

# The Dossier

*“I’m for truth, no matter who tells it. I’m for justice no matter who it’s for or against.”*

*Malcolm X*

## FOREWORD

Was Jared Kushner, or were others associated with the Trump Administration, promised and/or paid brokerage fees for the sale of the Russian state oil company Rosneft?

Did Michael Cohen use the payoff of a porn star less than two weeks before the 2016 election to cover up a secret payoff to foreign hackers interfering in said election?

Was Hillary Clinton under secret surveillance while in Moscow? Has the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation (FSB) compiled a mountainous casefile of evidence containing many years' worth of covert monitoring of Clinton's activities, including compromising tapes of her phone conversations?

Did the Kremlin have agents within the United States, including within the Democratic and Republican parties, who conducted espionage on its top leaders?

These are among the many intriguing questions raised by the Christopher Steele memo, famously known as the dossier. The mere passage of time has brought the answers to some of these questions. Investigative reporting by numerous outlets have shed light on other, more obscure portions of the memo. The full picture can only be revealed by placing the verified pieces together to form a tapestry of truth.

A jig-saw puzzle does not look like much when you first dump the pieces out of the box and onto the working surface. The assumption is made that the pieces will eventually fit together to reveal a duplicate of the picture that is on the box cover. This is a good faith belief based on prior experience with jig-saw puzzles in general and, more narrowly, with the source of the puzzle itself.

In the case of the dossier, the source of the puzzle is Christopher Steele. Mr. Steele is a retired British intelligence officer and Secret Intelligence Service (MI6) operative with three years of his more than twenty years of service acting as a spy under diplomatic cover in Russia. To conclude an impressive career with British intelligence, Steele headed the Russia desk for the last few years of his tenure with MI6. These facts alone make him a very credible source for many matters concerning Russia and covert operations regarding the same.

Aside from this, Mr. Steele also has years' worth of investigative cooperation with the U.S. intelligence community, including, in particular, substantial working relationships with leadership and high-level special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. When Mr. Steele became concerned about what he was discovering during his investigation for Fusion GPS, he shared some of this information with one or more of his contacts in the U.S. intelligence community, with the permission of his employer. A detailed article on the dissemination of the dossier into the hands of U.S. intelligence officials was published by *The New Yorker* on March 12<sup>th</sup> 2018.

Public knowledge of corroboration of the essential points of the dossier continues to grow with the majority of its content verified through multiple external sources. While trivial details such as the location of some events and clandestine meetings, the title of a dignitary, and the occasional spelling error have been demonstrated to be skewed, no significant point has been discredited.

Although much has been made of the publicly exposed portions of the dossier, the thirty-five typed pages thus far submitted for public scrutiny represent a fraction of the complete intelligence report prepared by Mr. Steele. It is

estimated that as much as two hundred (200) pages of the full dossier have been withheld.

In essence, the jig-saw puzzle that is the publicly known portion of the dossier is incomplete. Even when all pieces of the part of the dossier that is now public have been verified, it becomes a mere quadrant of the overall tapestry that Steele has undoubtedly uncovered. Entire sections are glaringly missing, while the few sections thus far exposed have many names and even entire paragraphs redacted. Isn't it time that the entire investigative report be released to the American people?

A note about the presentation of the dossier in this booklet: The work is presented with all typographical (misspellings, grammar and punctuation) errors intact. The reader will also notice that there are many spellings that are peculiar to British English, such as 'behaviour'. These were left intact in a further effort to present the material as authentically as possible.

Since the original report appears to have been typed, the typeface utilized throughout this book for the presentation of the original words of the dossier is *Courier New*. Comments, supporting evidence and notes are presented in the typeface *Agency FB* to provide contrast so that the reader may know what is part of the original material and what is not. This foreword and the supplemental material at the end are presented in *Times New Roman*.

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/080

### US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE DONALD TRUMP'S ACTIVITIES IN RUSSIA AND COMPROMISING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE KREMLIN

#### Summary

- Russian regime has been cultivating, supporting and assisting TRUMP for at least 5 years. Aim endorsed by PUTIN, has been to encourage splits and divisions in western alliance.  
July 2011, five years prior to the dossier, Trump attends the ribbon cutting ceremony at Trump Ocean Club in Panama. Since its opening, significant Russian buyers have been invested in the property. - numerous sources, including Richard Engel, NBC News Chief Foreign Correspondent.  
The Trump Organization is finally ousted from the Trump Ocean Club and his name removed from the building on March 5<sup>th</sup> 2018 - CBS News reports.
- So far TRUMP has declined various sweetener real estate business deals offered him in Russia in order to further the Kremlin's cultivation of him. However he and his inner circle have accepted a regular flow of intelligence from the Kremlin, including on his Democratic and other political rivals  
Willingness to accept Russian help is well documented both financially through investments in his properties and at least one meeting with Trump campaign officials has been admitted to by the campaign. - numerous sources including *The Guardian*, *The New York Times*, and *The Washington Post*.  
Trump also repeatedly sought to meet with Putin and have him attend the 2013 Miss Universe Pageant in Moscow. - numerous sources, including NBC News.
- Former top Russian intelligence officer claims FSB has compromised Trump through his activities in Moscow sufficiently to be able to blackmail him. According to several knowledgeable sources, his conduct

in Moscow has included perverted sexual acts which have been arranged/monitored by the FSB.

On November 9<sup>th</sup> 2017, *The Washington Post* and NBC News reported that Keith Schiller, Trump's longtime director of security, testified to the House Intelligence Committee that an offer was made for five women to be sent to Trump's hotel room during his visit to Moscow in 2013. Though clearly salacious, it is possible that the truly damning and compromising material involves corrupt financial dealings, considering the indictments of key Trump campaign officials.

- A dossier of compromising material on Hillary CLINTON has been collated by the Russian Intelligence Services over many years and mainly comprises bugged conversations she had on various visits to Russia and intercepted phone calls rather than any embarrassing conduct. The dossier is controlled by Kremlin spokesman, PESKOV, directly on PUTIN's orders, However it has not yet been distributed abroad, including to TRUMP. Russian intentions for its deployment still unclear

On October 30<sup>th</sup> 2017 *Newsweek* linked the 'compromising dirt' to a Russian lure used to entice George Papadopoulos into scheduling meetings with the Trump campaign. This may have led to the infamous meeting in Trump Tower. On December 30<sup>th</sup> 2017, *The New York Times* reported that Papadopoulos was the initial trigger for the investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 election. According to the reporting, Papadopoulos, during an evening of heavy drinking, had confided to an Australian diplomat, Alexander Downer, information regarding hacked emails of the DNC. Two months later, once the stolen emails began appearing online, Australian officials passed Downer's information on to U.S. officials. This led the FBI to open an investigation into Russian interference and was months before some of the actions alleged in the dossier were purported to have happened or could have been written about by Mr. Steele. Allegations designed to discredit FBI Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) warrants have claimed that the dossier was used as the sole source for said warrants. Such claims are obvious lies and attempted obstruction of justice. On July 27<sup>th</sup> 2017, Papadopoulos was arrested at Washington-Dulles International Airport. On October 5<sup>th</sup> 2017, he pleaded guilty to making false statements to the FBI.

## Detail

1. Speaking to a trusted compatriot in June 2016 sources A and B, a senior Russian Foreign Ministry figure and a former top level Russian intelligence officer still active inside the Kremlin respectively, the Russian authorities had been cultivating and supporting US Republican presidential candidate, Donald TRUMP for at least 5 years. Source B asserted that the TRUMP operation was both supported and directed by Russian President Vladimir PUTIN. Its aim was to sow discord and disunity both within the US itself, but more especially within the Transatlantic alliance which was viewed as inimical to Russia's interests. Source C, a senior Russian financial official said the TRUMP operation should be seen in terms of PUTIN's desire to return to Nineteenth Century 'Great Power' politics anchored upon countries' interests rather than the ideals-based international order established after World War Two. S/he had overheard PUTIN talking in this way to close associates on several occasions. The statements of the sources above listed as sources A, B and C are supported by Trump's willingness to criticize anyone except high ranking Russian officials, especially Vladimir Putin. The direction of Trump and his campaign's activities by the Russian President is further supported by the change made to the GOP Platform at the convention. The change to the platform was designed to weaken the party's stance on assistance to Ukrainian forces who were fighting Russian supported rebels. - numerous sources, including NPR, report that the change was under the direct orders of Donald Trump. He is not known to have made any other demands of change to the platform.
2. In terms of specifics, Source A confided that the Kremlin had been feeding TRUMP and his team valuable intelligence on his

opponents, including Democratic presidential candidate Hillary CLINTON, for several years (see more below). This was confirmed by Source D, a close associate of TRUMP who had organized and managed his recent trips to Moscow, and who reported, also in June 2016, that this Russian intelligence had been "very helpful". The Kremlin's cultivation operation in TRUMP also had comprised offering him various lucrative real estate development business deals in Russia, especially in relation to the ongoing 2018 World Cup soccer tournament. However, so far, for reasons unknown, Trump had not taken up any of these. This, in part, references the June 9<sup>th</sup> 2016 meeting of eight individuals in Trump Tower. The eight individuals were: Donald Trump, Jr., Paul Manafort, Jared Kushner, Natalia Veselnitskaya (a Russian lawyer tied to the Russian Government), Rinat Akhmetshin (a Russian-American lobbyist), Rob Goldstone (a publicist of Emin Agalarov - Goldstone's company, Qui 2, helped the Trump Organization bring the 2013 Miss Universe Pageant to Moscow), Ike Kaveladze (a senior vice president of a company owned by Russian oligarch Aras Agalarov, father of Emin Agalarov), and Anatoli Samochornov (a translator working for Veselnitskaya). - numerous sources, including CNN and NBC News. Based on the description here given of Source D, it is possible that he is either Emin Agalarov or Rob Goldstone.

3. However, there were other aspects to TRUMP's engagement with the Russian authorities. One which had borne fruit for them was to exploit TRUMP's personal obsessions and sexual perversion in order to obtain suitable 'kompromat' (compromising material) on him. According to Source D, where s/he had been present, TRUMP's (perverted conduct in Moscow including hiring the presidential suite of the Ritz Carlton Hotel, where he knew President and Mrs. OBAMA (whom he hated) had stayed on one of their official trips

to Russia, and defiling the bed where they had slept by employing a number of prostitutes to perform a 'golden showers' (urination) show in front of him. The hotel was known to be under FSB control with microphones and concealed cameras in all the main rooms to record anything they wanted to.

Although this allegation is not verified as of this writing, Trump's unusual sexual behavior has been well-documented, including:

- a confirmed payoff (the amount may be in dispute) to porn star Stormy Daniels. Their sexual activities have been described as 'unusual'.
- an affair with Playboy model Karen McDougal and a connected scheme to conceal such affairs involving David Pecker, CEO and Chairman of American Media, Inc.
- as many as twenty female accusers of sexual assault
- self-confession of Trump's attitude toward women on the September, 2005 Access Hollywood tape
- a 2005 self-confession on the Howard Stern radio show of voyeuristic behavior targeting teenage girls as young as 15 at the Miss Teen USA Pageant
- support of Roy Moore for the United States Senate in the special election for Alabama in 2017 despite a credible allegation of child molestation and other such untoward behavior leveled against candidate Moore
- the March 9<sup>th</sup> 2018, *The Washington Post* report that the Special Counsel's team had acquired a 2013 personal, typed letter of invite to the 2013 Miss Universe pageant from Donald Trump to Vladimir Putin with a hand-written note of how the former looked forward to seeing "beautiful" women during his trip.

It should also be noted here that the author of the dossier, Christopher Steele, a former M16 intelligence officer, credits three sources (D, E and F) for verification of the Moscow hotel golden shower incident. – numerous sources confirm the historic elicited behavior of Donald Trump. On November 9<sup>th</sup> 2017, *The Washington Post* and NBC News reported that Keith Schiller, Trump's longtime director of security, testified to the House Intelligence Committee that an offer was made for five women to be sent to Trump's hotel room during his visit to Moscow in 2013.

4. The Moscow Ritz Carlton episode involving TRUMP reported above was confirmed by Source E, [REDACTED], who said that s/he and several of the staff were aware of it at the time and subsequently. S/he believed it had happened in 2013. Source E provided an introduction for a company ethnic Russian operative to Source F, a female staffer at the hotel when TRUMP had stayed there, who also confirmed the story. Speaking separately in June 2016, Source B (the former top level Russian intelligence officer) asserted that TRUMP's unorthodox behavior in Russia over the years had provided the authorities there with enough embarrassing material on the now Republican presidential candidate to be able to blackmail him if they so wished. Two additional sources (E and F) for the golden showers incident cited by Steele. The identity of source E is somewhat protected by Steele but s/he may have been a clerk at the hotel while source F is listed as a female staffer. See also the note on the corresponding Summary entry, above.
5. Asked about the Kremlin's reported intelligence feed to TRUMP over recent years and rumours about a Russian Dossier of 'kompromat' on Hillary CLINTON (being circulated), Source B confirmed the file's existence. S/he confided in a trusted compatriot that it had been collated by Department K of the FSB for many years, dating back to her husband Bill's presidency, and comprised mainly eavesdropped conversations of various sorts rather than details/evidence of unorthodox or embarrassing behavior. Some of the conversations were from bugged comments CLINTON had made on her various trips to Russia and focused on things she had said which contradicted her current

position on various issues. Others were most probably from phone intercepts. Though unconfirmed, it is likely that the FSB have intercepted phone conversations of many U.S. diplomats and officials. It would be an indefensible position to claim that such Russian information gathering does not exist.

6. Continuing on this theme, Source G, a senior Kremlin official, confided that the CLINTON dossier was controlled exclusively by chief Kremlin spokesman, Dmitriy PESKOV, who was responsible for compiling/handling it on the explicit instructions of PUTIN himself. The dossier however had not as yet made available abroad, including to TRUMP or his campaign team. At present it was unclear what PUTIN's intentions were in this regard.

