22 7:1, 3, 9, 14, 16, 22 8:3, 8, 13, 19, 24 9:3, 12, 18 10:2, 7, 11, 18, 22 11:1, 7, 13, 15, 23 12:4, 7, 13, 17, 23 13:3, 7, 10, 13, 18, 23 14:1, 7, 11, 19, 25 15:10, 14, 17, 20 16:1, 7, 19, 24 17:2, 7, 11, 17, 21, 25 18:5, 11, 16 19:13, 16, 20 20:10, 16 21:6, 21 22:2, 11, 16, 22 23:4, 8, 12, 15, 19, 24 24:5 25:2, 10, 22 26:12, 17, 21 27:2, 8, 18, 25 28:6, 10, 12, 25 29:5, 18, 22 30:12, 19 31:1, 10, 20 32:3, 6, 9, 14, 18, 21 33:6, 10, 15, 19 34:2, 5, 17 35:9, 17 36:1, 15 37:1, 13, 17 38:4, 23 39:3, 8, 18, 24 40:7, 11, 21 41:1, 5, 11, 19 42:1, 7, 14, 17, 21, 25 43:4, 8, 21 44:2, 13, 18 45:3, 12, 19, 25 46:10, 20 47:4, 8, 14, 19, 23 48:2, 6 McLEELAN 48:1 McLellan 2:3 4:7, 13 47:23 means 26:10 42:5 mechanism 18:4 35:13 37:25 38:16 45:4, 7</p> | <p>mechanisms 17:14 meet 26:1 meeting 6:4 49:9 Megan 15:13, 18 Member 2:2, 3 4:7 members 14:17, 20 15:8 32:11 46:18 membership 15:1 memory 23:6 28:9 29:10 mentioned 17:7 24:7 27:8 43:8, 23 met 29:20, 25 31:6 method 12:9 mind 20:20 30:24 45:13 minor 14:22 minute 43:4 model 7:11, 21 monitoring 12:18 16:11, 20 17:13, 22 34:11 35:4, 13 36:18 37:5, 10, 21 month 20:3 monthly 16:10 34:8, 21 38:7 morning 4:3, 6 6:5 47:25</p> <p>< N > named 13:10 names 15:11, 16 nature 28:25 necessarily 21:16 necessary 24:19 needs 24:10 new 7:4 nontypographica l 5:10 notes 9:17, 19, 21 17:4 30:14 49:12 notified 46:2 number 11:4 18:19, 20 23:16,</p> | <p>20 27:14 29:14 36:8, 10 numbers 24:2 36:17</p> <p>< O > object 6:2 objected 5:14 obtain 4:10 16:10 OC 31:22 October 9:7 official 38:1 ongoing 45:18 online 19:1 20:23 onwards 41:13 operating 16:13 27:10 opportunity 5:6 9:23 order 4:21 20:23 24:8, 25 26:1, 10 orders 24:4 30:7 OTTAWA 1:2 4:5 8:21, 25 9:5 Ottawa's 6:10 8:15 42:22 ought 38:7 oversight 12:14</p> <p>< P > P3 7:11, 13, 18 PA 25:15 PAR 16:11 17:8 19:8 36:19 37:6 43:23 PARs 27:10 part 9:7 13:2 36:14, 21 37:4 38:4 39:20 42:9 participant 5:8 participants 1:11 2:5 5:3 particular 8:11 14:23 21:16, 19 26:9 39:16 46:17 Particularly 25:17 37:9</p> | <p>parties 24:14 27:15, 16 44:10, 19 45:5 partner 12:2 16:23, 25 17:4, 20 18:8 26:5, 14, 18, 22 27:4, 21 28:3 31:15 32:5 40:3 41:22 47:3 pause 6:6 payment 16:12 17:9, 14, 16, 17 18:2, 4, 6 19:8 21:14 34:7, 13, 24 35:1, 13, 14 36:9, 24 37:11, 24 38:12, 15 45:4 payments 34:8, 21 35:7 38:8 people 14:1 15:18 25:7 28:1 percentage 23:9 perform 10:23 35:19 performance 10:20 11:9, 17 15:21 16:10, 11, 16, 19 17:13, 22 18:2 20:2, 8 21:4, 7, 10, 12, 18, 24 22:5, 9, 12, 19, 21, 23, 25 24:6 26:13, 19, 24 27:6, 12 28:13, 18, 21 30:2, 5 32:10, 24 33:17 34:6, 11 35:4, 5, 12 36:18 37:5, 10, 21, 23 38:16 40:1, 17 43:15 46:22 performing 34:19 period 11:9 14:22 perjury 5:24 permits 4:15 person 5:19 32:17 45:9, 15 pick 23:18 Pickering 12:1</p> |
