

## **Chart: Side-by-Side Comparison of Kurt Volker's vs Other Witnesses' Testimony in Ukraine Impeachment Inquiry**

Introduction by Ryan Goodman  
co-editor-in-chief, Just Security

Ambassador Kurt Volker faces a serious credibility problem for having denied knowledge or involvement in President Donald Trump and Rudy Giuliani's efforts to press Ukraine to investigate Joe Biden. He also appears to have lied about a crucial July 10 meeting at the White House and other related matters. Volker faces a serious legal liability problem too. He made these apparent false statements to Congress in his deposition under penalty of law. The Chart below presents detailed information comparing Volker's testimony to the testimony of at least **eleven** other current and former U.S. officials whose statements contradict what Volker told Congress.

Volker was included in Ranking Member Devin Nunes' (R-Ca) [final list](#) of minority witnesses for the public hearings on impeachment. He is scheduled to appear on Tuesday afternoon.

On the morning of Oct. 3, Volker was the very first witness to testify in closed session before the three House Committees conducting the impeachment inquiry. Volker would have no way of knowing exactly which of his colleagues would later testify and what they might say. Within hours of the Committees' announcing a subpoena for Volker, he publicly resigned from his position as Special Envoy to Ukraine. He thus had greater latitude to speak with Congress. Several of his colleagues -- including David Holmes, George Kent, Ambassador Gordon Sondland, Ambassador Bill Taylor, and Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Vindman -- did not resign.

Now all of their deposition transcripts and others' testimony as well is publicly available.

Volker's testimony was unfavorable to the President and Giuliani in many respects. However in other important instances, Volker denied allegations about his own wrongdoing and the existence of the alleged pressure campaign against Ukraine. Sondland's original testimony (on Oct. 17) was more closely aligned with Volker's accounts, until Sondland broke from that message and issued a supplemental deposition nearly three weeks later (on Nov. 4).

Comparing Volker's testimony to other witnesses raises very serious concerns about Volker's truthfulness before Congress. To be more specific, **it appears that Mr. Volker lied to Congress in violation of federal criminal law** (18 USC 1001). The most serious instances include his flat denial that the Ukraine "investigations" were discussed in a July 10 meeting at the White House, his denial of his own knowledge or involvement in efforts to urge Ukraine to investigate Biden, his denial of his own knowledge or involvement in a quid pro quo scheme, and his claim that efforts to get Ukraine to make a public statement about the investigations ended in mid-to-late August.

Volker now has a choice to make before he appears before Congress and the public on Tuesday. He might be best advised to invoke his Fifth Amendment right to remain silent. Alternatively, he may want to issue a supplemental declaration of his own. Or he could include a “clarification” related to his prior statements during his prepared opening remarks at the Tuesday afternoon hearing.

None of this necessarily casts blame on Volker for his actions on behalf of the United States. It appears he was caught in the middle of a complex problem not of his own making. As a seasoned diplomat he tried to steer the situation toward an endpoint in which Ukraine could meet the demands of the President to maintain U.S. support. As Volker said in his prepared remarks last month, “I therefore faced a choice: do nothing, and allow this situation to fester; or try to fix it. I tried to fix it.” With Congress now in a full blown impeachment inquiry, Volker has a second opportunity to explain with complete candor what really happened over the course of the past several months.

I believe any fair-minded assessment of the record will reach a similar conclusion about Volker’s credibility and legal liability problems. The data presenting the competing testimony of witnesses are provided in the Chart below. It identifies thirteen topics of concern. Please [contact us](#) if you think the Chart is missing any significant information favorable or unfavorable to Mr. Volker.

### **Ambassador Kurt Volker’s Testimony vs. Other Witnesses’ Testimony in Ukraine Impeachment Inquiry**

#### Table of Contents

- 1) Awareness and involvement in urging Ukraine to investigate Bidens
- 2) Meeting with Ukrainian officials at White House on July 10
- 3) Quid pro quo 1: Whether releasing security assistance was linked to whether Ukraine announced investigations
- 4) Quid pro quo 2: Whether a White House meeting was linked to whether Ukraine announced investigations.
- 5) When efforts to get Ukraine to make public statement ceased (and Volker’s claiming responsible for helping prevent it)
- 6) Substance of meeting between Volker and Zelenskyy in Toronto on July 2/July 3
- 7) Whether individuals involved kept investigation of “Burisma” distinct from investigation of “Bidens”

- 8) Whether Giuliani was acting as an agent or at the direction of President Trump
- 9) Whether President directed Volker, Sondland, Perry to work with Giuliani
- 10) Whether it was appropriate to involve Giuliani
- 11) Whether there was an irregular channel -- keeping Taylor and others out of the irregular channel
- 12) Whether the suspension of security assistance was within the range of normal
- 13) Whether was appropriate to ask Ukraine to investigate 2016 election interference

**1) Awareness and involvement in urging Ukraine to investigate Bidens**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Volker</b></p> <p>“[A]t no time was I aware of or took part in an effort to urge Ukraine to investigate former Vice President Biden.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Opening written statement, p. 3</i></li> </ul> | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Holmes, Kent, Morrison, Sondland, Taylor, Vindman</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Taylor</u></p> <p>“I received text messages on a three-way WhatsApp text conversation with Ambassadors Volker and Sondland .... <b>Ambassador Volker said that what was “[m]ost impt is for Zelensky to say that he will help investigation—</b> and address any specific personnel issues—if there are any.”</p> <p>“Although this was the first time I had seen the details of President Trump’s July 25 call with President Zelenskyy, in which he mentioned Vice President Biden, <b>I had come to understand well before then that “investigations” was a term that Ambassadors Volker and Sondland used to mean matters related to the 2016 elections, and to investigations of Burisma and the Bidens.</b>”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, pp. 9-10 &amp; 18</i></li> </ul> |
|--|--|

“Taylor: If that person owed him [President Trump] something, before he signed the check he wanted to get that -- get whatever he was owed paid back to him. And **Ambassador Volker used very similar language** about a week later, which indicates to me that they had that conversation as well.

...

Goldman: Right, but what he -- what he was talking about, as you understood it, because in the context of the conversation is that what he owed him were these investigations that he wanted. Is that right?

Taylor: That -- that would have been to fix the wrong, exactly.

Goldman: And those investigations into the 2016 election and **Biden** and Burisma?

Taylor: That's correct.”

- *Taylor, Public Hearing (in reference to communications on September 8 and about a week later).*

“Goldman: What did you understand it to mean when -- that Zelensky had concerns about being an instrument in Washington domestic reelection politics?

Taylor: Mr. Danyliuk **understood that these investigations were pursuant to Mr. Giuliani's request to develop information, to find information about Burisma and the Bidens.** This was **very well-known in public.** Mr. Giuliani had made this point clear in several instances in the beginning -- in -- in the -- in the springtime, and Mr. Danyliuk was aware that that was a problem.”

- *Taylor, Public hearing*

Kent

“Question: Okay. And by no means was he adopting the narrative that Rudy Giuliani was proselytizing?”

Kent: I don't know what Kurt's view was about the narrative. What I know is that by September, **Kurt was actively promoting the request for Ukraine to open these investigations.**”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, pp. 272-73*

“But [Kurt] did tell me that he planned to start reaching out to the former Mayor of New York, Rudy Giuliani....

When I raised with Kurt, I said, about what? Because former Mayor Giuliani has a track record of, you know, asking for a visa for a corrupt former prosecutor. He attacked Masha, and he's tweeting that the new President needs to investigate **Biden** and the 2016 campaign.

And **Kurt's reaction, or response to me at that was, well, if there's nothing there, what does it matter?** And if there is something there, it should be investigated.”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, pp. 247*

“I had a conversation with Charge Taylor in which he amplified the same theme. And he indicated that Special Representative **Volker** had been engaging Andriy Yermak; that the President and his private attorney, Rudy Giuliani, were interested in the initiation of investigations; and that Yermak was very uncomfortable when this ....”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, p. 262*  
“[B]ased on Bill Taylor's account of the engagements with Andriy Yermak that were the engagements of Yermak with Kurt **Volker**, at that point it was clear that the investigations that were being suggested were the ones that Rudy Giuliani had been tweeting about, meaning **Biden**, Burisma, and 2016.”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, p. 264*

Describing an evening meeting in Kyiv with Volker, Taylor, Yermak on Sept. 14:

“Kent: But the more awkward part of the conversation came when Special Representative Volker made the point that the Ukrainians, who had opened their authorities under Zelenskyy, had opened investigations of former President Poroshenko, he didn't think that was appropriate.

And then Andriy Yermak said: What? **You mean the type of investigations you're pushing for us to do on Biden and Clinton?**

And at that point Kurt Volker did not respond.

Later on in the conversation, when it came to the potential for Zelenskyy and President Trump to meet, according to Charge Taylor, Special Representative **Volker said: And it's important that President Zelenskyy give the messages that we discussed before.** And Charge Taylor told me that he then said: Don't do that.”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, pp. 229-30 (see also Kent, Deposition transcript, p. 334-35)*

Vindman

“On July 10, 2019, Oleksandr Danylyuk, the Secretary of the National Security and Defense Council for Ukraine, visited Washington, D.C. for a meeting with National Security Advisor Bolton. **Ambassadors Volker and Sondland also attended**, along with Energy Secretary Rick Perry.

The meeting proceeded well until the Ukrainians broached the subject of a meeting between the two presidents. The Ukrainians saw this meeting as critically important in order to solidify the support of their most important international partner. **Amb. Sondland started to speak about Ukraine delivering specific investigations in order to secure the meeting with the President, at which time Ambassador Bolton cut the meeting short.**”

- *Vindman, Opening written statement, p. 5*

“Goldman: Was Ambassador Volker in the War Room for this conversation [referring to post-July 10th meeting debrief]?”

Vindman: He was.”

- *Vindman, Deposition testimony, p. 35*

“Vindman: ... [T]he conversation unfolded with Sondland proceeding to kind of, you know, review what the deliverable would be in order to get the meeting, and he talked about the investigation into the Bidens, and, frankly, I can't 100 percent recall because I didn't take notes of it, but Burisma, that it seemed -- I mean, **there was no**

**ambiguity**, I guess, in my mind. He was calling for something, calling for an investigation that didn't exist into the Bidens and Burisma.

Question: Okay. Ambiguity in your mind is different from what you --

Vindman: Sure.