Based on prior behavior, including elaborate blackmail operations, it is unlikely that Putin or the FSB would authorize the release of such sensitive information. This is especially true considering that Hillary Clinton lost the election. Before the election, the value of the information increased in inverse proportion with the number of people who had access to said information. Now that Trump is President, and Hillary Clinton is likely retired from political life, the information may only have value as long as it remains secret.

**20 June 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/086

### RUSSIA/CYBER CRIME: A SYNOPSIS OF RUSSIAN STATE SPONSORED AND OTHER CYBER OFFENSIVE (CRIMINAL) OPERATIONS

#### Summary

- Russia has extensive programme of state-sponsored offensive cyber operations. External targets include foreign government and big corporations, especially banks. FSB leads on cyber within Russian governments, security services and IFIs but much more on second tier ones through IT back doors, using corporate and other visitors to Russia

Some of these activities are evidenced in the very detailed February 16<sup>th</sup> 2018 indictments of the 13 Russian nationals and three Russian companies by Special Counsel Robert Mueller's team of prosecutors and investigators. See also note on Detail I., below.

- FSB often uses coercion and blackmail to recruit most capable cyber operatives in Russia into its state-sponsored programmes. Heavy use also, both wittingly and unwittingly, of CIS emigres working in western corporations and ethnic Russians employed by neighbouring governments e.g. Latvia  
As reported by *The Guardian*, Deutsche Bank has extensive connections to money laundering funds of 'criminal origin' through Latvia. As reported by *The Washington Post*, Deutsche Bank had at least \$384 million in loans to Donald Trump and at least \$285 million in loans to Jared Kushner's organization. These loans and others are reportedly being investigated by the Mueller team in connection with possible quid pro quo arrangements in which Deutsche Bank's alleged unethical money laundering behavior might see favorable and more lenient treatment by the Trump administration.

- Example cited of successful Russian cyber operation targeting senior Western business visitor. Provided back door into important Western institutions. Indictments by the Special Counsel's team have confirmed extensive cyber operations that the indicted individuals referred to as information warfare.
- Example given of US citizen of Russian origin approached by FSB and offered incentive of "investment" in his business when visiting Moscow. Meetings between Jared Kushner, the Russian ambassador and executives of Vnesheconombank (VEB), the Russian state bank, during the transition period of the Trump Administration were confirmed by numerous sources, including *The Independent*.
- Problems however for Russian authorities themselves in countering local hackers and cyber criminals, operating outside state control. Central Bank claims there were over 20 serious attacks on correspondent accounts held by CBR in 2015, comprising Rubles several billion in fraud.  
See note in Detail 5., below.
- Some details given of leading non-state Russian cyber-criminal groups  
See note in Detail 6., below.

## **Details**

1. Speaking in June 2016, a number of Russian figures with a detailed knowledge of national cyber crime, both state-sponsored and otherwise outlined the current situation in this area. A former senior intelligence officer divided Russian state-sponsored offensive cyber operations into four categories (in order of priority):- targeting foreign, especially western

governments; penetrating leading foreign business corporations, especially banks; domestic monitoring of the elite; and attacking political opponents both at home and abroad. The former intelligence officer reported that the Federal Security Service (FSB) was the lead organization within the Russian state apparatus for cyber operations. One of these four methods of information warfare, the last, which involves cyber political attacks, has been confirmed through the indictments of the 13 Russian nationals and three Russian companies by the Special Counsel's team of prosecutors and investigators. At the time of this writing, it is reasonable to conclude that further indictments are forthcoming, likely confirming additional cyber warfare actions.

*The Wall Street Journal* and others have reported that Cambridge Analytica was a possible source of collusion with the Russian cyber operations. Also reported is that the Special Counsel had requested internal documents from the London based firm. Cambridge Analytica is a data mining and data analysis company focusing on elections and voter data information for selective targeting of advertising.

*The Guardian* has reported that the company uses psychographic information obtained from millions of Facebook users. Cambridge Analytica has also reportedly admitted connections to WikiLeaks and the seeking of illegally obtained data. Steve Bannon, former chairman of the Trump campaign, Senior Counselor to President Trump and Chief Strategist of the White House, is a former vice president of Cambridge Analytica. *The Guardian* also reported that the Trump campaign, aided by Cambridge Analytica was using up to 50,000 targeted, adaptive ads per day during the latter part of the 2016 campaign.

*The New York Times* reported that Jared Kushner, who was overseeing the digital operations of the Trump campaign, is the reason that the Cambridge Analytica team joined the campaign. Brad Pascale, hired by Kushner, was convinced in using the firm with further reinforcement of the decision attributed to Steve Bannon.

See also Supplement I, the Minority House Russia Investigation Update, Appendix B under the headings of Trump Campaign Digital Operations and Cambridge Analytica.

2. In terms of the success of Russian offensive cyber operations to date, a senior government figure reported that there had been only limited success in penetrating the "first tier" foreign targets. These comprised western (especially G7 and NATO) governments, security and intelligence services and central banks, and the IFIs. To compensate for this shortfall, massive effort had been invested, with much greater success, in attacking the "secondary targets", particularly western private banks and the governments of smaller states allied to the West. S/he mentioned Latvia in this regard. Hundreds of agents, either consciously cooperating with the FSB or whose personal and professional IT systems had been unwittingly compromised, were recruited. Many were people who had ethnic and family ties to Russia and/or had been incentivized financially to cooperate. Such people often would receive monetary inducements or contractual favours from the Russian state or its agents in return. This had created difficulties for parts of the Russian state apparatus in obliging/indulging them e.g. the Central Bank of Russia knowing having to cover up for such agents' money laundering operations through the Russian financial system.

Jared Kushner and his businesses are extremely compromised in regards to debt, particularly in relation to the massive financial obligations coming due on the property located at 666 Fifth Avenue, New York. The debt, due in early 2019 is known to be more than \$1.2 billion. Numerous sources report that Jared has been scrambling to secure massive loans to alleviate the pressure of this financial liability.

3. In terms of the FSB's recruitment of capable cyber operatives to carry out its, ideally deniable, offensive cyber operations, Russian IT specialist with direct knowledge reported in June 2016 that this was often done using coercion and blackmail. In terms of 'foreign' agents, the FSB was approaching US citizens of Russian (Jewish) origin on business trips to Russia. In one case a US citizen of Russian ethnicity had been visiting Moscow to attract investors in his new information technology program. The FSB clearly knew this and had offered to provide seed capital to this person in return for them being able to access and modify his IP, with a view to targeting priority foreign targets by planting a Trojan virus in the software. The US visitor was told this was a common practice. The FSB also had implied significant operational success as a result of installing cheap Russian IT games containing their own malware unwittingly by targets on their PC's and other platforms.

It is widely known that the Kushner family are of Russian (Jewish) descent. Jared Kushner has extensive connections with various U.S. businesses that would be valuable targets in the Russian warfare efforts. Jared Kushner ran the Trump campaign's digital efforts, placing him in a strategic position of targeting by the Russian interference efforts.

4. In a more advanced and successful FSB operation, an IT operator inside a leading Russian SOE, who previously had been employed on conventional (defensive) IT work there, had been under instruction for the last year to conduct an offensive cyber operation against a foreign director of the company. Although the latter was

apparently an infrequent visitor to Russia, the FSB now successfully had penetrated his personal IT and through this had managed to access various important institutions in the West through the back door.

Jared Kushner's company's extreme financial vulnerability made him and his business associates a primary target of these efforts. Russian spyware implanted in the computer of Jared Kushner or his business associates would have enabled Russian hackers to hit specific U.S. targets with their Facebook ad campaigns. The indictments by the Special Counsel's team indicates that some of the anti-Clinton advertising campaign may have been unwitting of their role in the Russian efforts. The indictment does not specify that all those through whom the Russian information warfare efforts worked were unwitting players. The Steele report suggests that the initial infiltration was accomplished with the willing help of an individual in need of investment money and willing to allow access to their digital information.

5. In terms of other technical IT platforms, an FSB cyber operative flagged up the 'Telegram' enciphered commercial system as having been of especial concern and therefore heavily targeted by the FSB, not least because it was used frequently by Russian internal political activists and oppositionists. His/her understanding was that the FSB now successfully had cracked this communications software and therefore it was no longer secure to use.

This relates to top secret, compartmented information that can only be verified by U.S. intelligence agencies. They likely never will.

6. The senior Russian government figure cited above also reported that non-state sponsored cyber crime was becoming an increasing problem inside Russia for the government and authorities there. The Central Bank of Russia claimed that in 2015 alone there had been more than 20

attempts at serious cyber embezzlement of money from corresponding accounts held there, comprising several billions Roubles. More generally, s/he understood there were circa 15 major organised crime groups in the country involved in cyber crime, all of which continued to operate largely outside state and FSB control. These included the so-called 'Anunak', 'Buktrap' and 'Metel' organisations.

Perhaps the Russian government cyber agents should be focusing their efforts on internal thieves rather than attacking western democracies.

**26 July 2015**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/095

### RUSSIA/US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: FURTHER INDICATIONS OF EXTENSIVE CONSPIRACY BETWEEN TRUMP'S CAMPAIGN TEAM AND THE KREMLIN

#### Summary

- Further evidence of extensive conspiracy between TRUMP's campaign team and Kremlin, sanctioned at highest levels and involving Russian diplomatic staff based in US  
See note in Detail 1., below.
- TRUMP associate admits Kremlin behind recent appearance of DNC e-mails on WikiLeaks, as means of maintaining plausible deniability  
See note in Detail 2., below.
- Agreed exchange of information established in both directions. TRUMP's team using moles within DNC and hackers in the US as well as outside in Russia. PUTIN motivated by fear and hatred of Hillary CLINTON. Russians receiving intel from TRUMP's team on Russian oligarchs and their families in US  
See note in Detail 3., below.
- Mechanism for transmitting this intelligence involves "pension" disbursements to Russian emigres living in US as cover, using consular officials in New York, DC and Miami  
See note in Detail 4., below.
- Suggestion from source close to TRUMP and MANAFORT that Republican campaign

team happy to have Russia as media bogeyman to mask more extensive corrupt business ties to China and other emerging countries

See note in Detail 5., below.

## **Detail**

1. Speaking in confidence to a compatriot in late July 2016. Source E, an ethnic Russian close associate of Republican US presidential candidate Donald TRUMP, admitted that there was a well-developed conspiracy of co-operation between them and the Russian leadership. This was managed on the TRUMP side by the Republican candidate's campaign manager, Paul MANAFORT, who was using foreign policy advisor, Carter PAGE, and others as intermediaries. The two sides had a mutual interest in defeating Democratic presidential candidate Hillary CLINTON, whom President PUTIN apparently both hated and feared.

Because Carter Page had been under investigation for years prior to the sharing of the Steele dossier with the FBI, statements such as this corroborated information already in the possession of the U.S. intelligence community.

2. Inter alia, Source E, acknowledged that the Russian regime had been behind the recent leak of embarrassing e-mail messages, emanating from the Democratic National Committee (DNC), to the WikiLeaks platform. The reason for using WikiLeaks was "plausible deniability" and the operation had been conducted with the full knowledge and support of TRUMP and senior members of his campaign team. In return the TRUMP team had agreed to sideline Russian intervention in Ukraine, as a campaign issue and to

raise US/NATO defense commitments in the Baltics and Eastern Europe to deflect attention away from Ukraine, a priority for PUTIN who needed to cauterise the subject.

Reference the June 9<sup>th</sup> 2016 meeting in Trump Tower previously cited.

3. In the wider context of TRUMP campaign/Kremlin co-operation, Source E claimed that the intelligence network being used against CLINTON comprised three elements. Firstly there were agents/facilitators within the Democratic Party structure itself; secondly Russian émigré and associated offensive cyber operators based in the US; and thirdly state-sponsored cyber operatives working in Russia. All three elements had played an important role to date. On the mechanism for rewarding relevant assets based in the US, and effecting a two-way flow of intelligence and other useful information, Source E claimed that Russian diplomatic staff in key cities such as New York, Washington DC and Miami were using the émigré 'pension' distribution system as cover. The operation therefore depended on key people in the US Russian émigré community for its success. Tens of thousands of dollars were involved.

At least partially confirmed by the extensive revelations in the indictments of the Special Counsel's team against the 13 Russian nationals and three Russian companies as well as a U.S. citizen, Richard Pinedo. - numerous sources including a Vox report updated March 1<sup>st</sup> 2018.

4. In terms of the intelligence flow from the TRUMP team to Russia, Source E reported that much of this concerned the activities of business oligarchs and their families' activities and assets in

the US, with which PUTIN and the Kremlin seemed preoccupied.

Much like Trump, Putin seems obsessed with the loyalty of his assets and oligarchs living in the U.S.

5. Commenting on the negative media publicity surrounding alleged Russian interference in the US election campaign in support of TRUMP. Source E said he understood that the Republican candidate and his team were relatively relaxed about this because it deflected media and the Democrats' attention away from TRUMP's business dealings in China and other emerging markets. Unlike in Russia, these were substantial and involved the payment of large bribes and kickbacks which, were they to become public, would be potentially very damaging to their campaign.

Numerous sources have reported on the extensive business dealings of the Trump Organization in China.

6. Finally, regarding TRUMP's claimed minimal investment profile in Russia, a separate source with direct knowledge said this had not been for want of trying. TRUMP's previous efforts had included exploring the real estate sector in St Petersburg as well as Moscow but in the end TRUMP had had to settle for the use of extensive sexual services there from local prostitutes rather than business success.

Several such failed attempts at developing Russian business deals have been reported on, one real estate development deal for a Trump Tower in Moscow having failing as recently as a few months before the 2016 election. - numerous sources reporting, including *The Washington Post*.