|---|---|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>14:15 15:5 47:2 picking 20:20 place 5:23 41:18 played 13:19 PMR 16:10 18:23 19:9, 23 20:1, 4 43:23 PMRs 27:9 point 6:4 24:19 27:21 35:25 36:11, 13 42:19 pointing 37:7 posted 4:22 potential 38:24 39:10, 20 practice 46:14 predominantly 11:24 preparation 9:22 prepare 46:22 prepares 26:19 preparing 27:9 PRESENT 2:11 presented 33:7 presenters 49:8 pretty 46:19 prior 12:19 private 16:23, 25 17:3, 20 18:8, 25 26:5, 14, 18, 22 27:4, 21 28:3 31:15 32:5 40:3 41:22 problem 31:1 45:14 procedural 4:21 proceedings 5:18, 22 49:5 process 35:16 41:25 47:1 procurement 12:9 produce 10:25 produced 9:24 38:20 production 38:3 products 36:6 professional 6:8 project 6:11, 16 7:5, 8 8:4, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 20, 22, 24 9:1, 5, 6 10:8, 12 11:12, 19, 25 12:15, 24</p> | <p>13:14, 16, 19 16:17 17:15 18:14, 18, 21 19:7 20:9 21:10 25:11, 23 27:24 29:3, 12, 17 30:22 31:6 40:12, 16, 20, 21, 24 41:2, 6 42:23 43:14 44:25 45:1 46:4, 6, 8, 12 project-co 32:8 35:3 38:14, 22, 25 43:19 project-co's 34:25 45:17 projects 6:18, 20, 22, 25 7:10, 13, 17, 20, 23, 25 8:2 proposal 24:2 47:16 prosecution 5:24 protocol 31:16 provide 6:8, 15 11:8 24:23 26:4 33:1 41:24 42:2, 12 provided 27:3, 17 30:9, 22 31:18 40:14, 22 47:17 providing 30:14 provisions 43:13 Public 4:5, 11, 20, 23 5:13 12:19 purpose 4:9 8:1 24:11 30:19 31:3 purposes 34:5 46:21 Pursuant 5:12 9:25 < Q > QA 47:3 QPR 9:7 10:18 12:2 13:22, 23 15:25 16:18 41:9, 11, 13, 17 42:5, 10</p> | <p>QPR1 9:8 10:17 12:5 15:4 QPR2 9:10 15:7 quality 11:16 47:1 quarter 16:9 20:2 23:10 30:23 Quarterly 10:20, 22 11:8 15:21 26:12, 19, 23 27:6, 12 28:13, 17 32:9, 24 33:17 34:6 40:1, 17 42:6 43:15 46:22 question 5:15 6:2 8:17 questions 4:14, 16 9:12 22:4 29:24 32:22 47:24 48:3, 6 quick 9:17 quite 15:25 quote 31:18 < R > RAIL 1:2 4:5 6:10, 18, 20, 25 7:7 9:1 42:22 random 20:18 22:17 23:18 27:17 randomly 19:19 23:17 ratio 36:7, 16 37:2 reach 27:22 44:11 reached 38:8 45:5 reading 28:2 reads 25:8 26:5 47:10 really 19:24 20:3 33:14 35:16 39:15 46:8 reason 35:23 reasons 36:13 recalculating 38:6 recall 30:6 receivable 5:21</p> | <p>receive 27:19 32:22 40:8 received 43:11 44:16 receiving 33:12 RECESSED 20:14 43:6 record 24:13, 15 25:8, 15 28:1 34:12 37:22 39:16 48:8 recorded 49:10 records 19:5 21:1 24:13 30:3, 4, 15 38:11 43:11 rectification 21:1 24:9 refer 28:3 29:11 40:19 46:8 reference 10:1 25:10 referenced 40:13 referencing 9:13 referred 28:14 referring 28:4 35:3 refers 24:25 reflected 34:14 43:19 regime 37:25 relate 40:16 relates 6:9 relatively 31:22 rely 30:10 remarks 21:3 24:20 26:8 remember 8:10 15:15 23:11 Remo 13:11 42:12, 15, 18 remotely 1:11 remove 44:12, 13 repeat 8:17 repeating 30:25 45:13 report 10:24 11:1, 3 13:5, 8 15:21 16:3, 6 17:8, 10, 13, 18, 22 18:6 23:3</p> | <p>24:3, 20 25:1 26:4, 5 28:20 31:9, 12, 14 32:10 33:1, 5, 7, 12, 21, 24 34:3, 11, 13, 25 35:22 36:9, 14 37:6 40:1, 18 42:6 46:10 47:7 reported 19:2 25:16 36:17 Reporter 49:4, 19 REPORTER'S 49:1 reporting 18:23 reports 11:5, 9, 17 13:22, 24 15:23 16:11, 12, 13, 20 18:12 19:9 26:13, 16, 19, 24, 25 27:6, 9, 10, 12 28:13, 18 32:24 33:17 34:6 35:4, 13 36:18 37:10, 12, 21 43:16 46:22 represent 23:10 requesting 25:15 required 5:25 9:24 requirement 44:5 requirements 18:14, 18, 20, 21, 22 19:7 25:11, 15 26:1 29:14, 20, 24 31:5 40:16, 24 41:3, 7 44:21 45:21 46:9 resolved 24:24 39:15 44:9 respect 10:12 11:16 19:13 41:11 42:3 46:11 response 21:1 24:9 29:23 responses 27:3 30:13 resulted 44:4 RESUMED</p> |
|--|---|---|---|--|

