



1 **2014 11 07 h:**

2 Transcript page 130, lines 17 to 25 and page 131, lines 1 to 7 Ms. Glynn “*Subject to checking with*  
3 *my two wonderful assistants here, I have one final line of questioning and I think it’s a housekeeping*  
4 *item. If we could bring up the responses to PUB-FA-23, we think there’s a discrepancy in the*  
5 *numbers provided in 23 and 24. So if we go to the table -- and I should have had this put together so*  
6 *you could see the numbers together and I apologize, Mr. Doherty, but this indication, the second*  
7 *indication where it shows and 18.4 and 125.4 and 132, if we go over to PUB-24 and we look at the*  
8 *last highlighted, and I think it’s the same assumptions that are being used, the indication is now*  
9 *changed to 17.4, 186.7 and 195.3.” Page 131, lines 11 to 12, Ms. Glynn “*Maybe we could have an*  
10 *undertaking, Mr. Doherty -”* **Undertaking is to confirm the indications / assumptions supporting**  
11 **responses to PUB-FA-23 and PUB-FA-24.***

12 **FA Response:**

13 The indications for PUB-FA-23 are based on the response to OW’s April 9, 2014 questions whereas and  
14 PUB-FA-24 is an update where the error described in CA-FA-01 was also corrected. In addition, PUB-  
15 FA-23 was based on a one-year trend, whereas PUB-FA-24 was based on a trend over 396 days (more  
16 than one year). As such, the two responses will not be directly equal, but they are correct in relation to  
17 the questions asked as we understood them.