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/94

### RUSSIA: SECRET KREMLIN MEETINGS ATTENDED BY TRUMP ADVISOR, CARTER PAGE IN MOSCOW (JULY 2016)

#### Summary

- TRUMP advisor Carter PAGE holds secret meetings in Moscow with SECHIN and senior Kremlin Internal Affairs officials, DIVYEKIN  
Carter Page has not denied traveling to Moscow during this time or meeting with Russian government officials. He has indicated that nothing of substance was discussed.
- SECHIN raises issues of future bilateral US-Russia energy co-operation and associated lifting of western sanctions against Russia over Ukraine. PAGE non-committal in response  
Rex Tillerson, former ExxonMobil CEO, had extensive dealings with Russia during his tenure with the Texas-based oil company. In 2013, Tillerson was awarded the Order of Friendship by Vladimir Putin. Trump's appointment of Tillerson to U.S. Secretary of State uniquely positions the former to further this cooperation effort. In March, 2018, *The New Yorker* reported that Christopher Steele provided a second memo to U.S. intelligence with information related to the Kremlin's blocking of Trump's first choice for Secretary of State, Mitt Romney. Romney, the former Massachusetts Governor, was objectionable to the Kremlin due to his hawkish views toward Russia, even calling them the greatest threat to the United States. After going through with the interview of Romney for the position, Trump chose Rex Tillerson for U.S. Secretary of State. At the time, Tillerson was the obvious best possible choice from the Russian perspective. Let's state this as plainly as is possible: The clear evidence of the reporting, combined with the Steele dossier and the later Steele memo indicates that the Russian government has hand-picked the highest-ranking cabinet official in the United States Government, the U.S. Secretary of State. On March 13<sup>th</sup> 2018, Rex Tillerson was fired from his position as Secretary of State hours after making anti-Russian statements surrounding their use of nerve agent in an attempted assassination of Sergei Skripal and his daughter Yulia.

- DIVEYKIN discusses release of Russian dossier of 'kompromat' on TRUMP's opponent, Hillary CLINTON, but also hints at Kremlin possession of such material on TRUMP.  
A threat of blackmail (the stick) against one Presidential candidate while offering compromising information (the carrot) on the other.

## **Detail**

1. Speaking in July 2016, a Russian source close to Rosneft President, PUTIN close associate and US-sanctioned individual, Igor SECHIN, confided the details of a recent secret meeting between him and visiting Foreign Affairs Advisor to Republican presidential candidate Donald TRUMP, Carter PAGE.  
Rosneft is the Russian state oil company, led by Igor Sechin, a sanctioned Russian oligarch and friend of Rex Tillerson dating back to his former career with ExxonMobil.
2. According to SECHIN's associate, Rosneft President (CEO) had raised with PAGE the issues of future bilateral energy cooperation and prospects for an associated move to lift Ukraine-related western sanctions against Russia. PAGE had reacted positively to this demarche by SECHIN but had been generally non-committal in response.  
Bilateral energy cooperation became much more likely once Rex Tillerson was installed as U.S. Secretary of State. It is doubtful Igor Sechin would have met with Carter Page unless the latter came with an introduction by the former's friend, Tillerson.
3. Speaking separately, also in July 2016, an official close to Presidential Administration Head, S. IVANOV, confided in a compatriot that a senior colleague in the Internal Political Department of

the PA, DIVYEKIN (nfd) also had met secretly with PAGE on his recent visit. Their agenda had included DIVEYKIN raising a dossier of 'kompromat' the Kremlin possessed on TRUMP's Democratic presidential rival Hillary CLINTON, and its possible release to the Republican's campaign team.

See note in the corresponding Summary, above.

4. However, the Kremlin official close to S. IVANOV added that s/he believed DIVEYKIN also had hinted (or indicated more strongly) that the Russian leadership also had 'kompromat' on TRUMP which the latter should bear in mind in his dealings with them.

Again, a not too subtle threat highlighting Putin's demand for unquestioned loyalty.

As stated above, On March 13<sup>th</sup> 2018, Rex Tillerson was fired from his position as Secretary of State hours after making anti-Russian statements surrounding their use of nerve agent in an attempted assassination of Sergei Skripal and his daughter Yulia. Although Tillerson seemed eager to work with Russia at the beginning of his tenure as Secretary of State, as the months passed, it became obvious that he was unwilling to complete the gutting of the State Department and had become aware of Russia's increasing boldness and aggression. His statements indicate that he sensed that they were intruding into NATO countries and disrupting their governments at every opportunity. Also of note is the fact that Steve Goldstein, Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs was also fired, on the same day, March 13<sup>th</sup> 2018, hours after his statement elaborating on the facts of the Tillerson firing.

**19 July 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/097

### RUSSIA-US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: KREMLIN CONCERN THAT POLITICAL FALLOUT FROM DNC E-MAIL HACKING AFFAIR SPIRALLING OUT OF CONTROL

#### Summary

- Kremlin concerned that political fallout from DNC e-mail hacking operation is spiralling out of control. Extreme nervousness among TRUMP's associates as result of negative media attention/accusations

During June and July of 2016, the Trump campaign appeared to be in trouble. Trump's poll numbers slipped well below 40% for the first time as sources such as *Slate*, *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* began reporting on the many-faceted connections between Russia and candidate Trump as well as a number of his key supporters, allies and campaign officials. The July 21<sup>st</sup> 2016 article titled 'How a Trump presidency could destabilize Europe' by Anne Applebaum, columnist for *The Washington Post*, is an excellent example of such reporting. An earlier example, the July 4<sup>th</sup> 2016 *Slate* article by Franklin Foer titled Putin's Puppet is also worth the read by anyone interested in the subject. While Christopher Steele was gathering information from various sources on the 2016 actions of Trump associates, journalists were reporting on many of those associates' historic ties to Russia; some of those ties leading all the way up to Vladimir Putin. Russian hacking of the DNC servers was being reported on by *The Washington Post* as early as June 14<sup>th</sup> 2016 and hacks of The Clinton Foundation were reported by *Bloomberg* as early as June 22<sup>nd</sup> 2016.

- Russians meanwhile keen to cool situation and maintain 'plausible deniability' of existing/ongoing pro-TRUMP and anti-CLINTON operations. Therefore unlikely to be any ratcheting up offensive plays in immediate future.
- Source close to TRUMP campaign however confirms regular exchange with Kremlin

has existed for at least 8 years, including intelligence fed back to Russia on oligarchs' activities in US. The 'at least 8 years' statement predates the events in the standard, known timeline of potential Russian collusion with the Trump Organization since it equates to approximately 2008. What this dating does coincide with is Jared Kushner and Ivanka Trump's relationship. According to a March 1<sup>st</sup> 2018 *Business Insider* report, the couple met at a networking luncheon in 2007 and began dating soon thereafter. The couple were wed in 2009. In 1949, Jared Kushner's grand-parents, Joseph and Rae Kushner, immigrated to the United States from Belarus (part of the former Soviet Union). Joseph and Rae Kushner left the Soviet Union, ostensibly, to flee persecution. However, it should be noted that the Soviet Union began sending covert agents abroad shortly after World War II as the Cold War began. It was in the wake of the first Soviet test of an atomic bomb on August 29<sup>th</sup> 1949 that the western intelligence agencies finally began waking up and taking note of the vast network of spies that the Soviets were developing. The low-key NSC Directive 10/2 issued to the CIA on June 18<sup>th</sup>, 1948 to counter the Soviet threat now seemed increasingly important and would be considered the CIA Prime Directive for decades to come.

- Russians apparently have promised not to use 'kompromat' they hold on TRUMP as leverage, given high levels of voluntary co-operation forthcoming from his team. Potentially explaining why Trump has not publicly criticized Putin or any high ranking Russian oligarchs or diplomats in years.

## **Detail**

1. Speaking in confidence to a trusted associate in late July, 2016, a Russian émigré figure close to the Republican US presidential candidate Donald TRUMP's campaign team commented on the fallout from publicity surrounding the Democratic National Committee (DNC) e-mail hacking scandal. The émigré said there was a high level of anxiety within the TRUMP team as a result of various accusations levelled against them and

indications from the Kremlin that President PUTIN and others in the leadership thought things had gone too far now and risked spiralling out of control.

The implications of this are that, after July 2016, there may have been attempts to destroy much of the evidence, if any existed, that could have directly linked the Trump Campaign with the Kremlin. Anyone who attempted to destroy digital evidence may have found it to be more difficult to permanently do so than they anticipated.

2. Continuing on this theme, the émigré associate of TRUMP opined that the Kremlin wanted the situation to calm but for 'plausible deniability' to be maintained concerning its (extensive) pro-TRUMP and anti-CLINTON operations. S/he therefore judged that it was unlikely these would be ratcheted up, at least for the time being.
3. However, in terms of established operational liaison between the TRUMP team and the Kremlin, the émigré confirmed that an intelligence exchange had been running between them for at least 8 years. Within this context PUTIN's priority requirement had been for intelligence on the activities, business and otherwise, in the US of leading Russian oligarchs and their families. TRUMP and his associates duly had obtained and supplied the Kremlin with this information.

See the above notes concerning the 'at least 8 years' statement. There are limited possibilities for a connection with Russia and the Trump Organization that fits this expanded, 8-year timeframe. This, coupled with multiple mentions in the dossier of 'ethnic Russian(s)' of 'Jewish' descent further narrows the range, making it doubtful that the link reporting to the Kremlin could be anyone other than Jared Kushner and/or his father, Charles.

4. Finally, the émigré said s/he understood the Kremlin had more intelligence on CLINTON and her campaign but he did not know the details or when or if it would be released. As far as 'kompromat' (compromising information) on TRUMP were concerned, although there was plenty of this, he understood the Kremlin had given its word that it would not be deployed against in Republican presidential candidate given how helpful and co-operative his team had been over several years, and particularly of late. At least some of this information was, in fact, released after the date that this section of the dossier was written (July 30<sup>th</sup> 2016, as listed below). Again, it is also true that no information negative to Trump has been released about him. Even if the Russians do not possess compromising information on Trump, his actions (and inaction toward sanctions against Russia) indicate that he *believes* they do.

**30 July 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/100

### RUSSIA/USA: GROWING BACKLASH IN KREMLIN TO DNC HACKING AND TRUMP SUPPORT OPERATIONS

#### Summary

- Head of PA IVANOV laments Russian intervention in US presidential election and black PR against CLINTON and the DNC. Vows not to supply intelligence to Kremlin PR operatives again. Advocates now sitting tight and denying everything
- Presidential spokesman PESKOV the main protagonist in Kremlin campaign to aid TRUMP and damage CLINTON. He is now scared and fears being made a scapegoat by leadership for backlash in US. Problem compounding by his botched intervention in recent Turkish crisis
- Premier MEDVEDEV's office furious over DNC hacking and associated anti-Russian publicity. Want good relations with US and ability to travel there. Refusing to support or help cover up after PESKOV
- Talk now in Kremlin of TRUMP withdrawing from presidential race altogether, but this still largely wishful thinking by more liberal elements in Moscow

The above summary (and below detail) indicates a conflict at the highest levels of the Russian government and oligarchical structure concerning the interference in the 2016 U.S. Presidential Elections. It appears that some of the Russian leadership were hopeful of Trump being forced out of the race at this point. Obviously, this would have meant a certain defeat of whichever candidate replaced him on the Republican ticket. It is possible that the decision to proceed and lay low was arrived at because the information would get out and there would be even greater retaliations from a Republican held congress and a determined Clinton as U.S. President.

## **Detail**

1. Speaking in early August 2016, two well-placed and established Kremlin sources outlined the divisions and backlash in Moscow arising from the leaking of Democratic National Committee (DNC) e-mails and the wider pro-TRUMP operation being conducted in the US. Head of Presidential Administration, Sergei IVANOV, was angry at the recent turn of events. He believed the Kremlin "team" involved, led by presidential spokesman Dmitriy PESKOV, had gone too far in interfering in foreign affairs with their "elephant in a china shop black PR". IVANOV claimed always to have opposed the handling the exploitation of intelligence by this PR "team". Following the backlash against such foreign interference in US politics, IVANOV was advocating that the only sensible course of action now for the Russian leadership was to "sit tight and deny everything".

**See note in last Summary, above.**

2. Continuing on this theme the source close to IVANOV reported that PESKOV now was "scared shitless" that he would be scapegoated by PUTIN and the Kremlin and held responsible for the backlash against Russian political interference in the US election. IVANOV was determined to stop PESKOV playing an independent role in relation to the US going forward and the source fully expected the presidential spokesman now to lay low. PESKOV's position was not helped by a botched attempt by him also in interfere in the recent failed coup

in Turkey from a government relations (GR) perspective (no further details). This may be linked to the former National Security Advisor, Michael Flynn. On November 10<sup>th</sup> 2017, *The Wall Street Journal* and other sources reported that Flynn and his son were at the center of an elaborate plot to kidnap a Turkish dissident, Fethullah Gulen, and deliver him to the Turkish government. Flynn and his son were allegedly to be paid \$15 million for the kidnapping and transport to Turkey. At a cursory glance, this scheme could have been at the request of either the Turkish government, with whom Flynn has prior financial ties or the Russian government as a means of reparations for the above-mentioned interference by Peskov in the failed Turkish coup. The timing of the scheme would seem to indicate it was more likely a Russian formed scheme in which they intended to leverage Flynn's connections with Turkey. To avoid more extensive charges, and probably to protect his son from the same, Michael Flynn pleaded guilty to making false, fictitious and fraudulent statements to the FBI on December 1<sup>st</sup> 2017.

3. The extent of disquiet and division within Moscow caused by the backlash against Russian interference in the US election was underlined by a second source, close to premier Dmitriy MEDVEDEV (DAM). S/he said the Russian prime minister and his colleagues wanted to have good relations with the US, regardless of who was in power there, and not least so as to be able to travel there in future, either officially or privately. They were openly refusing to cover up for PESKOV and others involved in the DNC/TRUMP operations or to support his counter-attack of allegations against the USG for its alleged hacking of the Russian government and state agencies. Considering the ongoing investigation and the looming and more severe Russian sanctions, which will likely be applied by Trump's successor, it is possible that this internal rift in the Russian government continues. At the root of this is the unintended ultimate cost of the Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. elections.