Question: -- actually heard?

Vindman: Right. Correct.

Question: What did you hear Sondland say?

Vindman: That the Ukrainians would have to deliver an investigation into the Bidens.

Question: Into the Bidens. **So in the Ward Room he mentioned the word 'Bidens'?**

Vindman: **To the best of my recollection, yes."**

- *Vindman, Deposition testimony, p. 64*

#### Sondland

"We chose the latter path, which seemed to all of us – Secretary Perry, Ambassador **Volker**, and myself – to be the better alternative. But **I did not understand, until much later, that Mr. Giuliani's agenda might have also included an effort to prompt the Ukrainians to investigate Vice President Biden or his son or to involve Ukrainians, directly or indirectly, in the President's 2020 reelection campaign.**"

- *Sondland, Opening written statement, p. 8*

"Goldman: Let me take a step back. You said you've been focused on the press statement, and ultimately, what Mr. Giuliani wanted in that press statement was a specific mention of the investigations into Burisma and the 2016



elections. Is that right?

Sondland: That's what I understood **through Volker because, remember, I hadn't met Giuliani at this point.**

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, pp. 168-170*

Holmes

“While Ambassador Taylor did not brief me on every detail of his communications with the Three Amigos, he did tell me that **on a June 28 call** with President Zelenskyy, Ambassador Taylor, and the Three Amigos, it was made clear that some action on a **Burisma/Biden investigation was a precondition for an Oval Office meeting.**”

- *Holmes, Opening statement, p. 5 (Volker was a participant on the June 28 call)*

“I then heard President Trump ask, “So, he's gonna do the investigation?” Ambassador Sondland replied that “he's gonna do it,” adding that President Zelenskyy will do “anything you ask him to.”...

...

Ambassador Sondland agreed that the President did not “give a s—t about Ukraine.” I asked why not, and Ambassador Sondland stated that the President only cares about “big stuff.” I noted that there was “big stuff” going on in Ukraine, like a war with Russia, and Ambassador Sondland replied that he meant “big stuff” that benefits the President, **like the “Biden investigation”** that Mr. Giuliani was pushing.

- *Holmes, Opening statement, pp. 6-7*

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Morrison</u></p> <p>“As Dr. Fiona Hill and I prepared for me to succeed her, one of the areas we discussed was Ukraine. ... <b>Dr. Hill told me that Ambassador Sondland and President Trump’s personal lawyer, Rudy Giuliani, were trying to get President Zelensky to reopen Ukrainian investigations into Burisma.</b> At the time, I did not know what Burisma was or what the investigation entailed. After the meeting with Dr. Hill, I googled Burisma and learned that it was a Ukrainian energy company and that Hunter Biden was on its board.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- <i>Morrison, Opening written statement, p. 3</i></p> |
|--|--|

**2) Meeting with Ukrainian officials at White House on July 10**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Volker</b></p> <p>(1) <u>Note</u>: Volker makes no mention of the meeting in his Written Opening Statement. He was a participant in the meeting.</p> <p>(2) “Question: <b>What was discussed at the meeting, sum and substance?</b><br/> Volker: Yeah. It was<br/> Question: Is this the one you were telling us about earlier where Danylyuk was getting way too bureaucratic?<br/> Volker: Exactly, yes. It was talking about legislation to reform the security services, legislation to reform the defense establishment, and really getting down into the bureaucratic weeds, and not conveying a top-level message, a strategic message. And Yermak didn't say a word in the meeting. It was only Danylyuk doing</p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Hill, Taylor, Vindman</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Taylor</u></p> <p>“In the same July 19 phone call, [Hill and Vindman] gave me an account of a July 10 meeting with Ukrainian and American officials at the White House. They told me that <b>part way through the meeting, Ambassador Sondland had connected ‘investigations’ with an Oval Office meeting for President Zelenskyy, which so irritated then-National Security Advisor John Bolton that he abruptly ended the meeting, telling Dr. Hill and LTC Vindman that they should have nothing to do with domestic politics. He also directed Dr. Hill to ‘brief the lawyers.’</b> Dr. Hill said that Ambassador Bolton referred to this as a</p> |
|--|--|

his presentation and talking because he was Yermak was respecting Danylyuk's role of making this presentation. And **the meeting was just kind of flat, and I thought it was a missed opportunity.**"

- *Deposition testimony, p. 309*

(3) "Question: **Was there any discussion during that meeting about Giuliani's** --

Volker: **No.**

Question: -- activities in Ukraine?

Volker: No.

Question: Okay. **Anything about the investigations that we've been talking about?**

Volker: **No.**"

- *Deposition testimony, p. 310*

(4) "Question: Now, when you're asked about the meeting between Danylyuk and Bolton at the White House on July 10th, you say: It did not go you said when asked how it went, you said: Not good.

Volker: Yes.

Question: Sorry, that was garbled. But why did you say that?

Volker: Because Alex Danylyuk led the meeting and was talking really very bureaucratically. ...."

- *Deposition testimony, p. 66*

**'drug deal'** after the July 10 meeting. Ambassador Bolton opposed a call between President Zelenskyy and President ... Ambassador Sondland, a participant in the irregular channel, wanted to talk about the connection between a White House meeting and Ukrainian investigations."

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, p. 9*

### Vindman

"On July 10, 2019, Oleksandr Danylyuk, the Secretary of the National Security and Defense Council for Ukraine, visited Washington, D.C. for a meeting with National Security Advisor Bolton. Ambassadors **Volker** and Sondland also attended, along with Energy Secretary Rick Perry.

The meeting proceeded well until the Ukrainians broached the subject of a meeting between the two presidents. The Ukrainians saw this meeting as critically important in order to solidify the support of their most important international partner. Amb. **Sondland started to speak about Ukraine delivering specific investigations in order to secure the meeting with the President, at which time Ambassador Bolton cut the meeting short.**

Following this meeting, there was a scheduled **debriefing during which Amb. Sondland emphasized the importance that Ukraine deliver the investigations into the 2016 election, the Bidens, and Burisma.** I stated to Amb. Sondland that his statements were inappropriate, that the request to investigate Biden and his son

had nothing to do with national security, and that such investigations were not something the NSC was going to get involved in or push. Dr. Hill then entered the room and asserted to Amb. Sondland that his statements were inappropriate. Following the debriefing meeting, I reported my concerns to the NSC's lead counsel. Dr. Hill also reported the incident to the NSC's lead counsel."

- *Vindman, Opening written statement, p. 5*

"Vindman: ... [T]he conversation unfolded with Sondland proceeding to kind of, you know, review what the deliverable would be in order to get the meeting, and he talked about the investigation into the Bidens, and, frankly, I can't 100 percent recall because I didn't take notes of it, but Burisma, that it seemed -- I mean, **there was no ambiguity**, I guess, in my mind. He was calling for something, calling for an investigation that didn't exist into the Bidens and Burisma.

Question: Okay. Ambiguity in your mind is different from what you --

Vindman: Sure.

Question: -- actually heard?

Vindman: Right. Correct.

Question: What did you hear Sondland say?

Vindman: That the Ukrainians would have to deliver an investigation into the Bidens.

Question: Into the Bidens. **So in the Ward Room he mentioned the word 'Bidens'?**

Vindman: **To the best of my recollection, yes."**

- *Vindman, Deposition testimony, p. 64*

Hill

“Ambassador **Sondland**, in front of the Ukrainians, as I came in, was talking about how he had an agreement with Chief of Staff **Mulvaney** for a meeting with the Ukrainians if they were going to go forward with investigations. And my director for Ukraine was looking completely alarmed.

- *Hill, Deposition testimony, p. 69*

“[Sondland] started to basically talk about discussions that he had had with the Chief of Staff. **He mentioned Mr. Giuliani**, but then I cut him off because I didn't want to get further into this discussion at all.”

- *Hill, Deposition testimony, p. 69*

“Question: So it was you personally who heard Ambassador Sondland **mention Burisma?**

**Hill: Correct.**

Question: In the Ward Room?

Hill: Correct. And Wells had been sitting with me in Ambassador Bolton's office when the initial meeting took place, and he also understood it was a redirect.

Question: And Mr. Vindman was also there?

Hill: Correct.

Question: And heard it?

Hill: **And Kurt Volker.**”

- *Hill, Deposition testimony, pp. 151-52*

“Ambassador **Sondland blurted out: Well, we have an agreement with the Chief of Staff for a meeting if these investigations in the energy sector start.**

And Ambassador **Bolton immediately stiffened**. He said words to the effect -- I can't say word for word what he said because I was behind them sitting on the sofa with our Senior Director of Energy -- and we all kind of looked up and thought that was somewhat odd. And Ambassador Bolton immediately stiffened and ended the meeting.

[...]

And this is when Sondland, who is, you know, a fairly big guy, kind of leaned over across Ambassador Bolton, because I could see that from where I was sitting, and said to the Ukrainians and back to Ambassador Bolton, but we've already got, you know, kind of an agreement on a meeting.

I mean, he was basically, and you can imagine, you would all be annoyed as well that he was basically countermanding what Ambassador Bolton had just said. In other words saying, I actually have, you know, some completely separate agreement about a meeting, you know, kind of you're stonewalling kind of thing. And then he was clearly in the -- when he went out into the office in front of Ambassador Bolton he was kind of clearly, you know, feeling irritated, Sondland was. And that's when he said, let's go back down to the Ward Room and talk about next steps for the meeting. And that's when Bolton was just, you know, **I wouldn't say apoplectic, but pretty furious.**"

- *Hill, Deposition testimony, pp. 66-67, 155-56*

"Ambassador Bolton asked me to go over and report this to our NSC counsel, to John Eisenberg. And he told me, and this is a **direct quote** from Ambassador Bolton: **You go and tell Eisenberg that I am not part of whatever drug**

**deal Sondland and Mulvaney are cooking up** on this, and you go and tell him what you've heard and what I've said. So I went over to talk to John Eisenberg about this.”