20:15 43:7
retained 11:8
revenue 12:20
31:23
review 5:6
10:21, 23 11:4
16:18 19:12
24:11 30:7
34:15 35:5, 6,
10, 16 36:22
38:9, 19 39:17
42:6 44:17
46:4 47:7, 8
reviewed 27:5
reviewing 20:5,
18 45:23
revised 33:4
revisit 27:4
Rideau 28:4
role 13:18, 21
35:6
rough 23:12
roughly 10:16
RTG 26:13
28:4 32:6 34:9
35:18 40:3
43:10
RTM 31:24
run 31:21, 24
32:4
running 12:18

< S >
sake 27:25
Sam 12:1
14:14 15:4 47:2
sample 19:4, 17
20:1 24:4
scope 15:20
screen 9:14
screenshot 26:9
section 5:12, 25
6:3 28:19, 20
31:8, 11
sector 6:14
18:25
sectors 16:4
select 19:17, 19
selected 23:16
24:4
selection 20:19
22:17
sense 23:8
separately 38:21
September 9:10

service 12:20
27:16, 23 30:15
31:23
services 29:13
30:9, 21 46:16
set 23:25
24:13 36:7
37:19 49:6
sets 34:16
36:5, 23 38:2
shared 5:2, 8
sheets 27:15,
19 28:6 45:2
46:7
short 14:22
Shorthand 49:4,
12, 19
show 30:15, 17
36:8
shown 37:5
side 18:25
signed 27:15
similar 7:7
Simmalavong
2:7
simply 24:22
25:12
situation 21:16
25:9
solemn 4:10
somebody 34:18
Sorry 8:16
15:17 20:10
30:24 32:7 41:4
source 44:6
Speaking 23:6
28:8 29:10
special 8:1
specifically
32:14
specified 11:5
17:14 20:9
21:10, 13
specify 35:21
spoken 28:13
Stage 6:10
8:15, 21 9:4
10:12, 13 11:10,
11, 12, 19, 24
12:10, 12 42:9,
19, 22 43:1
stand 10:18
17:8
standard 25:3

start 8:8 24:8
started 9:7, 10
starting 7:3
9:9 20:25
statements 49:8
status 45:9, 16
Stenographer/Tra
nscriptor
2:12
stenographically
49:10
sticking 37:1
stop 20:11
subject 40:2
submission
18:23
submit 11:6
26:16
subsequently
21:14
sufficient 25:24
summary 37:22
supports 15:6
Swarnima 14:16
15:5
switched 14:5, 8
system 7:4
12:19 15:22
18:9 19:1, 14
21:13 25:7