4. According to the first source, close to IVAVOV, there had been talk in the Kremlin of TRUMP being forced to withdraw from the presidential race altogether as a result of recent events, ostensibly on the grounds of his psychological state and unsuitability for high office. This might not be so bad for Russia in the circumstances but in the view of the source, it remained largely wishful thinking on the part of those in the regime opposed to PESKOV and his "botched" operations, at least for the time being.

Repeating from above notes: It appears that some of the Russian leadership were hopeful of Trump being forced out of the race at this point. Obviously, this would have meant a certain defeat of whichever candidate replaced him on the Republican ticket. It is possible that the decision to proceed and lay low was arrived at because the information would get out and there would be even greater retaliations from a Republican held congress and a determined Clinton as U.S. President.

## **5 August 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/101

### RUSSIA/US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: SENIOR KREMLIN FIGURE OUTLINES EVOLVING RUSSIAN TACTICS IN PRO-TRUMP, ANTI- CLINTON OPERATION

#### Summary

- Head of PA, IVANOV assesses Kremlin intervention in US presidential election and outlines leadership thinking on operational way forward
- No new leaks envisaged, as too politically risky, but rather further exploitation of (WikiLeaks) material already disseminated to exacerbate divisions  
The WikiLeaks material certainly helped to exacerbate divisions among the Democratic Party.
- Educated US youth to be targeted as protest (against CLINTON) and swing vote in attempt to turn them over to TRUMP  
Special Prosecutor indictments of the Russians show evidence of this activity. - numerous sources.
- Russian leadership, including PUTIN, celebrating perceived success to date in splitting US hawks and elite  
Obvious evidence of Putin's glee has been very public.
- Kremlin engaging with several high profile US players, including STEIN, PAGE and (former DIA Director Michael Flynn), and funding their recent visits to Moscow  
Michael Flynn pleaded guilty to making false, fictitious and fraudulent statements to the FBI on December 1<sup>st</sup> 2017. Jill Stein has come under recent scrutiny for her involvement and Carter Page has been under investigation for years in connection with Russian criminal activities.

## Details

1. Speaking in confidence to a close colleague in early August 2016, Head of the Russian Presidential Administration (PA), Sergei IVANOV, assessed the impact and results of Kremlin intervention in the US presidential election to date. Although most commentators believed that the Kremlin was behind the leaked DNC/CLINTON e-mails, this remained technically deniable. Therefore the Russians would not risk their position for the time being with new leaked material, even to a third party like WikiLeaks. Rather the tactics would be to spread rumours and misinformation about the content of what already had been leaked and make up new content. The Special Counsel's February 16<sup>th</sup> 2018 indictment of 13 Russians nationals and three Russian companies shows evidence of these alternative tactics employed as some of the Kremlin became skittish.
2. Continuing on this theme, IVANOV said that the audience to be targeted by such operations was the educated youth in America as the PA assessed that there was still a chance they could be persuaded to vote for Republican candidate Donald TRUMP as a protest against the Washington establishment (in the form of Democratic candidate Hillary CLINTON). The hope was that even if she won, as a result of this CLINTON in power would be bogged down in working for internal reconciliation in the US, rather than being able to focus on foreign policy which would damage Russia's interests. This also should give President PUTIN more room for

manoeuvre in the run-up to Russia's own presidential election in 2018.

Sergei Ivanov apparently maintained his optimism that the race would be close and even a close, hard-fought loss could be a win for Russia and Putin. The Republican controlled U.S. Congress was already prepared to mire a potential Clinton administration in constant investigations and hearings.

3. IVANOV reported that although the Kremlin had underestimated the strength of US media and liberal reaction to the DNC hack and TRUMP's links to Russia, PUTIN was generally satisfied with the progress of the anti-CLINTON operation to date. He recently had had a drink with PUTIN to mark this. In IVANOV's view, the US had tried to divide the Russian elite with sanctions but failed whilst they, by contrast, had succeeded in splitting the US hawks inimical to Russia and the Washington elite more generally, half of whom had refused to endorse any presidential candidate as a result of Russian intervention.
4. Speaking separately, also in early August 2016, a Kremlin official involved in US relations commented on aspects of the Russian operation to date. Its goals had been threefold - asking sympathetic US actors how Moscow could help them; gathering relevant intelligence; and creating and disseminating compromising information ('kompromat'). This had involved the Kremlin supporting various US political figures, including funding indirectly their recent visits to Moscow. S/he named a delegation from Lyndon LAROCHE; presidential candidate Jill STEIN of the Green Party; TRUMP foreign policy adviser Carter PAGE; and former DIA Director Michael FLYNN, in this regard

and as successful in terms of perceived outcomes.

Michael Flynn pleaded guilty to making false, fictitious and fraudulent statements to the FBI on December 1<sup>st</sup> 2017. Jill Stein has come under recent scrutiny for her involvement (even seated at the same table with Putin and Flynn at a Moscow event). Based on this information, and depending on the testimony of Michael Flynn, it is likely that Stein, the Green Party Presidential Candidate has more information concerning offers of assistance from the Russian government. Carter Page has been under investigation for years in connection with Russian criminal activities.

**10 August 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/102

### RUSSIA/US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: REACTION IN TRUMP CAMP TO RECENT NEGATIVE PUBLICITY ABOUT RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE AND LIKELY RESULTING TACTICS GOING FORWARD

#### Summary

- TRUMP campaign insider reports recent DNC e-mail leaks were aimed at switching SANDERS (protest) voters away from CLINTON and over to TRUMP
- Admits Republican campaign underestimated resulting negative reaction from US liberals, elite and media and forced to change course as result.
- Need now to turn tables on CLINTON's use of PUTIN as bogeyman in election, although some resentment at Russian president's perceived attempt to undermine USG and system over and above swinging presidential election

#### Detail

1. Speaking in confidence on 9 August 2016, an ethnic Russian associate of Republican US presidential candidate Donald TRUMP discussed the reaction inside his camp, and revised tactics therein resulting from recent negative publicity concerning Moscow's clandestine involvement in the campaign. TRUMP's associate reported that the aim of leaking e-mails to WikiLeaks during the Democratic Convention had been to swing supporters of Bernie SANDERS away

from Hillary CLINTON and across to TRUMP. These voters were perceived as activist and anti-status quo and anti-establishment and in that regard sharing many features with the TRUMP campaign, including a visceral dislike of Hillary CLINTON. This objective had been conceived and promoted, inter alia, by TRUMP's foreign policy adviser Carter PAGE who had discussed it directly with the ethnic Russian associate.

There are at least two ethnic Russians listed as either close to Trump or associated with Trump. One of the ethnic Russians is also listed as (Jewish), while the other(s) is not. The ethnic Russian to which the above refers is possibly Fedor Emelianenko, a former heavyweight mixed martial arts competitor and one-time business partner of Donald Trump, or, more popularly suspected, Sergei Millian, a Belarusian-American business man.

2. Continuing on this theme, the ethnic Russian associate of TRUMP assessed that the problem was that the TRUMP campaign had underestimated the strength of the negative reaction of the liberals and especially the conservative elite to Russian interference. This was forcing a rethink and a likely change of tactics. The main objective in the short term was to check Democratic candidate Hillary CLINTON's successful exploitation of the PUTIN as bogeyman/Russian interference story to tarnish TRUMP and bolster her own (patriotic) credentials. The TRUMP campaign was focusing on tapping into support in the American television media to achieve this, as they reckoned this resource had been underused by them to date.

Eight days after this report was written/submitted, on August 18<sup>th</sup> 2016, NBC News reported that the Trump campaign made its first purchase of TV ads that would air August 19<sup>th</sup> thru the 29<sup>th</sup>.

3. However, TRUMP's associate also admitted that there was a fair amount of anger and resentment within the Republican candidate's team at what was perceived by PUTIN as going beyond the objective of weakening CLINTON and bolstering TRUMP, by attempting to exploit the situation to undermine the US government and democratic system more generally. It was unclear at present how this aspect of the situation would play out in the weeks to come.

**10 August 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/136

### RUSSIA/US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: FUTHER DETAILS OF TRUMP LAWYER COHEN'S SECRET LIAISON WITH THE KREMLIN

#### Summary

- Kremlin insider reports TRUMP lawyer COHEN's secret meeting/s with Kremlin officials in August 2016 was/were held in Prague
- Russian parastatal organisation Rossotrudnichestvo used as cover for this liaison and premises in Czech capital may have been used for the meeting/s.
- Pro-PUTIN leading DUMA figure KOSACHEV, reportedly involved as "plausibly deniable" facilitator and may have participated in the August meeting/s with COHEN

#### Detail

1. Speaking to a compatriot and friend on 19 October 2016, a Kremlin insider provided further details of reported clandestine meeting/s between Republican presidential candidate, Donald TRUMP's lawyer Michael COHEN and Kremlin representatives in August 2016. Although the communication between them had to be cryptic for security reasons, the Kremlin insider clearly indicated to his/her friend that the reported contact/s took place in Prague, Czech Republic.

On April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018, *McClatchy* reported that Special Counsel Mueller now has evidence of Cohen's travel to Prague.

2. Continuing on this theme, the Kremlin insider highlighted the importance of the Russian parastatal organisation, Rossotrudnichestvo, in this contact between TRUMP campaign representative/s and Kremlin officials.

Rossotrudnichestvo was being used as cover for this relationship and its office in Prague may well have been used to host the COHEN/Russian Presidential Administration (PA) meeting/s. It was considered a "plausibly deniable" vehicle for this, whilst remaining entirely under Kremlin control.

Rossotrudnichestvo is a Russian organization somewhat similar in context to the United States Chamber of Commerce with the major notable difference being that the former is a government entity while the latter is a powerful lobbying group.

3. The Kremlin insider went on to identify leading pro-PUTIN Duma figure, Konstantin KOSACHEV (Head of the Foreign Relations Committee) as an important figure in the TRUMP campaign-Kremlin liaison operation. KOSACHEV, also "plausibly deniable" being part of the Russian legislature rather than executive, had facilitated the contact in Prague and by implication, may have attended the meeting/s with COHEN there in August.

As stated above, on April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018, *McClatchy* reported that Special Counsel Mueller now has evidence of Cohen's travel to Prague. Konstantin Kosachev has been an advocate for the reunification of North and South Korea. - source Wikipedia, which cites a Russian language source. It is possible that Kosachev is behind the recent relaxation of tensions between the Trump Administration and the North Korean Supreme Leader Kim Jong-un. If Kosachev is operating the puppet strings on this recent détente, it is likely that the end goal is a united, socialist, Korean Peninsula. The elimination of a major military base of operations in the region for the United States has been a key goal of Putin for many years.

## **Company Comment**

We reported previously in our Company Intelligence Report 2016/135 of 19 October 2016 from the same source, that COHEN met officials from the PA Legal Department clandestinely in an EU country in August 2016. This was in order to clean up the mess left behind by western media revelations of TRUMP ex-campaign manager MANAFORT's corrupt relationship with the former pro-Russian YANUKOVYCH regime in Ukraine and TRUMP foreign policy advisor, Carter PAGE's secret meetings in Moscow with senior regime figures in July 2016. According to the Kremlin advisor, these meeting/s were originally scheduled for COHEN in Moscow but shifted to what was considered an operationally "soft" EU country when it was judged too compromising for him to travel to the Russian capital.

**20 October 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/105

### RUSSIA/UKRAINE: THE DEMISE OF TRUMP'S CAMPAIGN MANAGER PAUL MANAFORT

#### Summary

- Ex-Ukrainian President YANUKOVYCH confides directly to PUTIN that he authorised kick-back payments to MANAFORT, as alleged in western media. Assures Russian President however there is no documentary evidence/trail  
The kickback payments totaling over \$12 million were reported on August 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> 2016 by *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, respectively. If the Special Counsel's July 2017 seizure of Manafort documents and other information were entirely successful, it is possible that Yanukovich is wrong to have such confidence.
- PUTIN and Russian leadership remain worried however and sceptical that YANUKOVYCH has fully covered the traces of these payments to TRUMP'S former campaign manager.  
Considering how successful the Special Counsel's investigation has been thus far, Putin may be justified in worrying. See also in Detail 2., below.
- Close associate of TRUMP explains reasoning behind MANAFORT'S recent resignation. Ukraine revelations played part but others wanted MANAFORT out for various reasons, especially LEWANDOWSKI who remains influential

#### Detail

1. Speaking in late August 2016, in the immediate aftermath of Paul MANAFORT'S resignation as campaign manager for US Republican presidential candidate Donald TRUMP, a well-placed Russian figure reported on a recent meeting between

President PUTIN and ex-president YANUKOVYCH of Ukraine. This had been held in secret on 15 August near Volgograd, Russia and the western media revelations about MANAFORT and Ukraine had featured prominently on the agenda. YANUKOVYCH had confided in PUTIN that he did authorise and order substantial kick-back payments to MANAFORT as alleged but sought to reassure him that there was no documentary trail left behind which could provide clear evidence of this.

See notes in Summary, above.

2. Given YANUKOVYCH's (unimpressive) record in covering up his own corrupt tracks in the past, PUTIN and others in the Russian Leadership were skeptical about the ex-Ukrainian president's reassurances on this as relating to MANAFORT. They therefore still feared the scandal had legs, especially as MANAFORT had been commercially active in Ukraine right up to the time (in March 2016) when he joined TRUMP's campaign team. For them it therefore remained a point of potential political vulnerability and embarrassment.

Explaining why Manafort appears to be a weak link in the Russian interference plans. The amount of worry displayed by these reports implies that, if Manafort flips, all the dominoes will fall. It seems likely that Manafort may be holding out for a pardon from Trump or is in fear of his life or that of his family from the threat of rendition by the Russians. On February 23<sup>rd</sup> 2018, Richard Gates, a longtime business associate of Manafort, pleaded guilty to one count of false statements and one count of conspiracy against the United States in exchange for his cooperation. Gates' plea deal specifies that he must testify in all government concerns for which he is called, which implies that he could provide substantial information for New York State prosecution - numerous sources, including *Bloomberg*. Trump's power of pardon has no jurisdiction over state prosecution.

