1. Kent was not a direct witness to much of the information he provided during his deposition. A substantial amount of Kent’s information was relayed to him from other sources who either had first- or second-hand knowledge.

   A  The initial readouts I got were, yes secondhand from the three people. It was my understanding.

   Q  – in on the meeting?

   A  My understanding is again Fiona didn't give it directly to me. My understanding is that she may have gotten it from deputy -- then deputy national security advisor Kupperman.

   Q  She sent you the readout?

   A  No. She had a conversation with Brad Fredon who was the acting deputy assistant secretary at the time. To the best of my knowledge. I received the readout from Brad once I came back from my vacation. (pgs. 206-07)

2. Kent also received a readout from Alex Vindman about the July 25 call, but as urgent as it seemed, Vindman did not mention “Biden,” “Burisma,” or “2016.”

   A  He did not mention, to the best of my recollection, including the notes that I took, which I've submitted to the State Department. He did he -- Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, did not mention the specifics. He just said, as I said at the beginning, he said the majority of the conversation touched on very sensitive topics that I don’t feel comfortable sharing.

   Q  Did he mention Burisma?

   A  He did not mention any specifics.

   Q  And he didn't mention 2016?

   A  He did not mention that to me, no. (pgs. 165-66)

3. Kent agreed it is appropriate for the U.S. Government to consider corruption when evaluating foreign assistance:

   MR. MCCAUL:  So when the State Department evaluates foreign assistance to countries isn't it appropriate for them to look at the level of corruption in those countries?
MR. KENT: Yes. Part of our foreign assistance was specifically focused to try to limit and reduce corruption. And we also tried, to the best of our knowledge and abilities, to do due diligence to make sure that U.S. taxpayer dollars are being spent for the purposes that they were appropriated and that they are as effective as they can be. (pg. 103)

4. Kent recalled raising concerns to the Office of the Vice President in January or February 2015 that Hunter Biden’s board seat created the perception of a conflict of interest.

A When I was – the first time I was in Ukraine as acting deputy chief of mission in the period of mid-January to mid-February, 2015, subsequent to me going into the deputy prosecutor general on February 3rd and demanding who took the bribe and how much was it to shut the case against Zlochevsky I became aware that Hunter Biden was on the board. I did not know that at the time.

And when I was on a call with somebody on the Vice President's staff and I cannot recall who it was, just briefing on what was happening into Ukraine I raised my concerns that I had heard that Hunter Biden was on the board of a company owned by somebody that the U. S. Government had spent money trying to get tens of millions of dollars back and that could create the perception of a conflict of interest. (pgs. 226-27)

5. Kent described what Vice President Biden said on stage in 2018 when referencing Shokin’s firing as a quid pro quo.

Q He [VP Biden] was folksy. And he describes a quid pro quo where, you know, $1 billion worth of aid would be held up until they fired Shokin. Is that what your understanding of the way he tells it?

A That is - sounds more or less like what he said on that stage. Yes. (pgs. 218)

6. Kent corrects himself related to Biden’s quid pro quo and explains conditions placed on U.S. assistance is common.

Q And so when you mentioned that that connection [Biden calling for Shokin's firing] was a quid pro quo, you're not saying that that was an improper quid pro quo?

A I didn't stay [sic] that it was a quid pro quo, but it is the case that both the IMF and the U.S. Government do use conditionality for assistance, whether it is macroeconomic assistance provided by the IMF or, in the case of our sovereign loan guarantees, we put conditionality that related to management of the gas system, meeting macroeconomic stability goals proposed by the IMF, social safety nets, and issues related to anticorruption. . . . (pg. 336)
7. VP Pence’s absence from Zelensky’s Inauguration was due to short notice in scheduling:

A By the time we got close to when the inauguration date was set, which was on very short notice, the outgoing Ukrainian parliament voted on May 16th, which was a Thursday, to have the inauguration on May 20th, which was a Monday, leaving almost no time for either proper preparations or foreign delegations to visit. So we scrambled on Friday, the 17th, to try to figure out who was available. Vice-President Pence was not available. (pg. 189-90).