- *Hill, Deposition testimony, pp. 70-71*

### 3) Quid pro quo 1: Whether releasing security assistance was linked to whether Ukraine announced investigations

#### Volker

(1) “In my view, this hold on security assistance was not significant. I don't believe - in fact, **I am quite sure that at least I, Secretary Pompeo, the official representatives of the U.S., never communicated to Ukrainians that it is being held for a reason.**”

- *Deposition testimony, p.80*

(2) “The issue of a hold placed on **security assistance** to Ukraine also came up during this same time I was connecting Mr. Yermak and Mayor Giuliani. **I did not perceive these issues to be linked in any way.**”

- *Opening written statement, p. 9*

(3) “Question: Now, Ambassador Volker, given the pressure that Rudy Giuliani was putting on the Ukrainian administration to initiate these investigations, do you not think that the Ukrainians would not have understood that the actual explanation for the security assistance being held up was the fact that they did not issue that statement, or they had not initiated those investigations if there was no official explanation?”

Volker: That I see why you're asking this

#### Holmes, Morrison, Sondland, Taylor, Vindman

#### Taylor

“Taylor: That was my clear understanding, **security assistance money would not come until the President committed to pursue the investigation.**”

Chairman Schiff: So if they don't do this, they are not going to get that was your understanding?

Taylor, Yes, sir.”

- *Taylor, Deposition transcript, p. 190*

“During our **call on September 8**, Ambassador Sondland tried to explain to me that President Trump is a businessman. When a businessman is about to sign a check to someone who owes him something, the businessman asks that person to pay up before signing the check. **Ambassador Volker** used the same language several days later while we were together at the Yalta European Strategy Conference. I argued **to both** that the explanation made no sense: the Ukrainians did not ‘owe’ President Trump anything, and holding

question.

Question: Because 'it makes sense?'

Volker: But even my own understanding of this is back to the meeting I had in the Oval Office with the others and the President in May.

**His views on Ukraine were so sharply negative, and reinforced in a negative understanding, that it makes more sense to me, it's more direct that this is happening**

**independently**; that he sees that we are about to launch a notification of millions of dollars to Ukraine. Wait a second. You know, are they can we work with these guys? Are they corrupt still? Why should we be giving them American money? Why aren't the Germans doing this?

That's what I interpreted at the time what the issue is. And I don't know whether I said it that explicitly to the Ukrainians, but I think it's reasonable to see this as something happening on its own."

- *Deposition testimony, p. 277-78*

(4) "You asked what conversations did I have about that quid pro quo, et cetera. None, because I didn't know that there was a quid pro quo."

- *Deposition testimony, p. 129*

(5) "Zeldin: And in no way, shape, or form in either the readouts from the United States or Ukraine did you receive any indication whatsoever for anything that resembles a quid pro quo?"

Volker: Correct"

- *Deposition testimony, p. 214*

up security assistance for domestic political gain was 'crazy,' as I had said in my text message to Ambassadors Sondland and Volker on September 9."

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, p. 17; see also Deposition testimony, pp. 146-47 (discussing Volker's using same phrase as Sondland)*

"Question: Now, when Ambassador Sondland described to you this signing of the check, did you take it by that he was referring to signing the check for the military assistance?"

Taylor: Yes."

- *Taylor, Deposition testimony, pp. 146; see also Deposition testimony, pp. 146-47 (discussing Volker's using same phrase as Sondland)*

"During this same phone call with Mr. Morrison, he described a conversation Ambassador Sondland had with Mr. Yermak in Warsaw. Ambassador Sondland told Mr. Yermak that **the security assistance money would not come until President Zelenskyy committed to pursue the Burisma investigation.**"

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, p. 14*

"Ambassador Sondland also told me that he now recognized that he had made a mistake by earlier telling Ukrainian officials that only a White House meeting with President Zelenskyy was dependent on a **public announcement of investigations**—in fact, Ambassador Sondland said, **'everything' was dependent on such an announcement, including security**



**assistance.** He said that President Trump wanted President Zelenskyy “in a public box” by making a public statement about ordering such investigations.”

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, p. 14*

Morrison

“In preparation for my appearance today, I reviewed the statement Ambassador Taylor provided this inquiry on October 22, 2019. I can confirm that the substance of his statement, as it relates to conversations he and I had, is accurate.”

- *Morrison, Opening written statement, p 3*

“Ambassador Taylor and I had no reason to believe that the release of the security sector assistance might be conditioned on a public statement reopening the Burisma investigation until my September 1, 2019 conversation with Ambassador Sondland. Even then I hoped that Ambassador Sondland’s strategy was exclusively his own and would not be considered by leaders in the Administration and Congress, who understood the strategic importance of Ukraine to our national security.”

- *Morrison, Opening written statement, p. 5*

“Question: During the Warsaw visit Ambassador Sondland, I guess, had a sidebar with Yermak?

Morrison: Yes. Ukrainian Presidential Adviser Yermak.

Question: Did you witness that exchange?

Morrison: I witnessed it, yes.

Question: Okay. And were you part of the exchange or did you just see it occur?

Morrison: I saw it occur.

Question: Okay. And what did you learn about that exchange? I guess Ambassador Sondland told you what he told Yermak?

Morrison: He came -- he essentially walked across a, you know, a -- I don't know how to describe the room. He walked across the space and he briefed me on what he said he had said to Mr. Yermak.

Question: Okay. What did he tell you?

Morrison: **He told me that in his -- that what he communicated was that he believed the -- what could help them move the aid was if the prosecutor general would go to the mike and announce that he was opening the Burisma investigation.**

- Morrison, *Deposition testimony*, pp. 134-35 (see also 181-82)

“Chairman Schiff: And what did Ambassador Sondland tell you in the phone call?

Morrison: In the phone call, he told me that he had just gotten off the phone -- the September 7th phone call -- **he told me he had just gotten off the phone with the President.**

[...]

And he wanted to tell me what he had discussed with the President.

Chairman Schiff: And what did he tell you?

Morrison: He told me, as is related here in Ambassador Taylor's statement, that there was no quid pro quo, **but President Zelensky must announce the opening of the investigations and he should want to do it.**

Chairman Schiff: Okay. I think that clarifies things then.

So, in Warsaw, Ambassador Sondland tells you that he's conveyed to Yermak the

prosecutor general has to make these statements. He later conveys to you after talking with the President several days later that **the requirement is actually that Zelensky has to commit to these investigations.**

Morrison: Yes. And I had already heard that from Ambassador Taylor.”

- *Morrison, Deposition testimony, pp. 190-91*

Sondland

“[B]y the beginning of September 2019, and in the absence of any credible explanation for the suspension of aid, I presumed that **the aid suspension had become linked to the proposed anti-corruption statement.** As I said in my prepared testimony, security aid to Ukraine was in our vital national interest and should not have been delayed for any reason. And it would have been natural for me to have voiced what I had presumed to Ambassador Taylor, Senator Johnson, the Ukrainians, and M. Morrison.”

- *Sondland, Supplemental Declaration, p. 2*

“Also, I now do recall a conversation on September 1, 2019, in Warsaw With Mr. Yennak. ... **After that large meeting, I now recall speaking individually with Mr. Yermak, where I said that resumption of U.S. aid would likely not occur until Ukraine provided the public anti-corruption statement that we had been discussing for many weeks.** I also recall some question as to whether the public statement could come from the newly appointed Ukrainian Prosecutor General, rather than from President

Zelensky directly.”

- *Sondland, Supplemental Declaration, p. 2*

Holmes

“[I]t became apparent that the energy sector reforms, commercial deals, and anti-corruption efforts on which we were making progress were not making a dent in terms of persuading the White House to schedule a meeting between the presidents.”

“During this time, we were still trying to appeal to President Trump in foreign policy and national security terms. By this point, however, my clear impression was that **the security assistance hold was likely intended by the President either to express dissatisfaction that the Ukrainians had not yet agreed to the Burisma/Biden investigations or as an effort to increase the pressure on them to do so.**”

- *Holmes, Opening statement, pp. 4-5 & 8*

Vindman

“Zeldin: Are you aware of any communications where the United States told Ukraine that aid would be conditioned -- that the hold on aid would only be released if these investigations -- these investigations, these specific investigations, were pursued?”

Vindman: Congressman, it is my belief that the message -- and, again, this is my belief -- but that **the message was clear**. The Ukrainians had been attempting to obtain a bilateral meeting for several months in spite of the fact that one had been offered and a couple phone calls and a letter, and they hadn't

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>managed to obtain that. They had a conversation on the 25th of July in which, again, going back to it the way I characterized it, the President demanded an investigation and they still haven't achieved the meeting, and now they're learning about a hold on security assistance.</p> <p>So I cannot -- you know, <b>the logic there seems inescapable</b> that this would be their view -- and I understand the Ukrainians. I understand their, you know, their national security needs and so forth, that they would believe that this was another point of pressure.</p> <p>Zeldin: And do you have any firsthand knowledge of that being communicated to Ukraine?</p> <p>Vindman: No. And I'm trying to remember if there was anything that may have emerged since. Certainly Ambassador Taylor's testimony, you know, seems to draw that conclusion, but I'm not aware of anything specific.”</p> <p style="text-align: right;">- <i>Vindman deposition, pp. 316-17</i></p> |
|--|--|

**4) Quid pro quo 2: Whether a White House meeting was linked to whether Ukraine announced investigations**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Volker</b></p> <p>(1) “Question: Did the President ever withhold a meeting with President Zelensky until the Ukrainians committed to investigating those allegations?</p> <p>Volker: We had a difficult time scheduling a bilateral meeting between President Zelensky and President Trump.</p> <p>Question: Ambassador Volker, that was a yes-or-no question.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Hill, Holmes, Sondland, Taylor, Vindman</b><br/> <b>(see also statements by witnesses for no. 2 on July 10 White House meeting)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Holmes</u></p> <p>“While Ambassador Taylor did not brief me on every detail of his communications with the Three Amigos, he did tell me that <b>on a June 28 call</b> with President Zelenskyy, Ambassador Taylor, and the</p> |
|--|--|

Volker: Well, if I -- can you repeat the question then?

Question: Sure. Did President Trump ever withhold a meeting with President Zelensky or delay a meeting with President Zelensky until the Ukrainians committed to investigate the allegations that you just described concerning the 2016 President election?