3. Speaking separately, also in late August 2016, an American political figure associated with Donald TRUMP and his campaign outlined the reasons behind MANAFORT's recent demise. S/he said it was true that the Ukraine corruption revelations had played a part in this but also, several senior players close to TRUMP had wanted MANAFORT out, primarily to loosen his control on strategy and policy formulation. Of particular importance in this regard was MANAFORT's predecessor as campaign manager, Corey LEWANDOWSKI, who hated MANAFORT personally and remained close to TRUMP with whom he discussed the presidential campaign on a regular basis.

*The Washington Post* and others report that Paul Manafort is fired by the Trump campaign on August 19<sup>th</sup> 2016, two days after Trump received his first security briefing. NBC News has reported that, during the security briefing, Trump was first made aware of the U.S. intelligence community's investigation of Russian attempts at interference in the 2016 election. Specifically, the FBI informed Trump of the Russian attempts to infiltrate his campaign. Trump's opponent and former Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, was given the same briefing, which later prompted her to utter her now famous "puppet" line during the October 19<sup>th</sup> 2016 Presidential Debate inferring that Trump is a puppet of Vladimir Putin.

**22 August 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/111

### RUSSIA/US: KREMLIN FALLOUT FROM MEDIA EXPOSURE OF MOSCOW'S INTERFERENCE IN THE US PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

#### Summary

- Kremlin orders senior staff to remain silent in media and private on allegations of Russian interference in US presidential campaign
- Senior figure however confirms gist of allegations and reports IVANOV sacked as Head of Administration on account of giving PUTIN poor advice on issue. VAINO selected as his replacement partly because he was not involved in pro-TRUMP anti-CLINTON operation/s  
Sergei Ivanov was fired on August 12<sup>th</sup> 2016.
- Russians do have further 'kompromat' on CLINTON (e-mails) and considering disseminating it after Duma (legislative elections) in late September. Presidential spokesman PESKOV continues to lead on this  
See note on Detail 3., below.
- However, equally important is Kremlin objective to shift policy consensus favourably to Russia in US post-OBAMA whoever wins. Both presidential candidates' opposition to TPP and TTIP viewed as a result in the respect
- Senior Russian diplomat withdrawn from Washington embassy on account of potential exposure in US presidential election operation/s  
See note on Detail 5., below.

## Detail

1. Speaking in confidence to a trusted compatriot in mid-September 2016, a senior member of the Russian Presidential Administration (PA) commented on the political fallout from recent western media revelations about Moscow's intervention, in favour of Donald TRUMP and against Hillary CLINTON, in the US presidential election. The PA official reported that the issue had become incredibly sensitive and that President PUTIN had issued direct orders that Kremlin and government insiders should not discuss it in public or even in private.
2. Despite this the PA official confirmed, from direct knowledge, that the gist of the allegations was true. PUTIN had been receiving conflicting advice on interfering from three separate and expert groups. On one side had been the Russian ambassador to the US, Sergei KISLYAK, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, together with an independent and informal network run by presidential foreign policy advisor, Yuri USHAKOV (KISLYAK's predecessor in Washington) who had urged caution and the potential negative impact on Russia from the operation/s. On the other side was former PA Head, Sergei IVANOV, backed by Russian Foreign Intelligence (SVR), who had advised PUTIN that the pro-TRUMP, anti-CLINTON operation/s would be both effective and plausibly deniable with little blowback. The first group/s had been proven right and this had been the

catalyst in PUTIN's decision to sack IVANOV (unexpectedly) as PA Head in August. His successor, Anton VAINO, had been selected for the job partly because he had not been involved in the US presidential election operation/s.

3. Continuing on this theme, the senior PA official said the situation now was that the Kremlin had further 'kompromat' on candidate CLINTON and had been considering releasing this via "plausibly deniable" channels after the Duma (legislative) elections were out of the way in mid-September. There was however a growing train of thought and associated lobby, arguing that the Russians could still make candidate CLINTON look "weak and stupid" by provoking her into railing against PUTIN and Russia without the need to release more of her e-mails. Presidential Spokesman, Dmitriy PESKOV remained a key figure in the operation, although any final decision on dissemination of further material would be taken by PUTIN himself.

With the election still too close to call (see 4.), it is likely that Putin thought it possible to use the additional compromising information to embarrass Clinton, should she win. It is possible that his compromising information would be sufficient for a Republican dominated congress to bog a Clinton Administration down in hearings so as to make it ineffective in governing.

4. The senior PA official also reported that a growing element in Moscow's intervention in the US presidential election campaign was the objective of shifting the US political consensus in Russia's perceived interests regardless of who won. It basically comprised of pushing candidate CLINTON away from President OBAMA's policies. The best

example of this was that both candidates now openly opposed the draft trade agreements, TPP and TTIP, which were assessed by Moscow as detrimental to Russian interests. Other issues where the Kremlin was looking to shift the US policy consensus were Ukraine and Syria. Overall however, the presidential election was considered still to be too close to call.

5. Finally, speaking separately to the same compatriot, a senior Russian MFA official reported that as a prophylactic measure, a leading Russian diplomat, Mikhail KULAGIN, had been withdrawn from Washington at short notice because Moscow feared his heavy involvement in the US presidential election operation, including the so-called veterans' pensions ruse (reported previously), would be exposed in the media there. His replacement, Andrei BONDAREV however was clean in this regard.

It is now known that the Kremlin recalled their diplomat, Mikhail Kalugin (correct spelling) at the time this internal Russian disagreement was unfolding about the interference campaign. *McClatchy* later reported that Kalugin was under investigation by the FBI as a 'spy under diplomatic cover' at the time of his departure.

### **Company Comment**

The substance of what was reported by the senior Russian PA official in paras 1 and 2 above, including the reasons for Sergei IVANOV's dismissal, was corroborated independently by a former top level Russian intelligence officer and Kremlin insider, also in mid-September.

**14 September 2016**

## **COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/112**

### **RUSSIA/US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: KREMLIN-ALPHA GROUP CO-OPERATION**

#### **Summary**

- Top level Russian official confirms current closeness of Alpha Group-PUTIN relationship. Significant favours continue to be done in both directions and FRIDMAN and AVEN still giving informal advice to PUTIN, especially on the US  
Mikhail Fridman is one of three co-founders of Alfa Group (correct spelling) along with German Khan (mentioned below) and Alexei Kuzmichov. Khan, Fridman and Petr Aven are co-owners of Alfa-Bank, the corporate banking and financial services arm of Alfa Group.
- Key intermediary in PUTIN-Alpha relationship identified as Oleg GOVORUN, currently Head of a Presidential Administration department but throughout the 1990s, the Alpha executive who delivered illicit cash directly to PUTIN
- PUTIN personally unbothered about Alpha's current lack of investment in Russia but under pressure from colleagues over this and able to exploit it as lever over Alpha interlocutors

#### **Details**

1. Speaking to a trusted compatriot in mid-September 2016, a top level Russian government official commented on the history and current state of relations between President PUTIN and the Alpha Group of businesses led by oligarchs Mikhail FRIDMAN, Petr AVEN and German KHAN. The Russian government figure

reported that although they had had their ups and downs, the leading figures in Alpha currently were on very good terms with PUTIN. Significant favours continued to be done in both directions primarily political ones for PUTIN and business/legal ones for Alpha. Also, FRIDMAN and AVEN continued to give informal advice to PUTIN on foreign policy, and especially about the US where he distrusted advice being given to him by officials.

German Khan, co-founder and co-owner of Alfa Group (correct spelling) is the father-in-law of Alex Van der Zwaan. On February 20<sup>th</sup> 2018, Van Der Zwaan pleaded guilty to making false statements to investigators of the Special Counsel's probe into Russian interference in the 2016 election. - numerous sources, including *The Washington Post*.

2. Although FRIDMAN recently had met directly with PUTIN in Russia, much of the dialogue and business between them was mediated though a senior Presidential Administration official, Oleg GOVORUN, who currently headed the department therein responsible for Social Co-operation With the CIS. GOVORUN was trusted by PUTIN and recently had accompanied him to Uzbekistan to pay respects at the tomb of former president KARIMOV. However according to the top level Russian government official, during the 1990s GOVORUN had been Head of Government Relations at Alpha Group and in reality, the "driver" and "bag carrier" used by FRIDMAN and AVEN to deliver large amounts of illicit cash to the Russian president, at that time deputy Mayor of St. Petersburg. Given that and the continuing sensitivity of the PUTIN-Alpha relationship, and need for

plausible deniability, much of the contact between them was now indirect and entrusted to the relatively low profile GOVORUN.

3. The top level Russian government official described to PUTIN-Alpha relationship as both carrot and stick. Alpha held 'kompromat' on PUTIN and his corrupt business activities from the 1990s whilst although not personally overly bothered by Alpha's failure to reinvest the proceeds of its TNK oil company sale into the Russian economy since, the Russian president was able to use pressure on this count from senior Kremlin colleagues as a lever on FRIDMAN and AVEN to make them do his political bidding.

**14 September 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/113

### RUSSIA/US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION- REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE TRUMP'S PRIOR ACTIVITIES IN ST. PETERSBURG

#### Summary

- Two knowledgeable St. Petersburg sources claim Republican candidate TRUMP has paid bribes and engaged in sexual activities there but key witnesses silenced and evidence hard to obtain
- Both believe Azeri business associate of TRUMP, Araz AGALAROV will know the details  
Araz Agalarov is the father of Emin Agalarov, who helped to arrange the infamous Trump Tower meeting between Donald Trump Jr., Jared Kushner and Paul Manafort representing the Trump campaign and Natalia Veselnitskaya, et al representing the Russian assistance to the Trump campaign. - numerous sources report.

#### Detail

1. Speaking to a trusted compatriot in September 2016, two well-placed sources based in St. Petersburg, one in the political/business elite and the other involved in the local services and tourist industry, commented on Republican US presidential candidate Donald TRUMP's prior activities in the city.
2. Both knew TRUMP had visited St Petersburg on several occasions in the past and had been interested in doing business deals there involving real estate. The local business/political elite figure reported that TRUMP had paid bribes there to further his

interests but very discreetly and only through affiliated companies making it very hard to prove. The local services industry source reported that TRUMP had participated in sex parties in the city too, but that all direct witnesses to this recently had been "silenced" i.e. bribed or coerced to disappear.

The author disagrees with Steele's definition of the term 'silenced'. A more likely meaning is 'renditioned' in espionage terms or murdered in ordinary parlance. To paraphrase an old saying, the only way to be certain that three people will remain 'silent' is if one of them is a blind, deaf mute and the other two are dead.

3. The two St. Petersburg figures cited believed an Azeri business figure, Araz AGALAROV (with offices in Baku and London) had been closely involved with TRUMP in Russia and would know most of the details of what the Republican presidential candidate had got up to there.

Both Araz Agalarov and his son, Emin might have extensive knowledge of Trump's goings on in Russia.

**14 September 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/130

### RUSSIA: KREMLIN ASSESSMENT OF TRUMP AND RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

#### Summary

- Buyer's remorse sets in with Kremlin over TRUMP support operation in US presidential election. Russian leadership disappointed that leaked e-mails on CLINTON have not had greater impact in campaign
- Russians have injected further anti-CLINTON material into the 'plausibly deniable' leaks pipeline which will continue to surface, but best material already in public domain
- PUTIN angry with senior officials who "over promised" on TRUMP and further heads likely to roll as a result. Foreign Minister LAVROV may be next  
Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov apparently gained his redemption (and some measure of revenge on the FBI leadership who were investigating the interference) when Donald Trump ultimately won the U.S. Presidency, see notes in detail 3., below.
- TRUMP supported by Kremlin because seen as divisive, anti-establishment candidate who would shake up current international status quo in Russia's favor. Lead on TRUMP operation moved from Foreign Ministry to FSB and then presidential administration where it now sits

## Detail

1. Speaking separately in confidence to a trusted compatriot in early October 2016, a senior Russian leadership figure and a Foreign Ministry official reported on recent developments concerning the Kremlin's operation to support Republican candidate Donald TRUMP in the US presidential election. The senior leadership figure said that a degree of buyer's remorse was setting in among Russian leaders concerning TRUMP. PUTIN and his colleagues were surprised and disappointed that leaks of Democratic candidate, Hillary CLINTON's hacked e-mails had not had greater impact on the campaign.
2. Continuing on this theme, the senior leadership figure commented that a stream of further hacked CLINTON material already had been injected by the Kremlin into compliant western media outlets like Wikileaks, which remained at least "plausibly deniable", so the stream of these would continue through October and up to the election. However s/he understood that the best material the Russians had already was out and there were no real game-changers to come.
3. The Russian Foreign Ministry official, who had direct access to the TRUMP support operation, reported that PUTIN was angry at his subordinate's "over-promising" on the Republican presidential candidate, both in terms of his chances and reliability and being able to cover and/or contain the US backlash over Kremlin interference.

More heads therefore were likely to roll, with the MFA the easiest target. Ironically, despite his consistent urging of caution on the issue. Foreign Minister LAVROV could be the next one to go.

On May 10<sup>th</sup> 2017, Sergey Lavrov and Sergey Kislyak, the Russian Ambassador to the U.S., met with Trump in the Oval Office having fired James Comey the day before. During the meeting, Trump stated that he faced great pressure because of Comey and the Russia investigation, implying that the FBI Director's firing relieved that pressure. It is also reported that Trump divulged code word sensitive Israeli intelligence to Lavrov and Kislyak during the same meeting. – numerous sources including *Vanity Fair* and *The Washington Post*.

On March 16<sup>th</sup> 2018, 26 hours before his retirement, and after months of ridicule and abuse, the Trump administration vengefully fired Andrew McCabe, the former Deputy Director of the FBI under James Comey. On March 17<sup>th</sup> 2018, *The Associated Press* reported that, like Comey, Andrew McCabe kept contemporaneous notes on his communications with Trump. Numerous sources report that, not only is this firing particularly spiteful, but it appears to be a furtherance of the obstruction of justice that began with the firing of James Comey.