< T >
talking 28:21
29:1, 8, 13 30:3
team 4:8 13:22
14:2, 5, 8, 9, 11,
12, 17, 20 15:1,
3, 8 18:12
32:11 38:5
39:22 41:20, 24
42:2, 5, 6, 10
45:20 46:18
47:2
teams 42:8
Technician 2:13
tend 5:16, 17
term 27:14, 19
28:6 45:2 46:7
terms 28:12
38:15, 16 45:3
47:14
things 14:22
25:20 29:8
30:8 34:12

36:24
thirteen 18:22
time 4:14 11:9
14:22 19:6
20:25 21:1
24:9 27:21
34:21, 23 42:19
48:8 49:6, 9
time-to-time
14:6
timing 41:14
today 10:4
today's 4:9
Tohmatsu 2:8
topic 28:23
topics 27:5
total 23:9
Touche 2:8
tracking 28:22
31:8, 11 38:19
training 31:17
transcribed 4:17
transcript 4:19,
22 5:1, 6, 8, 11
49:12
Transit 4:5
6:10, 18, 20 8:4,
7, 12, 14, 20 9:1
28:4 42:22
Transpo 31:22
trial 5:22 12:18
trigger 21:14
trying 31:4
turn 19:6
turned 17:15
38:1
turning 36:8
type 8:2 25:1,
20 31:19 38:18
typically 25:6
46:17
typos 5:7

< U >
U/A 10:5
Uhm-hmm 28:10
unclear 35:24
understand
10:3 19:20
20:12 25:8
29:7 37:3
38:13 39:24
understanding
31:20 43:17

45:10, 18
updates 31:17

< V >
verify 34:19
version 33:4, 20
Videoconferenci
ng 1:10
view 41:2, 6
Virtual 2:13

< W >
WANG 1:3 2:6
4:2 6:12, 19, 24
7:2, 6, 12, 15, 20,
24 8:6, 10, 16,
23 9:2, 6, 16, 21
10:7, 10, 13, 20,
24 11:3, 11, 14,
20 12:1, 6, 11,
16, 21 13:1, 6, 9,
12, 15, 21, 25
14:10, 14, 21
15:3, 12, 15, 19,
24 16:3, 9, 22
17:1, 6, 9, 12, 19,
23 18:1, 7, 13,
19 19:15, 19, 24
20:21 21:9
22:1, 7, 14, 20
23:2, 6, 11, 14,
17, 22 24:1, 12
25:5, 14 26:3,
15, 20 27:1, 7,
13, 20 28:5, 8,
11, 19 29:2, 9,
21 30:1, 18, 24
31:7, 13 32:1, 5,
7, 13, 16, 20, 25
33:9, 14, 18, 23
34:4, 10, 22
35:11, 21 36:3,
21 37:8, 15, 18
38:10 39:2, 7,
11, 22 40:4, 10,
19, 25 41:4, 8,
15, 23 42:4, 11,
16, 20, 24 43:2,
17, 22 44:8, 15,
24 45:8, 14, 24
46:3, 13, 25
47:6, 10, 18, 22
wanted 48:3
wants 47:21
website 4:23

witness 5:13,
17, 20
wondering
25:23 41:12
44:18
won't 44:8
words 45:13
work 6:9 9:10
10:11, 16 11:18
12:7 13:2
14:23 24:3, 8,
25 26:9 30:7
33:20 38:5
39:1, 5, 9, 20, 25
40:17 42:12, 19,
22 43:1 45:20
46:11, 21 47:15,
17, 20
worked 7:17
working 8:7, 9,
20, 21, 25 9:4
11:24 13:11, 16
14:8, 12 15:2, 8
42:9 43:15
writing 9:17
written 31:17
wrong 22:24

< Y >

Yeah 7:15
11:14, 21 12:6
20:21 22:1
33:23 39:7
40:10 42:4
44:15 47:18
year 8:11
years 6:13, 20
Yoon 2:7 9:20
10:5 14:3 48:5

< Z >

Zoom 1:10