Volker: The answer to the question is no, if you want a yes-or-no answer. But the reason the answer is no is we did have difficulty scheduling a meeting, but there was no linkage like that.”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 35-36*

(2) “Question: In the text messaging exchange on September 8 or September 9 with Bill Taylor, where he says that he believes that the aid was being held up and the White House visit was being withheld because of the investigations, do you know why he had that concern **or what basis he had for believing that?**

Volker: **No, I don't.** I believe, and I'd have to go back and read it again, but I believe it was the Politico article that suggested that. And we, Gordon **Sondland and I, both spoke with Bill and said, I don't think that's it,** and don't panic over this.”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 302*

Three Amigos, it was made clear that some action on a **Burisma/Biden investigation was a precondition for an Oval Office meeting.**”

- *Holmes, Opening statement, p. 5 (Volker was a participant on the June 28 call)*

Taylor

“By mid-July it was becoming clear to me that **the meeting President Zelenskyy wanted was conditioned on the investigations of Burisma and alleged Ukrainian interference in the 2016 U.S. elections.**”

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, p. 8*

“Ambassador Sondland also told me that he now recognized that he had made a mistake by earlier telling Ukrainian officials that only a White House meeting with President Zelenskyy was dependent on a public announcement of investigations—in fact, Ambassador Sondland said, **‘everything’ was dependent on such an announcement,** including security assistance. He said that President Trump wanted President Zelenskyy ‘in a public box’ by making a public statement about ordering such investigations.”

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, p. 14*

“Chairman Schiff: [I]s your testimony that, hey, **you don't make these public statements about these two political investigations we want, you're not getting this meeting -- you make these statements, you'll get the meeting;** you don't make these statements, you won't. Was that your understanding of the state of affairs in

July of 2019?

Taylor: **Yes.**”

- *Taylor, Deposition testimony, p. 130*

Sondland

**“I understood that satisfying Mr. Giuliani was a condition for scheduling the White House visit...”**

- *Sondland, Supplemental Declaration, p. 1*

“Question: So I think you said in your opening statement that you understood that **in order to arrange this meeting** with the White House you had to somehow satisfy Mr. Giuliani’s concerns. Was that your takeaway [from the May 23 meeting with President Trump]?  
Sondland: That was the takeaway, yeah.”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, p. 75*

“Chairman Schiff: ... Before the invitation was extended, you understood from the President that **unless Mr. Giuliani's interests or concerns were met there was going to be no meeting.** Isn't that correct?

Sondland: I understood that walking out of the door on the 23rd.”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, p. 141*

“Question: But my last question, because our time is up, is did you or did you not know before the discussion about this press statement whether Mr. Giuliani, as the representative of the President, per the President's instructions, conditioned a White House meeting on investigations

related to domestic reelection politics?  
Sondland: That was Mr. Taylor's characterization. My only recollection is that **the White House visit was conditioned on the press statement involving the 2016 and Burisma.** That was the only condition.”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, p. 170*

#### Hill

“Question: But, again, it's the -- they seem to be exchanging a White House meeting for a commitment by Ukraine to investigate these matters that Rudy Giuliani had been pressing?”

Hill: That's what it looks like. The ‘heard from the White House’ is interesting to me because I don't know, obviously, who they heard from in the White House.”

- *Hill, Deposition testimony, p. 222*

“Ambassador **Sondland, in front of the Ukrainians, as I came in, was talking about how he had an agreement with Chief of Staff Mulvaney for a meeting with the Ukrainians if they were going to go forward with investigations.** And my director for Ukraine was looking completely alarmed.”

- *Hill, Deposition testimony, p. 69 (discussing meeting at White House, in which **Volker was also present**)*

#### Vindman

“When the Ukrainians raised this issue of trying to figure out what the date would be for the Presidential meeting, Ambassador Sondland proceeded to



discuss **the deliverable required in order to get the meeting**, and he alluded to investigations. Very quickly thereafter, Ambassador Bolton terminated the meeting...”

- *Vindman, Deposition testimony, p. 27*

“Ambassador Sondland relatively quickly went into **outlining how** the -- you know, **these investigations need to -- on the deliverable for these investigations in order to secure this meeting.**”

- *Vindman, Deposition testimony, p. 29*

#### Text Messages

[7/25/19, 8:36:45 AM] **Kurt Volker:**  
Good lunch - thanks. Heard from White House-**assuming President Z convinces trump he will investigate / "get to the bottom of what happened" in 2016, we will nail down date for visit to Washington.** Good luck! See you tomorrow- kurt

[8/10/19, 4:56:15 PM] Andrey Yermak:  
Hi Kurt. Please let me know when you can talk. I think **it's possible to make this declaration and mention all these things. Which we discussed yesterday. But it will be logic to do after we receive a confirmation of date. We inform about date of visit** and about our expectations and our guarantees for future visit. Let discuss it

[8/10/19, 5:01:32 PM] Kurt Volker: Ok!  
It's late for you—why don't we talk in my morning, your afternoon tomorrow? Say 10am/5pm?

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>[8/10/19, 5:02:18 PM] <b>Kurt Volker:</b> I agree with your approach. <b>Let’s iron out statement and use that to get date and then Prez can go forward with it?</b></p> <p>[8/10/19, 5:26:17 PM] Andrey Yermak: Ok</p> <p>[8/10/19, 5:38:43 PM] Kurt Volker: Great. Gordon is available to join as well</p> <p>[8/10/19, 5:41:45 PM] Andrey Yermak: Excellent</p> <p>[8/10/19, 5:42:10 PM] Andrey Yermak: Once we have a date, will call for a press briefing, announcing upcoming visit and outlining vision for the reboot of US-UKRAINE relationship, including among other things Burisma and election meddling in investigations</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">- <i>Text Messages Between Volker, Taylor, Sondland, Yermak, and Giuliani (released Oct. 3, 2019), pp. 6-7</i></p> |
|--|---|

**5) When efforts to get Ukraine to make public statement ceased (and Volker’s claiming responsible for helping prevent it)**

| <b>Volker</b>   | <b>Holmes, Kent, Taylor, Sondland</b>  |
|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Kent</u></p> <p>(1) “...the end of August. And by the time that we had that, we had dropped the idea of even looking at a statement.”</p> <p><i>Deposition testimony, p. 125</i></p> <p>(2) “Question: Skipping down to <b>August 19th</b> [...]”<br/> Volker: ... And <b>about this time, I stopped pursuing it as well</b>, because I</p> | <p>"Question: Do you know what those messages were?"</p> <p>Kent: This goes back to the signaling for a public appearance. The hoped-for interview with CNN with Zelenskyy did not happen during the conference. Fareed Zakaria was one of the hosts, but there was no special interview. So there was discussion that President Zelenskyy</p> |

was becoming now here convinced this was going down the wrong road.”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 199*

(3) “Question: [...] That it was actually your caution, perhaps, as well as the Ukrainians' caution, that may not have led to the immediate issuance of a statement, despite the President's effort and Giuliani's effort to get a statement?

Volker: Definitely the latter, that their caution and my advising and agreeing with that caution I think led them to never make a statement.”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 202*

(4) “Question: Whatever happened to that statement?

Volker: **It died.** I mean, no one – once we started seeing a tempo of engagement with Ukraine, we had first the sense that Rudy was not going to be convinced that it meant anything, and, therefore, convey a positive message to the President if it didn't say Burisma and 2016.

I agreed with the Ukrainians they shouldn't do it, and in fact told them just drop it, wait till you have your own prosecutor general in place. Let's work on substantive issues like this, security assistance and all. Let's just do that. **So we dropped it.**

And so **by this time**, there's -- **I'm not actively discussing that with anybody anymore**”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 259-60*

(5) Note: After all these prior exchanges in his deposition, Volker was asked and answered the following:

“Noble: And I wanted to go back to a point of clarification. When we were talking about the statement that was

would have an interview with CNN the week of the U.N. General Assembly leaders meeting, which was the **September 23rd to 27th.**

Question: And the message that **Mr. Volker** wanted President Zelenskyy to provide during the CNN interview was what?

Kent: That Zelenskyy should message that – his willingness to open investigations in the two areas of interest to the President and that had been pushed previously by Rudy Giuliani.”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, pp. 330-31*

“Question: Because you said that as of **September 15th** there was still a hope, for example, that President Zelenskyy would give an interview with CNN when he was in New York for the General Assembly and specifically mention those investigations, right?

Kent: That was my understanding of what Ambassador **Volker** and Ambassador Sondland were requesting of the Ukrainians, yes.”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, pp. 333*

#### Holmes

“On **September 13**, an Embassy colleague received a phone call from a colleague at the U.S. Embassy to the European Union (under Ambassador Sondland) and texted me regarding the call, ‘Sondland said the [Zelenskyy] interview is supposed to be **today or Monday [Sept 16]** and they plan to announce that a certain investigation that was “on hold” will progress.’ The text also

being drafted in August of 2018[sic], I believe you testified it was never issued.

Volker: Right.

Noble: The Ukrainians dropped it. But they continued to talk about a possible interview - -

Volker: Yes.

Noble: -- that President Zelensky was going to do, correct?

Volker: Yes. **I was not involved in that.** I heard about that from Gordon Sondland that he had been in touch with Ukraine, and there was talk about Zelensky giving an interview in which he would talk about his commitment to investigating things that happened in the past. I don't know the details of those conversations, and I don't know believe any such interview happened.

Noble: And was the plan for that interview for President Zelensky to specifically mention Burisma and the 2016 elections?

Volker: **I don't know.**"

- *Deposition testimony, p. 285*

explained that our European Union Embassy colleague did not know if this was decided or if Ambassador Sondland was advocating for it.

Also on **September 13**, following a meeting with President Zelenskyy in his private office in which I took notes, Ambassador Taylor and I ran into Mr. Yermak on the way out. When Ambassador Taylor again stressed the importance of staying out of U.S. politics and said he hoped no interview was planned, Mr. Yermak shrugged in resignation and did not answer, as if to indicate they had no choice. In short, **everyone thought there was going to be an interview, and that the Ukrainians believed they had to do it.**"

- *Holmes, Opening statement, p. 8*

"Ambassador Taylor did tell me **on September 8** 'now they're insisting Zelenskyy commit to the investigation in an interview with CNN.' ... [T]his was a demand that President Zelenskyy personally commit to a specific investigation of President Trump's political rival on a cable news channel."

- *Holmes, Opening statement, p.8*

Taylor

"The following day, **on September 8**, Ambassador Sondland and I spoke on the phone. He confirmed that he had talked to President Trump as I had suggested a week earlier, but that President Trump was adamant that President Zelenskyy, himself, had to 'clear things up and do it in public.' ...