4. Asked to explain why PUTIN and the Kremlin had launched such an aggressive TRUMP support operation in the first place, the MFA official said that Russia need to upset the liberal international status quo, including on Ukraine-related sanctions, which was seriously disadvantaging the country. TRUMP was viewed as divisive in disrupting the whole US political system; anti-Establishment; and a pragmatist with whom they could do business. As the TRUMP support operation had gained momentum, control of it had passed from the MFA to the FSB and then into the presidential administration where it remained, a reflection of its growing significance over time. There was still

a view in the Kremlin that TRUMP would continue as a (divisive) political force even if he lost the presidency and may run for and be elected to another public office.

**12 October 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/134

### RUSSIA/US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: FURTHER DETAILS OF KREMLIN LIAISON WITH TRUMP CAMPAIGN

#### Summary

- Close associate of SECHIN confirms his secret meeting in Moscow with Carter PAGE in July
- Substance included offer of large stake in Rosneft in return for lifting sanctions on Russia. PAGE confirms this is TRUMP's intentions  
See note in Detail 2., below.
- SECHIN continued to think TRUMP could win presidency up to 17 October. Now looking to reorientate his engagement with the US
- Kremlin insider highlights importance of TRUMP's lawyer, Michael COHEN in covert relationship with Russia. COHEN's wife is of Russian descent and her father a leading property developer in Moscow  
Laura Cohen's (née Shusterman) father is Fima Shusterman, a property investor/developer. Michael's younger brother, Bryan is also married to a woman of Ukrainian descent named Oxana (née Dronov). Oxana's father is Alex Dronov, a Ukrainian-born agribusiness developer whose company, Grain Alliance, is financially connected to the Cohen companies, Ethanol of Ukraine, Ltd. and Ukrethanol LLC. It is likely that Fima Shusterman, is of both ethnic Ukrainian and ethnic Russian descent. Shusterman owns properties in the U.S. and it is likely that he has stake in properties in Moscow, or other cities in Russia - sources include *Talking Points Memo* and *Kyiv Post*.

#### Detail

1. Speaking to a trusted compatriot in mid October 2016, a close associate of

Rosneft President and PUTIN ally Igor' SECHIN elaborated on the reported secret meeting between the latter and Carter PAGE, of US Republican presidential candidate's foreign policy team, in Moscow in July 2016. The secret meeting had been confirmed to him/her by a senior member of SECHIN's staff, in addition to by the Rosneft President himself. It took place on either 7 or 8 July, the same day or the one after Carter PAGE made a public speech to the Higher Economic School in Moscow.

2. In terms of the substance of their discussion, SECHIN's associate said that the Rosneft President was so keen to lift personal and corporate western sanctions imposed on the company, that he offered PAGE/TRUMP's associates the brokerage of up to a 19 per cent (privatised) stake in Rosneft in return. PAGE had expressed interest and confirmed that were TRUMP elected US president, then sanctions on Russia would be lifted.

On December 7<sup>th</sup> 2016, Russia agreed to sell a 19.5% share of its state-owned oil company, Rosneft for €10.2 billion (\$11 billion) to a joint venture between Qatar and Glencore plc, a commodities and mining company. Brokering such a sale could earn the broker 1-2 % of the sale. Of interest are Jared Kushner's nefarious dealings with Qatar. Kushner is under scrutiny for allegedly encouraging the blockade against Qatar as retaliation for the Qataris failing to lend him money. Kushner also met with Sergei Gorkov, chairman of Vnesheconombank, a week after the sale of Rosneft. - numerous sources, including *The Washington Post*, *Newsweek*, and *Bloomberg News*. Kushner's statement on this is possibly accurate in that he did not try to elicit sovereign funds for any of his projects. However, it is possible that Kushner was instructed by Gorkov that he would need to speak with Qatar regarding brokerage fees for the Rosneft sale (or their half of such fees).

3. According to SECHIN's close associate, the Rosneft President had continued to believe that TRUMP could win the US presidency right up to 17 October, when he assessed this was no longer possible. SECHIN was keen to re-adapt accordingly and put feelers out to other business and political contacts in the US instead.
4. Speaking separately to the same compatriot in mid-October 2016, a Kremlin insider with direct access to the leadership confirmed that a key role in the secret TRUMP campaign/Kremlin relationship was being played by the Republican candidate's personal lawyer Michael COHEN. [REDACTED]

#### **Source Comment**

5. SECHIN's associate opined that although PAGE had not stated it explicitly to SECHIN, he had clearly implied that in terms of his comment on TRUMP's intention to lift Russian sanctions if elected president, he was speaking with the Republican candidate's authority. The fact that Carter Page has not been reported to have committed a criminal act, his refusal to explicitly commit others to criminal acts and that he has been connected with multiple investigations involving Russian criminals without ever being charged leads the author to believe that Page is either a useful idiot of the FBI or a wily, double agent, superspy.

#### **Company Comment**

6. [REDACTED]

**18 October 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/135

### RUSSIA/US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF TRUMP LAWYER, COHEN IN CAMPAIGN'S SECRET LIAISON WITH THE KREMLIN

#### Summary

- Kremlin insider outlines important role played by TRUMP's lawyer COHEN in secret liaison with Russian leadership
- COHEN engaged with Russians in trying to cover up scandal of MANAFORT and exposure of PAGE and meets Kremlin officials secretly in the EU in August in pursuit of this goal
- These secret contacts continue but are now farmed out to trusted agents in Kremlin-linked institutes so as to remain "plausibly deniable" for Russian regime
- Further confirmation that sacking of IVANOV and appointments of VAINO and KIRIYENKO linked to need to cover up Kremlin's TRUMP support operational

#### Detail

1. Speaking in confidence to a longstanding compatriot friend in mid-October 2016, a Kremlin insider highlighted the importance of Republican presidential candidate Donald TRUMP's lawyer, Michael COHEN, in the ongoing secret liaison relationship between the New York tycoon's campaign and the Russian leadership. COHEN's role had grown following the departure of Paul MANNAFORT as TRUMP's campaign manager in

August 2016. Prior to that MANNAFORT had led for the TRUMP side.

2. According to the Kremlin insider, COHEN now was heavily engaged in a cover up and damage limitation operation in the attempt to prevent the full details of TRUMP's relationship with Russia being exposed. In pursuit of this aim, COHEN had met secretly with several Russian Presidential Administration (PA) Legal Department Officials in an EU country in August 2016. The immediate issues had been to contain further scandals involving MANNAFORT's commercial and political role in Russia/Ukraine and to limit the damage arising from exposure of former TRUMP foreign policy advisor, Carter PAGE's secret meetings with Russian leadership figures in Moscow the previous month. The overall objective had been to "sweep it all under the carpet and make sure no connections could be fully established or proven"
3. Things had become even "hotter" since August on the TRUMP-Russia track. According to the Kremlin insider, this had meant that direct contact between the TRUMP team and Russia had been farmed out by the Kremlin to trusted agents of influence working in pro-government policy institutes like that of Law and Comparative Jurisprudence. COHEN however continued to lead for the TRUMP team.
4. Referring back to the (surprise) sacking of Sergei IVANOV as Head of PA in August 2016, his replacement by Anton VAINO and the appointment of former Russian premier Sergei KIRIYENKO to another

senior position in the PA, the Kremlin insider repeated that this had had been directly connected to the TRUMP support operation and the need to cover up now that it was being exposed by the USG and in the western media.

### **Company Comment**

The Kremlin insider was unsure of the identities of the PA officials with whom COHEN met secretly in August, or the exact date/s and locations of the meeting/s. There were significant internal security barriers being erected in the PA as the TRUMP issue became more controversial and damaging. However s/he continued to try to obtain these.

There is little to verify in this section. Some of it is self-evident and other portions do not have specific, verifiable details.

**19 October 2016**

## COMPANY INTELLIGENCE REPORT 2016/166

### US/RUSSIA: FURTHER DETAILS OF SECRET DIALOGUE BETWEEN TRUMP CAMPAIGN TEAM, KREMLIN AND ASSOCIATED HACKERS IN PRAGUE

#### Summary

- TRUMP's representative COHEN accompanied to Prague in August/September 2016 by 3 colleagues for secret discussions with Kremlin representatives and associated operators/hackers
- Agenda included how to process deniable cash payments to operatives; contingency plans for covering up operations; and action in event of a CLINTON election victory  
See note on Detail 2., below.
- Some further details of Russian representatives/operatives involved; Romanian hackers employed; and use of Bulgaria as bolt hole to "lie low"  
See note on Detail 3., below.
- Anti-CLINTON hackers and other operatives paid by both TRUMP team and Kremlin, but with ultimate loyalty to Head of PA, IVANOV and his successor/s

#### Detail

1. We reported previously (2016/135 and /136) on secret meeting/s held in Prague, Czech Republic in August 2016 between then Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump's representative, Michael COHEN and his interlocutors from

the Kremlin working under cover of Russian 'NGO' Rossotrudnichestvo.

2.

[REDACTED]

provided further details of these meeting/s and associated anti-CLINTON/Democratic Party operations. COHEN had been accompanied to Prague by 3 colleagues and the timing of the visit was either in the last week of August or the first week of September. One of their main Russian interlocutors was Oleg SOLODUKHIN operating under Rossotrudnichestvo cover. According to [REDACTED], the agenda comprised questions on how deniable cash payments were made to hackers who had worked in Europe under Kremlin direction against the CLINTON campaign and various contingencies for covering up these operations and Moscow's secret liaison with the TRUMP team more generally. It is possible that this meeting took place earlier, in July, when Michael Cohen's passport shows that he traveled to Italy, whereby he could have traveled to Prague within the EU. However, if Michael Cohen is telling the truth, in that he has never been to Prague, it is equally possible that Michael's brother Bryan (also a lawyer) could have traveled to Prague as his proxy. If Bryan is the Cohen with whom the meeting in Prague took place, either the July or August timeline is plausible. On April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018, *McClatchy* reported the Special Counsel now has evidence of Cohen's travel to Prague.

3.

[REDACTED] reported that over the period March-September 2016 a company called [REDACTED] and its affiliates had been using botnets and porn traffic to transmit viruses, plant bugs, steal data and conduct "altering operations" against the Democratic Party leadership. Entities linked to one [REDACTED] were involved and he and another hacking expert, both recruited under duress by

the FSB, [REDACTED] were significant players in this operation. In Prague, COHEN agreed contingency plans for various scenarios to protect the operation, but in particular what was to be done in the event that Hillary CLINTON won the presidency. It was important in this event that all cash payments owed were made quickly and discreetly and that cyber and other operators were stood down/able to go effectively to ground to cover their traces. (We reported earlier that the involvement of political operatives Paul MANAFORT and Carter PAGE in the secret TRUMP-Kremlin liaison had been exposed in the media in the run-up to Prague and that damage limitation of these also was discussed by COHEN with the Kremlin representatives).

Again, the Cohen involved here could be Bryan, Michael's brother and business partner. Either or both of the siblings could, without suspicion, legitimately travel to any country in Europe due to their extensive business dealings. Maintaining plausible deniability would be greatly simplified if the source had mistaken the Cohen in Prague for Michael when it was Bryan acting as the interlocutor for the Trump Campaign. Further implied is a possibility that Bryan could have conferenced Michael into the meeting using his own mobile phone with very low risk of intelligence listening in to two U.S. citizens, brothers, conversing about what would appear to be normal activities of their business. Michael Cohen could have been anywhere else in the world and conferenced in with Bryan Cohen in attendance in Prague. Also of interesting note is the fact that Michael Cohen admittedly arranged an elaborate scheme to pay off the porn star Stormy Daniels (real name Stephanie Clifford) at approximately the same time as this alleged scheme to pay "Romanian hackers" with deniable cash payments. Cohen has allegedly arranged many such payments to Trump indiscretions over the years. It seems likely that any such arrangement for paying of discrete funds on behalf of the Trump Campaign would indeed be handled by Michael Cohen, possibly with assistance from his brother and business partner, Bryan.

4. In terms of practical measures to be taken, it was agreed by the two sides in Prague to stand down various "Romanian hackers" (presumably based in their homeland or neighbouring eastern Europe) and that other operatives should head for a bolt-hole in Plovdiv, Bulgaria where they should "lay low". On payments, IVANOV's associate said that the operatives involved had been paid by both TRUMP's team and the Kremlin, though their orders and ultimate loyalty lay with IVANOV, as Head of the PA and thus ultimately responsible for the operation, and his designated successor/s after he was dismissed by president PUTIN in connection with the anti-CLINTON operation in mid-August. Cohen was near frantic in his pursuit of completing the Stormy Daniels non-disclosure agreement. He attempted to close the deal from late September until obtaining her signature on October 28<sup>th</sup> 2016, just 12 days before the election. This lends credence to the possibility that the payment to Stormy Daniels could have been subterfuge designed to cover another, more egregious payoff. One possible evidence for the cover-up of such additional payments could be comparison of the amount of money actually transferred through the Cohen created devices versus the actual amounts paid to Stephanie Clifford (aka Stormy Daniels). Time to follow the money. On April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018, *The New York Times* and others reported that the F.B.I. raided Michael Cohen's office, home and hotel room seizing evidence by subpoena issued for the U.S. attorney's office of the Southern District of New York. The subpoena and raid was reportedly completed on referral from the Special Counsel's office. Numerous sources report that the raids and seizure of evidence was related to financial crimes, including actions related to the alleged payoff of Stephanie Clifford.

**13 December 2016**

## Supplement I –

### Russia Investigation Status Update, Minority Report

**Congress of the United States**  
**Washington, DC 20515**

March 13, 2018

#### **Status of the Russia Investigation**

One year ago, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) initiated its investigation of Russia’s interference in the 2016 U.S. election and pledged to follow the facts wherever they would lead. With yesterday’s announcement that the Majority will be prematurely shutting down the Russia investigation and issuing a report at odds with the consensus of the Intelligence Community and the overwhelming evidence produced during our own probe, they have broken that commitment.