Ambassador Sondland also said that he had talked to President Zelenskyy and

Mr. Yermak and had told them that, although this was not a quid pro quo, if President Zelenskyy did not “clear things up” in public, we would be at a “stalemate.” I understood a “stalemate” to mean that Ukraine would not receive the much-needed military assistance. Ambassador Sondland said that **this conversation concluded with President Zelenskyy agreeing to make a public statement in an interview on CNN.**”

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, p. 16 (Volker was on the Sept. 8 call. See Taylor, Deposition transcript, at 207)*

“Finally, **on September 11**, I learned that the hold had been lifted and that the security assistance would be provided. I was not told the reason why the hold had been lifted. The next day, I personally conveyed the news to President Zelenskyy and the Ukrainian Foreign Minister. And I again reminded Mr. Yermak of the high strategic value of bipartisan support for Ukraine and the importance of not getting involved in other countries’ elections. **My fear at the time** was that since Ambassador Sondland had told me **President Zelenskyy already agreed to do a CNN interview, President Zelenskyy would make a statement regarding ‘investigations’** that would have played into domestic U.S. politics. I sought to confirm through Mr. Danyliuk that President Zelenskyy was not planning to give such an interview to the media. While Mr. Danyliuk initially confirmed that on September 12, I noticed during a meeting **on the morning of September 13** at President Zelenskyy’s office that Mr. Yermak looked **uncomfortable in response to the question.** Again, I

asked Mr. Danyliuk to confirm that there would be no CNN interview, which he did.”

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, p. 17*

“Goldman: ...it was your clear understanding, was it not, that **in early September**, when the pressure campaign was still secret, that the Ukrainians believed that they needed to announce these public investigations, is that right?

Taylor: Mr. Goldman, I know that the Ukrainians were very concerned about the security assistance, and I know that they were prepared or preparing to do -- to make **a public statement that is with a CNN interview, that that was being planned**. Those are the two pieces that I know.

Goldman: And that CNN interview was to announce these investigations as you understood it, right?

Taylor: That was the implication. That was certainly the implication.”

- *Taylor, Public hearing*

“Chairman Schiff: And in fact, even after the aid was ultimately released, even after the White House learns of the whistleblower complaint and the congressional investigation, **the aid is released even after those events**, you were still worried that Zelensky was going to feel it necessary to go on CNN and announce these investigations, were you not?

Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I was still worried that he might do that. So yes, I - I thought that would be a bad idea and so when there was some indication that there might still be a plan for the CNN interview in New York, which was upcoming at the - at - **at the United**

**Nations General Assembly meeting**, I was worried - I - I wanted to be sure that that didn't happen so I addressed it with the - with the Zelensky staff.”

- *Taylor, Public hearing*

### Sondland

“Question: Getting back to Taylor's **concerns on the 9th**, which you know, he references in the interview. Do you know what interview he was referencing?

Sondland: I think this was the press statement had now morphed into some kind of an interview that President Zelensky would give to a TV station.

Question: Okay.

Sondland: And that that would replace the press statement.”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, p. 177*

“Question: Ambassador Sondland, I want to direct your to the end of August. [...]

Question: Around that time, I believe you testified that you and Ambassador Volker and the Ukrainians had dropped the idea of doing a statement announcing the investigations that Rudy Giuliani wanted, specifically Burisma and 2016. Is that right?

Sondland: Yeah, I believe the Ukrainians didn't want to go forward.

Question: But you were **still discussing the possibility of President Zelensky doing a public interview, possibly with a news outlet**, in which he would announce those investigations?

Sondland: I think **the Ukrainians mentioned to Volker** that they were

planning to do one and that they might incorporate some of those things in that interview.”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, pp. 205-206*

**6) Substance of meeting between Volker and Zelenskyy in Toronto on July 2/July 3**

**Volker**

Note: Volker gave a long, detailed description without mentioning he raised investigations with Zelenskyy at Toronto meeting:

“On July 2, I met with President Zelenskyy and his delegation in Toronto, Canada, as I was the senior U.S. Representative attending a conference about reform in Ukraine. At the end of that meeting, I had a private conversation with President Zelenskyy, in which I explained that I believed that Mayor Giuliani continues to have a negative view of Ukraine based on assertions of actions that happened in 2016, and that this viewpoint is likely making its way to the President. I made clear that Mayor Giuliani does not speak for the U.S. government, but is a private citizen and the President’s personal attorney.

I stressed that those of us on the Presidential Delegation at his Inauguration understood that President Zelenskyy and his team had nothing to do with anything that happened in 2016, and that the best thing would be to have a bilateral meeting with President Trump. I said that as soon as that meeting would take place, I was confident that President Trump would be as impressed with President Zelenskyy as I and the others on

**Kent, Taylor**

Taylor

“I sensed something odd when Ambassador Sondland told me on June 28 that he did not wish to include most of the regular interagency participants in a call planned with President Zelenskyy later that day. Ambassador Sondland, Ambassador Volker, Secretary Perry, and I were on this call, dialing in from different locations. However, Ambassador Sondland said that he wanted to make sure no one was transcribing or monitoring as they added President Zelenskyy to the call. Also, before President Zelenskyy joined the call, **Ambassador Volker separately told the U.S. participants that he, Ambassador Volker, planned to be explicit with President Zelenskyy in a one-on-one meeting in Toronto on July 2.** In that meeting, Ambassador Volker planned to **make clear what President Zelenskyy should do to get the White House meeting.** I did not understand what this meant, but Ambassador Volker said he would relay that President Trump wanted to see rule of law, transparency, but also, **specifically, cooperation on investigations to ‘get to the bottom of things.’”**



our delegation had been, and that our bilateral relationship would flourish.”

- *Written Opening Statement, p. 6 (see also Deposition testimony, pp. 137-38 & 262-64)*

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, p. 7*

“Question: Okay. And did you speak to Ambassador Volker after he went to Toronto in early July?

Taylor: Many times. But about that?

Q: Specifically about a conversation that he had with President Zelensky?

Taylor: Yes.

Question: And what did he tell you about that conversation?

...

Question: No, in what context did the issue or topic of investigations come up? Was it in connection with an interaction between President Zelensky and President Trump?

Taylor: Yes, it was specifically in preparation for the phone call and **Kurt suggested to President Zelensky that President Trump would like to hear about the investigations.**

- *Taylor, Deposition testimony, pp. 65-66*

#### Kent

“Kent: Kurt Volker told me that it was giving guidance to Zelenskyy on how he needed to characterize his willingness to be cooperative on issues of interest to the President.

Question: Such as?

Kent: I do not have the full details of what exactly that was, but I think it was sending signals about potential investigations.”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, pp. 205-06*

### **7) Whether individuals involved kept investigation of “Burisma” distinct**

**from investigation of “Bidens”**

**Volker**

(1) “Volker: And so, when we talked or heard Burisma, I literally meant Burisma and that, not the conflation of that with the Bidens. So I know that as we look in hindsight, we can see what he's saying and thinking, but I drew from the beginning a very clear distinction.”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 213*

(2) “Question: And so by calling for an investigation in Burisma, it was essentially calling for an investigation of Biden?”

Volker: No. In my mind, those are three separate things. There is Bidens; there is Burisma as a company, which has a long history; and there is 2016 elections.”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 193*

(3) “I followed up with Mr. Yermak, and he said that they would indeed be prepared to make a statement. He said it would reference Burisma and 2016, in a wider context of rooting out corruption anyway. **There was no mention of Vice President Biden. Rather, in referencing**

**Burisma**, it was clear he was **only talking about whether any Ukrainians** had acted inappropriately. [...] We had a further conversation with Mayor Giuliani, who said that in his view, the statement should include specific reference to ‘Burisma’ and ‘2016.’ Again, there was no mention of Vice President Biden in these conversations.”

- *Written Opening Statement, p. 8*

**Croft, Sondland, Taylor  
(see also witness statements for no. 1 on urging Ukraine to investigate Bidens)**

Taylor

“Chairman Schiff: I think you testified also that you had come to understand that **the term investigations** was a term that Ambassador Sondland as well as **Volker used to mean matters related to the 2016 elections and to the investigations of Burisma and Biden**, is that correct?”

Taylor: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.”

- *Taylor, Public Hearing*

Croft

“Question: And what was the other [investigation] that you understood? Croft: Into potential sort of Ukraine support for Bidens or some, you know, sort of idea, some conflict of interest or something like that, Biden and Burisma. Question: **So you understood that Biden and Burisma were the same investigation?** Croft: **Yes.**”

- *Croft, Deposition Transcript, p. 120*

Sondland

“Sondland: [...] It started with corruption. Then it was Burisma and 2016 election. And then at some point in the continuum, late in the game, I **connected Burisma with Biden.**

Question: Okay. So when did you connect -- when did you learn about Burisma and 2016?”

Sondland: I believe that was somewhere in the middle. In other words, well after the May 23rd meeting, but sometime probably in July-August, where it start they kept putting more conditions on this meeting, and that's when I began to learn it.”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, pp.79-80*

**8) Whether Giuliani was acting as an agent or at the direction of President Trump**

**9) Whether President directed Volker, Sondland, Perry to work with Giuliani**

**These two items are closely related.**

**Volker**

(1) “Volker: He is the President's personal attorney. I don't know whether he was representing the President or whether he was doing his own things to try to be helpful to the President.

Chairman Schiff: Well, he's the President's agent, is he not?

Volker: I did not make a judgment about that.”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 115-16.*

(2) “Question: Did you understand that Rudy Giuliani spoke for President Trump when he was dealing with the Ukrainians?

Volker: No.

Question: Did he -- but you said he was his personal lawyer. Is that correct?

Volker: Yes.

Question: Was he -- do you know whether he was conveying -- Rudy Giuliani conveying messages that President Trump wanted conveyed to the Ukrainians?

Volker: I did not have that impression. I believe that he was doing his own communication about what he believed

**Kent, Sondland, Taylor, Yovanovitch**

Sondland

“[M]y understanding was that **the President directed Mr. Giuliani’s participation, that Mr. Giuliani was expressing the concerns of the President.**”

- *Sondland, Opening written statement, p. 14*

“Chairman Schiff: ... Before the invitation was extended, **you understood from the President that unless Mr. Giuliani's interests or concerns were met** there was going to be no meeting. Isn't that correct?

Sondland: **I understood that** walking out of the door on the 23rd.”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, p. 141*

“Please know that I would not have recommended that Mr. Giuliani or any

and was interested in.”