The decision to shut down the investigation before key witnesses could be interviewed and vital documentary evidence obtained will prevent us from fully discharging our duty to the House and to the American people. But the Committee Minority will be issuing an interim report that lays out the facts that we know to date and identifies what significant investigative steps remain, especially with respect to the issues of collusion and obstruction of justice. In this document, we will set out the investigative threads that we have been pursuing—and in some cases, been prevented from pursuing—and will need to be completed at a later date to ensure not only that the public is fully informed, but also to determine whether the Russians have leverage over the President of the United States.

Below is a partial list of key witnesses that the Committee has yet to contact or interview, as well as document production requests that the Committee has yet to make from persons and entities of relevance to the investigation. As noted in the appendices below, many of these persons and entities were previously requested by the Minority—some as early as August 2017 and many repeatedly—but have yet to be contacted by, appear before, or produce documents to the Committee.

**Appendix A** details the Committee’s outstanding lines of inquiry, some of which have been addressed only in part and others not at all. Many of the Minority’s requests bear directly on the second and third prongs of our investigation: whether the Russian active measures campaign included links between Russia and individuals associated with political campaigns or any other U.S. persons, and what we need to do to protect ourselves and our allies from election interference in the future.

**Appendix B** outlines **more than 30 key witnesses** that the Committee has yet to interview. This list, chosen from a broader set of individuals and entities of

interest, includes witnesses to whom the Committee has already sent letters, but who so far have failed to respond to the Committee's request for voluntary cooperation; witnesses that the Minority has previously requested and whom the Majority has not agreed to call in for testimony or to request documents from; and pertinent new witnesses that the Committee has discovered in the course of the investigation.

Among other witnesses, Appendix B includes:

- formal and informal campaign foreign policy advisors who have yet to appear before or produce documents to the Committee, including Reince Priebus, Stephen Miller, KT McFarland, Sean Spicer, Keith Kellogg, Joseph E. Schmitz, and Tera Dahl;
- individuals with knowledge about the June 9, 2016 Trump Tower meeting with Russian emissaries, the stated purpose of which was to provide damaging information on Hillary Clinton, including Natalia Veselnitskaya, who offered to cooperate, and Roman Benjaminov, a witness with relevant information who resides in the United States;
- persons and entities tied to the Trump campaign's digital operation, including relevant personnel from contractors such as Cambridge Analytica, along with documentary evidence that would shed light on Cambridge Analytica's efforts to obtain stolen DNC emails from WikiLeaks;
- individuals or groups who were involved in or may have knowledge of third-party political outreach from the Kremlin to the Trump campaign, including persons linked to the National Rifle Association (NRA) and who can shed light on the NRA's relationship with Alexander Torshin, a close ally of Russian President Putin, such as Maria Butina, Paul Erickson, and Cleta Mitchell; and
- U.S. government officials and experts focused on election security, such as officials from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the National Association of Secretaries of State, the Department of Homeland Security, and key employees from CrowdStrike.

The Minority also has identified additional current and former U.S. government personnel, as well as outside experts, who can shed light on Russia's active measures campaign and the U.S. government response. This list includes numerous Intelligence Community officials from specific agencies and entities of interest, such as the FBI's new Foreign Influence Task Force, whom the Committee have yet to interview. These officials can provide important insights into Russia's covert methods and activity, the U.S. government's response under the Obama and Trump administrations, and policy and legislative recommendations to protect the United States moving forward.

**Appendix C** identifies more than **20 entities** from which the Committee has yet to request documents, including Deutsche Bank, the Estate of Peter Smith (and associated entities), the Russian-American Chamber of Commerce in the USA,

and social media companies. These requests relate directly to investigative threads essential to determining the extent of Russia's election interference and are indispensable to a comprehensive investigation.

**Appendix D** outlines **more than 15 persons and entities** for which the Committee believes compulsory process for appearance and/or document production to the Committee is necessary. Included are witnesses who have refused to appear; who have invoked a nonexistent privilege to avoid pertinent testimony or who have simply refused to answer questions because the answers may be adverse to the interests of the President or his campaign; who have not produced any documentation; or whose production was insufficient and for whom we have a reasonable basis to believe that they possess documents responsive to the Committee's investigation. This list includes, among others: Donald Trump Jr., Michael Cohen, Jared Kushner, Hope Hicks, Attorney General Sessions, Erik Prince, and the White House. The Committee must also initiate a contempt process to compel Stephen Bannon to testify to the Committee fully and without constraints.

In consideration of the Special Counsel's ongoing investigative equities, the Committee also has deferred interviewing **Michael Flynn, Paul Manafort, Rick Gates, and George Papadopoulos**, but these interviews will be essential to a complete understanding of the issues of collusion and obstruction of justice. To conduct a legitimate investigation, the Committee would need to interview these individuals, whether or not they have reached plea agreements or are the subject of criminal indictments. For example, Mr. Flynn specifically informed the Committee via his attorney on June 7, 2017 that he planned to invoke his Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination; the Committee did not demand his appearance, as a result. In light of Mr. Flynn's guilty plea, the Committee should revisit his appearance and seek to negotiate his testimony. The Committee also ought to interview other individuals who may be of investigative interest to the Special Counsel, reportedly such as George Nader and Simona Mangiante.

Open hearings are also an integral component of the Committee's investigation and have allowed the public to hear from FBI Director James Comey (prior to his termination), former CIA Director John Brennan, former DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson, and senior executives from Facebook, Twitter, and Google about key aspects of Russia's active measures campaign. Given the repeated warnings from the Intelligence Community and others that the Russians are seeking to reprise their 2016 operation in this year's midterm elections, the Committee should have held open hearings on election security to clarify the extent of Russia's intrusion into our election systems, highlight vulnerabilities in our elections infrastructure, and identify the technical and other solutions necessary to protect our country.

Conducting a thorough and impartial investigation of these matters has been a challenging undertaking that has been made much more so by the Majority's concerted efforts, at the behest of the White House, to undermine our work and that of the FBI and Special Counsel. For our part, the HPSCI Democrats remain fully committed to conducting this investigation as originally envisioned, leaving no stone unturned in determining the facts of Russia's interference in the

2016 U.S. elections and the steps we need to take to ensure the future integrity of our democratic process. To the best of our ability, we will continue to do so, until such time as the Congress once again lives up to its oversight responsibilities. The American people expect and deserve no less.

## Appendix A: Key Lines of Inquiry

The heads of our intelligence agencies have uniformly concluded that Russia will again seek to influence our elections. With the midterm elections now only months away, it is imperative that we develop a comprehensive understanding of Russia's 2016 covert and overt attack to adequately inform the American people about what happened, and to detect, deter, and counter, to the greatest extent possible, further attempts to influence our political process.

Curtailing the investigation prematurely would leave key lines of inquiry unanswered:

- **Hacking and dissemination of campaign emails.** The Intelligence Community (IC) has made it clear that Russia relied on third-party entities, or “cutouts,” such as WikiLeaks, Guccifer 2.0, and DC Leaks to publicly disseminate with plausible deniability information stolen from the Democratic National Committee (DNC) and the campaign of Hillary Clinton. Our investigation must explore precisely how the Russians executed this cyber operation, and how they communicated with and shared the stolen cache with these cutouts. Outstanding questions include: Did the Trump campaign receive advanced knowledge of or access to stolen information; did the stolen documents inform any of their campaign activity, including voter persuasion and targeting; and what was the chain of custody of the hacked and stolen emails that were then weaponized and strategically released?
- **Campaign knowledge of email hack.** As the Special Counsel has revealed, weeks before the world learned that Russian actors hacked into the DNC and the Clinton campaign, the Russians, through intermediaries, informed one of candidate Trump's five named foreign policy advisors, George Papadopoulos, in April 2016 that the Russian government had “dirt” on Hillary Clinton in the form of “thousands of emails.” In evidentiary evidence before the FISA Court, the DOJ also revealed that the Russians previewed the release of this information to Mr. Papadopoulos at that time. The early date of this contact is significant: even the Clinton campaign was not yet aware that Russia possessed their stolen emails.

Several weeks later, in a direct approach by Russia in early June 2016 to the highest levels of the Trump campaign, the Kremlin offered dirt on Hillary Clinton as part of what was described as the Russian government's “support for Mr. Trump.” The campaign response to the offer was two-fold: that they would “love” the help, particularly as the general election neared, and that they were disappointed with what the Russians provided at the meeting. At this point, several weeks after Russian agents informed Mr. Papadopoulos of their valuable cache, the campaign was on notice that Russia had far more helpful dirt to offer in the form of stolen emails. Days after the Trump Tower meeting, WikiLeaks would announce it had received stolen emails, documents we now know they received from the Russians.

Several outstanding questions remain: What more did the Russians relay to Mr. Papadopoulos and possibly others; how did they relay it; and with whom on the campaign did Mr. Papadopoulos—who was in frequent contact with numerous high-level Trump associates—share this valuable information? Were others on or tied to the campaign made aware of Russia’s plan to hack and anonymously release the stolen emails?

- **Russia’s intermediaries.** As the Committee’s investigation has uncovered, the Russian government used a variety of intermediaries to approach the Trump campaign repeatedly throughout the election and the presidential transition. As a counterintelligence matter, we must investigate crucial unanswered questions, including: How were these Russian-linked intermediaries tied to President Putin and the Kremlin; were they operating at the Kremlin’s direction or in concert with it; what motivation did they have in probing and communicating with Trump campaign officials; what messages did they convey; what information or impressions did they glean from Trump associates; and how did these approaches inform the Kremlin’s active measures campaign as election day neared?

After the election, when the Russian campaign was revealed and the United States sanctioned Russia for its unprecedented attack on our sovereignty, the President-elect’s National Security Advisor-designate, Michael Flynn, with the knowledge of other high-ranking transition officials, conspired with Russia to undermine the effect of U.S. sanctions, which were imposed to punish Russia for its intervention on Mr. Trump’s behalf. The Committee must seek to determine the extent of any coordination or collusion with or agreements made between Russian agents and individuals affiliated with the Trump campaign or transition with respect to sanctions relief.

- **Elections security.** The Committee has only scratched the surface in examining what the United States must do to protect ourselves and our allies against election interference. To date, we have interviewed only a small number of relevant witnesses and experts, and we have sought very limited data from the U.S. government and outside experts on this issue. As we approach the 2018 mid-term elections, we must fully understand: What specific vulnerabilities to voting systems exist and what remedial measures are needed; how should political parties, campaigns, and candidates secure their communications to defend against cyber-attacks; what measures and protocols should the Federal Government, including our intelligence and law enforcement agencies, adopt; and how can Congress facilitate these steps?
- **Social media campaign.** The Committee has shared with the public examples of the Russian government-directed social media campaign that relied on an extensive network of fake accounts and personas posing as Americans. The February 16, 2018 Special Counsel indictment of individuals connected to the Russian Internet Research Agency further underscores the extensive planning, sophistication,

organization, and scope of Russia's exploitation of social media platforms to influence American public opinion during the election. Russia's campaign amplified and influenced wide swaths of the U.S. electorate and infected public debate, with a clear purpose: to help the Trump campaign, vilify Hillary Clinton, and sow general discord—key points also confirmed in the January 6, 2017 Intelligence Community Assessment.

As Facebook, Twitter, and Google acknowledged during their November 1, 2017 testimony before the Committee, more extensive forensic investigation is needed to determine the full extent of Russia's weaponization of social media. This includes mapping the network of covert personas and accounts that Russia deployed; determining how Russia amplified accounts and propaganda, including through paid advertising; and understanding fully how Russian disinformation spread within and across platforms.

To answer these questions, the Committee must develop a more comprehensive picture of what happened on those platforms, but also how Russian disinformation spread to other social media platforms. The Committee also has a responsibility to investigate how Russian disinformation spread to press reporting and public debate; whether and how the presidential campaigns used or were harmed by this covert influence operation; and, where relevant, propose policy and legislative changes that can help guard against future foreign government weaponization of technology platforms.

- **Financial leverage.** Donald Trump's finances historically have been opaque, but there have long been credible allegations as to the use of Trump properties to launder money by Russian oligarchs, criminals, and regime cronies. There also remain critical unanswered questions about the source of President Trump's personal and corporate financing. For example, Deutsche Bank, which was fined \$630 million in 2017 over its involvement in a \$10 billion Russian money-laundering scheme, consistently has been the source of financing for President Trump, his businesses, and his family. We have only begun to explore the relationship between President Trump and Deutsche Bank, and between the bank and Russia. Moreover, as the Committee has learned, candidate Trump's private business was actively negotiating a business deal in Moscow with a sanctioned Russian bank during the election period. We must also seek to determine: Did the Russian government, through business figures close to the Kremlin, seek to court Donald Trump and launder funds through the Trump Organization; and did candidate Trump's financial exposure via Deutsche Bank or other private loans constitute a point of leverage that Russia may have exploited and may still be using?
- **Money-laundering and foreign payments.** The Special Counsel's Office has secured indictments against or guilty pleas from Paul Manafort, candidate Trump's campaign chairman, and Rick Gates, candidate Trump's deputy campaign chairman. Numerous criminal

offenses have been charged by the grand jury, including money-laundering. As the indictments and guilty pleas allege, Mr. Manafort and Mr. Gates funneled “millions of dollars in payments into foreign nominee companies and bank accounts, opened by them and their accomplices in nominee names and in various foreign countries, including Cyprus, Saint Vincent & the Grenadines, and the Seychelles. Manafort and Gates hid the existence of the foreign companies and bank accounts, falsely and repeatedly reporting to their tax preparers and to the United States that they had no foreign bank accounts.”

Mr. Manafort also continued to communicate during his tenure on President Trump’s campaign with a former Russian associate, who the Special Counsel described in court as “a long-time Russian colleague...who is currently based in Russia and assessed to have ties to a Russian intelligence service.” The Committee’s investigation must seek to determine whether Mr. Manafort and Mr. Gates’s money-laundering activities, tied to pro-Russian interests, constituted a point of leverage that Russia sought to benefit from or exploit to gain access to the Trump campaign, particularly given that Mr. Manafort reportedly offered private briefings about the Trump campaign to these contacts.