- *Deposition testimony, pp. 46-47*

(3) “Volker: He just didn't believe it. He was skeptical. And he also said, that's not what I hear. I hear, you know, he's got some terrible people around him. And **he referenced that he hears from Mr. Giuliani** as part of that.

Question: Can you explain a little bit more about what the President said about Rudy Giuliani in that meeting?

Volker: He said that's not what I hear. I hear a whole bunch of other things. And I don't know how he phrased it with Rudy, but it was I think he said, **not as an instruction but just as a comment, talk to Rudy, you know. He knows all of these things**, and they've got some bad people around him. And that was the nature of it.

It was clear that he also had other sources. It wasn't only Rudy Giuliani. I don't know who those might be, but he or at least he said, I hear from people.”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 305*

private citizen be involved in these foreign policy matters. However, **given the President's explicit direction**, as well as the importance we attached to arranging a White House meeting between Presidents Trump and Zelensky, we agreed to do as President Trump directed.”

- *Sondland, Opening written statement, p. 14*

“In my October 17, 2019 prepared testimony and in my deposition, I made clear that I had understood sometime after our May 23, 2019, White House debriefing that scheduling a White House visit for President Zelensky was conditioned upon President Zelensky's agreement to make a public anti-corruption statement. **This condition had been communicated by Rudy Giuliani, with whom President Trump directed Ambassador Volker, Secretary Perry, and me, on May 23, 2019, to discuss issues related to the President's concerns about Ukraine.** Ambassador Volker, Secretary Perry, and I understood that **satisfying Mr. Giuliani was a condition** for scheduling the White House visit, which we all strongly believed to be in the mutual interest of the United States and Ukraine.”

- *Sondland, Supplemental Declaration, p. 1*

“Question: So I think you said in your opening statement that you understood that in order to arrange this meeting with the White House **you had to somehow satisfy Mr. Giuliani 's concerns. Was that your takeaway** [from the May 23 meeting with President Trump]?  
Sondland: **That was the takeaway, yeah.**”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, p. 75*

**“As I stated earlier, I understood from President Trump, at the May 23, 2019 White House debriefing, that he wanted the Inaugural Delegation to talk with Mr. Giuliani concerning our efforts to arrange a White House meeting for President Zelensky. Taking direction from the President, as I must, I spoke with Mr. Giuliani for that limited purpose. In these short conversations, Mr. Giuliani emphasized that the President wanted a public statement from President Zelensky committing Ukraine to look into anti-corruption issues. Mr. Giuliani specifically mentioned the 2016 election (including the DNC server) and Burisma as two anti-corruption investigatory topics of importance for the President.”**

- *Sondland, Opening written statement, p. 13*

“Question: At the May 23rd meeting, when the President said go talk to -- what did he say, go talk to Rudy or --  
Sondland: He didn't even say go talk. He just said: Talk to Rudy. It was sort of like I don't want to talk about this.

Question: So did you take that as -- I mean, it's been described variously as an order or an instruction. Was he giving an order or an instruction or was he just trying to --

Sondland: My impression was that if we never called Rudy and just left it alone that nothing would happen with Ukraine, in terms of all of the things we wanted to have happen. So I didn't take it as an order as much as an indication that if he was going to have his mind changed, that was the path. That's how I interpreted

talk to Rudy.”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, p. 90*

“Sondland: Listen, the State Department was fully aware of the issues, and there was **very little they could do about it if the President decided he wanted his lawyer involved.**

Question: And does that include Secretary Pompeo and his counselor, Ulrich Brechbuhl?

Sondland: My speculation is yes, that **they hit a brick wall when it came to getting rid of Mr. Giuliani.**”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, pp. 357-58*

#### Taylor

“Here's what I understood from Ambassador **Volker** and Ambassador Sondland. In order to get President Zelensky and President Trump in a meeting in the Oval Office, **they took from that May 23rd meeting that they needed to work with Rudy Giuliani, so and so they did.**”

- *Taylor deposition, p. 113*

“At the same time, however, I encountered an irregular, informal channel of U.S. policy-making with respect to Ukraine, unaccountable to Congress, a channel that included then-Special Envoy Kurt Volker, U.S. Ambassador to the European Union Gordon Sondland, Secretary of Energy Rick Perry, White House Chief of Staff Mick Mulvaney, and, as I subsequently learned, Mr. Giuliani.”

“By mid-July it was becoming clear to me that the meeting President Zelenskyy

wanted was conditioned on the investigations of Burisma and alleged Ukrainian interference in the 2016 U.S. elections. It was also clear that **this condition was driven by the irregular policy channel I had come to understand was guided by Mr. Giuliani.**”

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, pp. 2 & 8*

Yovanovitch

“Swalwell: Are you familiar with Rudy Giuliani's quote in The New York Times describing himself as a lawyer saying, quote, ‘He basically knows what I'm doing,’ comma, ‘sure, as his lawyer,’ were you familiar with that quote?”

Yovanovitch: It sounds familiar.

Swalwell: And you have a lawyer with you today, Ms. Yovanovitch. And you understand that lawyers act on their clients' behalf. Is that right?

Yovanovitch: Yes.

Swalwell: That it would be improper for a lawyer to go outside any directive that a client gives, is that right?

Yovanovitch: That's my understanding.

Swalwell: Are you familiar with a New York Times story on May 9, 2019, where Rudy Giuliani says that he intends to visit Ukraine and says, ‘We're not meddling in an election; we're meddling in an investigation.’ Are you familiar with that quote?”

Yovanovitch: Yes.

Swalwell: That's 11 days before you were removed as ambassador, is that right?

Yovanovitch: Yes.

Swalwell: He is talking publicly about designs on coming to Ukraine. But what I think is interesting is that Mr. Giuliani says 'We're,' as in we are. He doesn't say 'I am not meddling in an election.' He doesn't say 'I'm not meddling in an investigation.' He says, 'We.' He's speaking for himself and his client. And I want to talk about that quote, 'We're not meddling in an election. We're meddling in an investigation.' Is it proper for you or anyone who acts on behalf of the United States government to meddle in an investigation?

Yovanovitch: No, I don't believe so.”

- *Yovanovitch, Public hearing*

Kent

"Question: So the Ukrainians certainly understood that Mr. Giuliani was not a regular private citizen. Is that right?

Kent: Correct.

Question: And would you assess that they understood that he represented President Trump?

Kent: They understood that Mr. Giuliani asserted he represented Mr. Trump in his private capacity. Yes.”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, p. 187*



Additional material  
President Trump to President Zelenskyy

“Mr. Giuliani is a highly respected man. He was the mayor of New York City, a great mayor, and I would like him to call you. I will ask him to call you along with the Attorney General.”

“I will have Mr. Giuliani give you a call and I am also going to have Attorney General Barr call and we will get to the bottom of it. I'm sure you will figure it out.”

“I will tell Rudy and Attorney General Barr to call.”

- [Memorandum of Telephone Conversation of July 25, 2019](#)

-  
Giuliani

(sample of statements to media)

“When asked whether Trump has given Giuliani’s efforts his blessing, Giuliani said, ‘I don’t do anything that involves my client without speaking with my client.’”

[Washington Post](#), Sept. 22, 2019

“[Giuliani] said his efforts in Ukraine have the full support of Mr. Trump. He declined to say specifically whether he had briefed him on the planned meeting with Mr. Zelensky, but added, ‘He basically knows what I’m doing, sure, as his lawyer.’”

[New York Times](#), May 9, 2019

“Giuliani said he has kept the president informed of his efforts in Ukraine for months. But he declined to say specifically what he has told the

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>president.”</p> <p><a href="#">Washington Post</a>, Sept. 20, 2019</p> <p>“‘We’re not meddling in an election, we’re meddling in an investigation, which we have a right to do,’ Mr. Giuliani said ... ‘I’m asking them to do an investigation that they’re doing already and that other people are telling them to stop. And I’m going to give them reasons why they shouldn’t stop it because that information will be very, very helpful to my client, and may turn out to be helpful to my government.’”</p> <p><a href="#">New York Times</a>, May 9, 2019</p> |
|--|--|

**10) Whether it was appropriate to involve Giuliani**

Note: Ambassador Volker may have kept from some of his colleagues (such as Hill, Kent) that the President directed him to work with Giuliani.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Volker</b></p> <p>“Question from Minority: So any assertion or claim that it was improper to be bringing Rudy Giuliani into that process, you would rebut that, right?”</p> <p>Volker: I would disagree with that. I believe it’s part of my job to try to advance the relationship between the U.S. and Ukraine, to advance U.S. interests with Ukraine, foreign policy, national security interests, to strengthen Ukraine as a democracy.</p> <p>And I -- as the special representative, there’s a lot of public role with that, and so you meet with a lot of people, you communicate with a lot of people, you try to bridge-build, and problem-solve. And I didn’t view -- let me put it this way: <b>I didn’t think it improper to contact Mr. Giuliani much as I would, you</b></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Croft, Hill, Holmes, Kent, Morrison, Taylor, Sondland, Vindman</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Kent</u></p> <p>“Sewell: Was it normal to have a person who is a private citizen take an active role in foreign diplomacy?<br/> <b>Kent: I did not find his particular engagement normal, no.</b>”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- <i>Kent, Public hearing</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Taylor</u></p> <p>“Sewell: And was that normal? Is that normal? To have a private citizen of the United States take an active role in diplomacy?<br/> <b>Taylor: It is not normal.</b> It is not unusual to ask for people outside the government to give opinions to help form</p> |
|---|--|

**know, not think it improper to contact anybody.** You know, I've had meetings with businessmen who have invested in Ukraine. I've had meetings with clergy. I've had meetings with American citizens who have had problems in Ukraine and that wanted to tell me about them, you know, all kinds of things.

Question from Minority: And that essentially was part of your job --

Volker: Exactly.”

- *Deposition testimony, pp. 163-64*

the policies of the US government. It is **unusual to have a person input into the channel that goes contrary to US policy.”**

- *Taylor, Public hearing*

Castor: And [Ambassador Volker] is somebody that's always, to the best of your knowledge, acted in the best interests of the United States?

Taylor: He -- **when he got involved with Mr. Giuliani, I think that that pulled him away from or it diverted him** from being focused on what I thought needed to be focused on, that is -  
- yeah. So, **in general, yes, but the Giuliani factor I think affected Ambassador Volker.”**

- *Taylor, Deposition testimony, p. 110*

Croft

“Question: Okay. I mean, [Volker] **wasn't enthusiastic about Rudy Giuliani's involvement, was he?**  
Croft: **Not that I understood no.”**

- *Croft, Deposition testimony, p. 79*

Sondland

“Indeed, Secretary Perry, Ambassador **Volker**, and I were disappointed by our May 23, 2019 White House debriefing. ... **We were also disappointed by the President's direction that we involve Mr. Giuliani. Our view was that the men and women of the State Department, not the President's personal lawyer, should take responsibility for all aspects of U.S. foreign policy towards Ukraine.”**

- *Sondland, Opening written*

*statement, p. 8*

**“Please know that I would not have recommended that Mr. Giuliani or any private citizen be involved in these foreign policy matters.”**

- *Sondland, Opening written statement, p. 14*

“Question: Was Ambassador **Volker** enthusiastic about communicating with Mr. Giuliani?”

Sondland: I don't think so.

Question: Okay. **So Mr. Giuliani's involvement here was a negative. Is that fair to say?**

**Sondland: Well, I think I've said in my statement that we would have all preferred to have the State Department handle this whole matter and not involve people outside of the State Department, because you don't know what they're doing.**

Question: But did you ever commiserate with Ambassador Volker, we've got to talk to Rudy?

Sondland: I may have.

Question: And do you know if he related something similar to, we have to talk to Rudy?

**Sondland: I think that was the I think that was the general impression of anyone who had to deal with Mayor Giuliani on this matter because it's not consistent with the way business is normally done.**

Question: Okay. **So nobody was**

**enthusiastic about partnering with Rudy Giuliani on this issue?**

Sondland: **Not that I can recall.**”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, pp. 95-96*

“Question: Did you ever discuss Rudy Giuliani with Secretary Pompeo?

Sondland: Only in general terms.

Question: And what did you discuss?

Sondland: That he's involved in affairs.

**And Pompeo rolled his eyes and said: Yes, it's something we have to deal with.”**

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, pp. 356-57*

“Question: What about Rudy Giuliani, did you discuss Giuliani with Brechbuhl?

Sondland: I may have. Again, **people usually smiled when they heard Rudy's name because he was always swirling around somewhere.**

Question: Yeah, but, I mean, he was causing serious issues in the U.S. relationship with Ukraine. Did you raise those concerns with --

Sondland: Listen, the State Department was fully aware of the issues, and there was very little they could do about it if the President decided he wanted his lawyer involved.

Question: And does that include Secretary Pompeo and his counselor, Ulrich Brechbuhl?

Sondland: My speculation is yes, that **they hit a brick wall when it came to getting rid of Mr. Giuliani.”**

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony,*

Hill

**“Hill: We did say to [Volker] that we did not think it was a good idea for him talking to Rudy Giuliani.**

Question: And how did he respond to that?

Hill: He said that he thought that he would be able to, I don't think he used exactly these words, but be able to reason with him and to, you know, kind of , basically, you know, manage this. Well, we did not think that this was manageable.

**And Ambassador Bolton made it very clear that nobody should be talking to Rudy Giuliani, on our team or anybody else should be.**

[...]

Hill: Ambassador Bolton made it very clear that, you know, again, he didn't think anybody should be dealing with Giuliani.

Question: And who did he make that clear to?

Hill: He expressed it in one of the meetings with Ambassador Volker. But, at that point, I don't think he was fully aware of the extensive meetings that Ambassador Volker was having. This may have been early on, when Ambassador Volker had just started to meet with Giuliani.

[...]

**Hill: I'd personally said to Ambassador Volker and others that**

**he shouldn't be talking to Mr. Giuliani.**

Question: And did you say that to Mr. Volker before that July 10th meeting?

Hill: Absolutely.

...

Hill: ... I expressed to [Volker] that I was concerned that there were business dealings, nefarious business dealings, underway. And I had mentioned to Kurt Volker the names of these individuals that had been relayed to me.”

- *Hill, Deposition testimony, p. 113-129*

#### Vindman

“So that Ambassador Sondland was trying to orchestrate an investigation being called by Mayor Giuliani who was a live hand grenade.”

- *Vindman, Deposition testimony, p. 68*

#### Holmes

“I became aware that Mr. Giuliani, a private lawyer, was taking a **direct role in Ukrainian diplomacy**. ... In fact, at one point during a preliminary meeting of the inauguration Delegation, someone wondered aloud about why Mr. Giuliani was so active in the media with respect to Ukraine. My recollection is that **Ambassador Sondland stated, ‘Dammit Rudy. Every time Rudy gets involved he goes and f--s everything up.’**”

- *Holmes, Opening statement, pp. 3-4*

#### Morrison

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>“Question: It was not in the official U.S. policy toward Ukraine to have -- to involve Rudy Giuliani?<br/>Morrison: Not one that I was involved in.”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- <i>Morrison, Deposition testimony, p. 116</i></p> <p>“Question: Well, what did [Taylor] describe to you was going on with the text messages with Sondland, Volker, and Giuliani?<br/>Morrison: I remember being focused on the fact that there were text messages, the fact that Rudy was having all of these phone calls over unclassified media. And I found that to be highly problematic and indicative of someone who didn't really understand how national security processes are run.”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- <i>Morrison, Deposition testimony, p. 119</i></p> |
|--|---|

**11) Whether there was an irregular channel -- keeping Taylor and others out of the irregular channel**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Volker</b></p>   | <p><b>Hill, Kent, Taylor</b></p>  |
| <p>“During this time, I informed Secretary of State Pompeo, Counselor Brechbuhl, National Security Advisor Bolton, NSC staff, and Chargé Amb. Bill Taylor on various occasions that I was engaged in these conversations, and was seeking to steer them in a way to reinforce an accurate picture of the Ukrainian leadership’s commitment to reform and fighting corruption.”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- <i>Opening written statement, p. 8</i></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Kent</u> and <u>Taylor</u></p> <p>“Quigley: Mr Kent, as the day-to-day state department point person in Washington on Ukraine policy, <b>were you aware</b> of this effort to persuade President Zelensky to issue a statement in order to get a White House meeting while they were happening?<br/><br/>Kent: When this exchange happened on August 10, <b>I was not.</b><br/><br/>Quigley: When did you learn about them?</p> |



Kent: As Ambassador Taylor referenced earlier, in his testimony in oral answering, he heard on August 16. He then called me and we had a conversation, and at that point, I memorialized my concerns in a note to the file.

Quigley: Ambassador Taylor, as the point person on the ground in Ukraine, **were you aware** of this effort to get Ukraine to issue this written statement in early August?

Taylor: Not the written statement, **no sir**.

Quigley: The **entire discussion** about a public statement about the two investigation President Trump wanted was done in what you have described as an **irregular channel involving Ambassadors Sondland and Volker**. And they tasked to take on Ukraine Policy by the President. Isn't that correct, Mr. Kent?

Kent: That would be my understanding  
Quigley: Ambassador?

Taylor: The same."

- *Kent and Taylor, Public hearing*

Kent

"Kent: And then this particular moment was the time where not just what I read on tweets by private citizens, but a greater understanding of actions taken by U.S. officials, **in this case, Ambassador Volker**, that my concerns grew.

...  
And what we're talking about now are issues and approaches that were not discussed in the interagency process as

staffed by the NSC and the person of either Lieutenant Colonel Vindman or his boss, which was Fiona Hill and then now has become Tim Morrison.”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, pp. 266-67*

“Question: Were you aware of efforts to convince the Ukrainian Government to issue a statement a couple days before the August 1.5 time period?”

Kent: I was not aware of the effort to negotiate the text of the statement that came out as a result of Ambassador **Volker's** testimony here, and the tweets that he released, not until I had read those.

Question: **So you were completely unaware of those discussions related to a possible statement about investigations?**

Kent: **Correct.**”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, p. 265 (see also Kent, Deposition transcript, pp. 251-52)*

Taylor

“[D]uring our July 19 call, Dr. Hill informed me that Ambassador Volker had met with Mr. Giuliani to discuss Ukraine. **This caught me by surprise. The next day I asked Ambassador Volker about that meeting, but received no response.** I began to sense that the two decision making channels—the regular and irregular—were separate and at odds.”

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing*

“Question: Okay. How did you react when you learned, I guess from seeing Ambassador **Volker's** text messages, that this had been going on **behind the scenes, given that you're the Charge d'Affaires** in Ukraine, and yet you have no idea that Volker and Sondland are working with Giuliani and Yermak to get out a statement from the President of Ukraine and you had no idea that that's going on? Did that concern you?  
Taylor: It did. When I found out about it again, this was the irregular channel, I was in the regular channel. Every now and then I would see what was going on in the irregular channel, but not in this case.”

- Taylor, Deposition testimony, p. 203

Hill

“Castor: And all these people, as you've testified, have acted with you know, are individuals of high integrity.  
Hill: But they were not coordinating across the government. I can be pretty confident, based on where I left things on July 19th, that **nobody beyond Ambassador Volker and Ambassador Sondland knew what they were doing, beyond Chief of Staff Mulvaney.**”

- Hill, Deposition testimony, p. 123

**12) Whether the suspension of security assistance was within the range of normal**

**Volker**

(1) “Volker: In my view, this hold on

**Croft, Kent, Sondland, Taylor, Williams**

Taylor

security assistance was not significant.”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 80*

(2) “Meadows: ... Foreign aid is routinely held up while they’re waiting for authorizing committees to be notified for weeks, months. Does that happen on a regular basis?

Volker: All the time.

Meadows: All the time. So, to suggest that there is some nefarious purpose just because one foreign aid allotment gets held up, you would have nefarious purposes every single year through every appropriation process. Is that correct?

Volker: That is correct.”

- *Deposition testimony, p. 337*

“In a regular NSC secure video-conference call on July 18, I heard a staff person from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) say that **there was a hold on security assistance to Ukraine** but could not say why. Toward the end of an otherwise normal meeting, a voice on the call—the person was off-screen—said that she was from OMB and that her boss had instructed her not to approve any additional spending on security assistance for Ukraine until further notice. **I and others sat in astonishment**—the Ukrainians were fighting the Russians and counted on not only the training and weapons, but also the assurance of U.S. support. All that the OMB staff person said was that the directive had come from the President to the Chief of Staff to OMB. **In an instant, I realized that one of the key pillars of our strong support for Ukraine was threatened. The irregular policy channel was running contrary to the goals of longstanding U.S. policy.**

There followed a series of NSC-led interagency meetings, starting at the staff level and quickly reaching the level of Cabinet secretaries. **At every meeting, the unanimous conclusion was that the security assistance should be resumed, the hold lifted.** At one point, the Defense Department was asked to perform an analysis of the effectiveness of the assistance. **Within a day,** the Defense Department came back with the determination that the assistance was effective and should be resumed. My understanding was that the Secretaries of Defense and State, the CIA Director, and the National Security Advisor sought a joint meeting with the President to convince him to release the hold, but such

a meeting was hard to schedule and the hold lasted well into September.”

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, p. 8*

“By mid-August, because the **security assistance had been held for over a month for no reason that I could discern**, I was beginning to fear that the longstanding U.S. policy of strong support for Ukraine was shifting. I called State Department Counselor Ulrich Brechbuhl to discuss this on August 21. He said that he was not aware of a change of U.S. policy but would check on the status of the security assistance. **My concerns deepened** the next day, on August 22, during a phone conversation with Mr. Morrison. I asked him if there had been a change in policy of strong support for Ukraine, to which he responded, “it remains to be seen.” He also told me during this call that the **“President doesn’t want to provide any assistance at all.” That was extremely troubling to me.** As I had told Secretary Pompeo in May, if the policy of strong support for Ukraine were to change, **I would have to resign.** Based on my call with Mr. Morrison, **I was preparing to do so.”**

- *Taylor, Opening written statement, Public hearing, pp. 10-11*

Croft

“Croft: I think, typically, its role is usually limited to the budget side of things. So it was **rather unusual to have OMB expressing concerns that were purely policy-based and not budget-oriented.**”

- *Croft, Deposition testimony, p. 28.*

“Croft: . . . And OMB began sending working level officials to attend meetings, even at the sub PCC level, which was **very unusual** at the time. And they weren’t just attending Ukraine-related meetings, they were coming to all of our meetings, which, as an aside, is quite taxing on a very small organization.”

- *Croft Deposition testimony, p. 28*

“Question: But I was struck by something you said during the Trump administration, and that was that it was very unusual for OMB to weigh in on a policy decision like the provision of Javelins to Ukraine. Why was that so unusual?”

**Croft: I had never heard of OMB injecting itself into a purely policy discussion or decisionmaking process.** What struck me about it especially is, first, that **that position was in contrast to all of the traditional foreign policy-making agencies long held and long expressed views.** And, secondly, that the objection or concerns expressed were not related to the money, the budget part of OMB, but rather to the policy part of the decision.”

- *Croft, Deposition testimony, p. 93*

Kent

“Question: Mulvaney had put a hold at the direction of the President. Is that what you heard?”

Kent: That is what the representative of the Office of and Budget stated in the sub-PCC on July 18th,

Question: Was there any discussion following that announcement?

Kent: There was **great confusion** among the rest of us because we didn't understand why that had happened.”

- *Kent, Deposition transcript, p. 304*

#### Sondland

“Sondland: There was never any clear -- any clear articulation by anyone of, is there even a hold, is it a review, is it an audit, is it the Europeans? I could never get a straight answer out of anyone.”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, p. 121*

“Malinowski: Second issue: You told us that you were trying to figure out why the aid was cut off when you learned that that was, in fact, true, and that nobody involved in the Ukraine file seemed to know why the aid was cut off.

Sondland: They all seemed to have different reasons. No one could give me a clear answer saying, this is our current policy.

Malinowski: Isn't that a bit odd that nobody involved in making and implementing policy towards this important country knew why aid had been cut off to that country?

Sondland: It's **extremely odd.**”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, p. 338*

#### Williams

“Question: So this kind of **came out of the blue?**

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Williams: It did.”</p> <p>“Question: Why did you think Ambassador Taylor's memo was both significant and persuasive?</p> <p>Williams: I thought he laid out a very strong case for the effectiveness of U.S. security assistance to Ukraine, as we've discussed before, not just because of the actual physical and substantial support that it provides, but also the symbolic value of it; and that at this particular critical moment in Ukrainian politics and security environment, that any signal of wavering U.S. support would send the wrong message to President Zelensky just as he was trying to implement his reform agenda.</p> <p>Question: And you said you recall Ambassador Taylor writing that he thought the freeze was -- <b>the hold was folly</b>. Did you agree with that assessment as well?</p> <p>Williams: <b>Yes.</b>”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- <i>Williams, Deposition testimony, pp. 55 &amp; 126</i></p> |
|--|--|

**13) Whether was appropriate to ask Ukraine to investigate 2016 election interference**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Volker</b></p>  | <p><b>Anderson, Hill, Morrison, Sondland, Vindman</b></p> <p><u>Sondland</u></p>                               |
| <p>(1) “Get to the bottom of what happened in 2016’ is a reference to the Prosecutor General's claims that there was interference. That to be investigated I always thought was fine, because that is just a matter of, you know, we don't want</p> | <p>“Schiff: And would you ever have countenance, the withholding of aid, to secure Ukraine's commitment to</p> |



anybody interfering in our elections and did it happen.”

- *Deposition testimony, p.146*

(2) “Question: And, in fact, wouldn't you agree that if President Zelensky actually undertook those two investigations at the behest of President Trump, that that would actually undermine his message of anticorruption?”

Volker: I don't agree with that.

Question: Why not?

Volker: If things happened in the past that were corrupt or illegal, then President Zelensky is quite appropriately investigating them. If nothing happened in the past, then you don't turn up anything and there's no problem.”

- *Deposition transcript, p. 207*

investigate the DNC?

Sondland: I believe I testified, or my statement indicates, I would not have withheld aid for any reason.

Schiff: And you, in particular, wouldn't withhold aid to secure help in a U.S. election, correct?

Sondland: For any reason.

Schiff: Well, I'm asking about this particular reason. Would you ever countenance withholding aid from Ukraine to secure an investigation of the DNC that might be in the President's interest in the 2016 election in the 2020 election?

Sondland: I would not.”

- *Sondland, Deposition testimony, pp. 139-140*

#### Anderson

“Anderson: I had a communication from Alex Vindman, which I relayed to Ambassador Volker, I believe it was July 10th, which was basically saying we need to make sure we separate any collusion investigation stuff from our policy.”

- *Anderson, Deposition testimony, pp. 68-69*

#### Vindman

“Following [the July 10th] meeting [with Oleksandr Danylyuk], there was a scheduled debriefing during which Amb. Sondland emphasized the importance that **Ukraine deliver the investigations into the 2016 election, the Bidens, and Burisma. I stated to Amb. Sondland that his statements were inappropriate**, that the request to investigate Biden and his son had nothing to do with national security, and that such investigations

were not something the NSC was going to get involved in or push. Dr. **Hill then entered the room and asserted to Amb. Sondland that his statements were inappropriate.**”

- *Vindman, Opening statement, p. 5*

“The fact that it was clear that I, as the representative -- I, as the representative of the NSC, thought it was inappropriate and that we were not going to get involved in investigations. .. In my mind, I had spent quite a bit of time in that part of the world. I understand how the justice system works. It's not a rule of law that governs. These could all be orchestrated to achieve some sort of objective. And, in my mind, I thought it was, you know -- if they thought that this was in their national security interests and they could potentially get away with it -- you know, I'm not talking about the Ukrainians; I'm talking about foreign powers in general -- and if they thought that it was in their national security interests -- and this is a country that's fighting a war against Russia -- and they could get away with it, I mean, why should they really care that much about domestic politics at a different country? They're going to do what they need to protect and advance their own national security interests. And, you know, this would not be -- if they chose to do it, they could potentially tip the scales, and this would not be a fair investigation, and it would provide, you know, compromising on maybe even fabricated information, if need be.”

- *Vindman, Deposition testimony, pp. 32-33*

Morrison

“Morrison: If I recall correctly -- so we're talking 2 days later, September 7th. So

this is after, I believe -- so this was, I think, the conversation where -- I don't know if this was the first conversation on the second conversation I had after 1 September with Gordon, but this was a conversation where Gordon related that both -- the President said there was not a quid pro quo, but he further stated that President Zelensky should want to go to the microphone and announce personally -- so it wouldn't be enough for the prosecutor general, he wanted to announce personally, Zelensky personally, that he would open the investigations.

Question: Okay. Was this Ambassador Sondland talking?

Morrison: I was relating to Ambassador Taylor my conversation with Ambassador Sondland.

Question: And do you think -- was Ambassador Sondland -- had he related to you that the President had said this?

Morrison: Yes.

Question: Okay. And **you had a sinking feeling about this. Could you explain why?**

Morrison: Well, it's September 7th. September 30th is coming. I was growing pessimistic that we would be able to see the tumblers align to get the right people in the room with the Presidents to get the aid released. **I also did not think it was a good idea for the Ukrainian President to -- at this point I had a better understanding -- involve himself in our politics."**

- *Morrison, Deposition testimony, pp. 144-45*

"Question: Do you recall a conversation with Ambassador Taylor where you conveyed that Ambassador Bolton wanted to stay out of politics?

Morrison: I don't recall a specific conversation, but that strikes me as

something I would have said, because I also explained to him I wanted to stay out of politics.

Question: And what did you mean by staying out of politics?

Morrison: We wanted to stay away from the Gordon channel.

Question: Did you also want to stay away from the Burisma bucket of issues, as you've referred to them?

Morrison: Yes.

Question: Okay. And I believe you testified earlier that you perceived -- on you believe that if President Zelensky were to make a public announcement about investigating the Burisma bucket of issues, that that would have entangled him in U.S. domestic politics. Is that right?

Morrison: I became concerned about that. [...]

Question: Okay. And it's fair to say also that the Burisma bucket of issues were referenced in the President's July 25th call with President Zelensky?

Morrison: It's more -- I mean, it references content from that call. It's more -- the way I think about the Burisma bucket of issues is it's Burisma, the Ukrainian firm, it's Hunter Biden, it's the election server and CrowdStrike and those issues."

- *Morrison, Deposition testimony, pp. 175-76*

"Question: Did the President's discussion of CrowdStrike, the server, and the Bidens, was that consistent with what you understood to be U.S. official policy towards Ukraine?

Morrison: No."

- *Morrison, Deposition testimony, p. 47*