- **Post-election effects and Obstruction of Justice.** Russia’s interference also profoundly affected developments after Election Day. Our investigation must follow these leads, for example:

Why did National Security Adviser-designate Michael Flynn intervene with Russia after the Obama Administration imposed new sanctions to punish the country for its election interference, and what specifically did he and his Russian contact discuss? Who directed Mr. Flynn’s intervention, and why did Mr. Flynn and others, including President-elect and then President Trump, lie about this contact?

Did President Trump seek to obstruct the FBI’s investigation into Michael Flynn by pressuring FBI Director Comey to drop the investigation, by repeatedly requesting his loyalty, and by firing him?

Why did President Trump fire Director Comey—was this because the President wanted to thwart the FBI’s broader investigation into Russian interference in the U.S. election, which Director Comey announced publicly at a hearing before the House Intelligence Committee weeks before? Or because he refused to lift the Russia “cloud” over the President’s head?

Why did President Trump and his advisors write a misleading public statement following revelations in the summer of 2017 that his son, Donald Trump Jr., and two other senior campaign advisors attended a June 2016 meeting in which they were promised sensitive information from the Russian government which would be damaging to Hillary Clinton?

## **Appendix B: Key Witnesses the Majority Refused to Interview**

**Reince Priebus:** In his role as RNC Chairman, Mr. Priebus interacted with Trump campaign officials of interest. The Committee has reason to believe that he met with Paul Manafort on June 9, 2016, the same day Mr. Manafort, Jared Kushner, and Donald Trump Jr. met with Russian persons claiming to have damaging information about Hillary Clinton. Mr. Priebus may also have valuable information to share about relevant events and communications of interest during the transition and first months of the Trump administration, including Mr. Flynn's communications with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak and the Administration's reaction to public disclosure of those contacts.

**Stephen Miller:** Mr. Miller served as a senior policy advisor to the Trump campaign and likely attended the March 2016 meeting of the foreign policy advisory board. Mr. Miller likely was involved in key decision points during the campaign and transition, and engaged with the campaign's foreign policy advisors. He also could shed light on the RNC platform change on Ukraine and, as a speech writer during the campaign, the June speech of candidate Trump promising interesting new information about Hillary Clinton the week his son was set to meet secretly with the Russian delegation.

**Kathleen (KT) McFarland:** Ms. McFarland served on the transition team before becoming Michael Flynn's deputy national security advisor and was a close associate of Flynn. Publicly reported emails coupled with the Michael Flynn's Statement of the Offense indicate that Ms. McFarland may very well have known about Mr. Flynn's communications with the Russian Ambassador in late December 2016. Ms. McFarland reportedly wrote in a December 29, 2016 email that sanctions announced hours earlier by the Obama administration were aimed at discrediting Trump's victory. The email reportedly went on to state that the sanctions could make it much harder for Trump to ease tensions with Russia "which has just thrown the U.S.A. election to him." This comment seems to indicate an acknowledgment by Ms. McFarland that the Kremlin not only interfered in the U.S. election but that the interference helped Trump win.

**Sean Spicer:** Former White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer reportedly was present for key developments during the transition and could help clarify communications of great interest to our investigation, including those of Michael Flynn with the Russian Ambassador and other foreign officials, and Mr. Flynn's communications with the Trump transition team during this period. Mr. Spicer can also provide insight into post-inauguration events and communications of significant interest that bear directly on the investigation's parameters.

**Kellyanne Conway:** Ms. Conway may be able to shed light on the activities of Peter Smith, who was engaged in an operation to find, authenticate and release Hillary Clinton's "missing" emails. Ms. Conway would also be well-placed to discuss relevant events and communications of interest during the campaign, transition and Trump administration, including Michael Flynn's late December contacts with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak and the Administration's reaction to public disclosure of those communications.

**Tera Dahl:** Ms. Dahl served as Diplomatic Outreach Coordinator for the Trump campaign. The Committee has reason to believe that Ms. Dahl would have insight into Trump campaign-related meetings and calls with foreign persons, including Russian officials or representatives. She also likely was aware of campaign activities and interactions involving George Papadopoulos and Carter Page, as well as other persons of interest, based on her foreign policy advisory role.

**Daniel Scavino Jr.:** Mr. Scavino served as the Social Media Director for the Trump Campaign. Mr. Scavino was a key campaign official who developed the campaign's online content and Facebook marketing plan. Mr. Scavino could help the Committee better understand the campaign's social media operations. Mr. Scavino can also shed light on a Russian social media platform and its offer to establish a presence for the Trump campaign.

**Joseph "Keith" Kellogg Jr.:** One of candidate Trump's initial five campaign foreign policy advisors, along with Walid Phares, Carter Page, George Papadopoulos, and Joseph E. Schmitz, Mr. Kellogg has yet to interview with or produce documents to the Committee. Mr. Kellogg served throughout the campaign and transition, and currently serves as Chief of Staff on the White House's National Security Council. It is important that the Committee interview all members of the Trump campaign's foreign policy advisory team to develop a comprehensive understanding of all communications and events of interest.

**Joseph E. Schmitz:** One of candidate Trump's initial five campaign foreign policy advisors, along with Walid Phares, Carter Page, George Papadopoulos, and Keith Kellogg, Mr. Schmitz also has yet to interview with or produce documents to the Committee. It is important that the Committee interview all members of the Trump campaign's foreign policy advisory team to develop a comprehensive understanding of all communications and events of interest. Mr. Schmitz is a recurring figure in witness testimony and documents produced to the Committee.

**Sam Nunberg:** Mr. Nunberg, a former Trump campaign aide who left in August 2015, may have important insight into the early workings of the campaign and any early communication with Russia, as well as information on individuals of interest to the Committee, including Roger Stone. Public reporting indicates that Mr. Nunberg may have knowledge of contact between Mr. Stone and WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange during the 2016 election, conversations which would be of great interest and relevance to the Committee's investigation.

**George Nader:** Mr. Nader, an adviser to Emirati crown prince Mohammed bin Zayed Al-Nahyan with ties to the Trump campaign and Administration, likely can provide information to the Committee about reported attempts by Trump associates to set up a secret backchannel with Russia during the presidential transition period. Mr. Nader reportedly was present in the Seychelles in January 2017 when Erik Prince attended a secret meeting with Kirill Dmitriev, the head of the Russian Direct Investment Fund, and during a December 2016 meeting with Emirati officials and Trump transition personnel which may have been a precursor to the Seychelles meeting.

**Marshall Billingslea:** Mr. Billingslea was a member of the Trump Administration transition landing team at the National Security Council, and expressed concerns about the extent of Michael Flynn’s contacts with specific Russian officials.

**Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI):** To ensure a full accounting of the FBI’s investigative work identifying and countering Russia’s election interference in 2016, and developments since, to include President Trump’s decision to fire FBI Director James Comey, it is imperative that the Committee interview key senior FBI officials. Among others, the Committee should interview **former FBI Director Comey**, who the Committee has not heard from since his termination; **former General Counsel James Baker**, who can address FBI’s internal deliberations and decision-making throughout 2016 and post-election; and **FBI Agent Peter Strzok**, who was involved in the Bureau’s counterintelligence investigation at key junctures.

**Dimitri Simes:** Mr. Simes serves as President and CEO of the Center for the National Interest, which hosted President Trump’s April 27, 2016 foreign policy speech at the Mayflower Hotel. The Committee is investigating matters related to the speech and communications that may have occurred at the event, and the Committee has reason to believe that Mr. Simes played a central role in drafting portions of the speech related to Russia. The Committee should also obtain relevant personal correspondence between Mr. Simes and Trump campaign officials and any individuals with direct or assumed links to the Russian government.

**Cleta Mitchell:** Ms. Mitchell, a partner at the law firm Foley & Lardner LLP, conducted work for the National Rifle Association (NRA) and may be able to clarify for the Committee any Russian-related approaches to and interaction with the organization and persons of interest to the Committee during the 2016 election.

**Paul Erickson:** According to public reports, Mr. Erickson emailed Trump campaign officials during the election claiming that Russia was “seeking a dialogue with the U.S.” and would use the NRA annual convention in 2016 to make “first contact.” Mr. Erickson may be able to provide insight into reported Russian-directed efforts throughout and possibly prior to 2016 to approach U.S. organizations and persons. He may also have insight into the actions of Alexander Torshin, a deputy governor of the Central Bank of Russia, and Maria Butina, reportedly a former assistant to Mr. Torshin, at the NRA convention.

**Maria Butina:** Public reports indicate Ms. Butina, previously an assistant to Alexander Torshin, sought to facilitate meetings with Trump campaign officials and between President Putin and candidate Trump during the election. Ms. Butina, who appears to have been active with the NRA in recent years within the U.S. reportedly has founded a Russian counterpart gun advocacy organization. She may be able to clarify for the Committee the origin and purpose of alleged Russian-directed efforts to approach U.S. organizations and persons connected to the Trump campaign throughout and prior to 2016. The Minority believes that it is important to request as a matter of record Ms. Butina’s cooperation even if she is not a U.S. citizen; however, she may be living in the United States.

**Johnny Yenason:** Mr. Yenason has been identified as a key individual connected to the NRA and the Russian organization “The Right to Bear Arms,” started by Maria Butina. Mr. Yenason reportedly knows Alexander Torshin and Ms. Butina and may be the person who connected these individuals with senior officials from the Trump campaign.

**Sergei Millian:** Mr. Millian, a naturalized American citizen who leads a group called the Russian-American Chamber of Commerce, declined to cooperate with the investigation unless he was granted immunity. The Minority informed the Majority on November 29, 2017, that it was open to engaging Mr. Millian to assess his concerns, but is not aware of any information to warrant the Committee granting Mr. Millian legal immunity. Consistent with the Committee’s approach with other unwilling witnesses, and absent compelling information that legal immunity may be warranted, the Committee should issue a subpoena for production and appearance if Mr. Millian remains unwilling to appear before the Committee on terms consistent with witness interviews to date and Committee rules.

**Natalia Veselnitskaya:** Ms. Veselnitskaya, the Russian attorney who met with Donald Trump Jr. and other campaign officials on June 9, 2016, ostensibly to provide the campaign “dirt” on its opponent, Hillary Clinton, has expressed willingness publicly to speak to congressional investigators and reportedly has responded in writing to questions from the Senate Judiciary Committee. However, she has never been invited to appear before the House Intelligence Committee. The Committee therefore should engage Ms. Veselnitskaya to determine her willingness to provide testimony about key events of interest.

**Roman Beniaminov:** The Committee has reason to believe that Mr. Beniaminov had prior knowledge of the purpose of the June 9, 2016 Trump Tower meeting with Donald Trump Jr. and that the Russian lawyer in attendance would be bringing “dirt” on Hillary Clinton. Press reports indicate that Mr. Beniaminov shared a business address in New Jersey with Emin Agalarov, who was involved in planning the June 9 meeting.

**Bijan Kian:** Mr. Kian is an Iranian-American who was a partner at the Flynn Intel Group and reportedly was involved in the firm’s lobbying efforts as well as work on behalf of Inovo BV, a Netherlands-based firm owned by Turkish-American businessman Ekim Alptekin. Flynn Intel Group reportedly filed paperwork under the Foreign Agents Registration Act acknowledging that work done for Inovo BV “could be construed to have principally benefitted the Republic of Turkey.” Inovo BV reportedly paid Flynn Intel Group \$530,000 to investigate Fethullah Gulen, a U.S.-resident cleric who is wanted by the Turkish government. The Minority seeks to question Mr. Kian about this and other activities of relevance to the Committee’s investigation.

**Simona Mangiante:** Ms. Mangiante recently married George Papadopoulos. In response to a Trump campaign adviser who described Mr. Papadopoulos’s role in the campaign as that of a “coffee boy,” Ms. Mangiante publicly disputed this characterization and defended his cooperation with the Special Counsel. She stated that Mr. Papadopoulos had communicated with high level campaign

officials, including Stephen Bannon and Michael Flynn, and that Mr. Papadopoulos helped to organize a meeting between candidate Trump and Egyptian President el-Sisi through a connection he had at the Egyptian embassy – a claim that is consistent with other information provided to the Committee. Ms. Mangiante may have further information about Mr. Papadopoulos’s campaign role, which would be of interest to the Committee.

**John Szobocsan:** Mr. Szobocsan, Managing Director at Corporate Venture Alliances, LLC, has been identified as a substantive partner in Peter Smith’s effort to find, authenticate and disseminate Hillary Clinton’s “missing” emails, a focus area for the Committee’s investigation.

**Allen Garten:** As Counsel for the Trump Organization, Mr. Garten has been involved in a variety of matters of interest to the Committee and reportedly communicated directly with Donald Trump about them, including how to address publicly the June 9, 2016 meeting that Donald Trump Jr., Jared Kushner, and Paul Manafort held with a Russian delegation. The Committee should request Mr. Garten’s testimony and ask the Trump Organization to clarify the basis for and subject matter of any redaction from material it has produced to the Committee, and compel via subpoena the disclosure of relevant redacted information, if necessary.

**Alan Weisselberg:** Mr. Weisselberg serves as Chief Financial Officer of the Trump Organization and reportedly conducts due diligence on properties, and reviews leases on asset acquisitions and other deals with real estate firms that might be interested in marketing a property using the Trump name. Mr. Weisselberg will likely be able to shed light on the many attempts made by President Trump to secure a deal for a Trump Tower in Moscow.

**Mark Corallo:** According to Michael Wolff’s recent book, “Fire and Fury: Inside the Trump White House,” Mr. Corallo privately confided that he believed the meeting on Air Force One in which President Trump reportedly personally drafted the statement concerning his son’s June 9, 2016 meeting with Russian intermediaries likely amounted to obstruction of justice. The Minority seeks to determine the facts that form the basis for Mr. Corallo’s knowledge about the Air Force One incident and what led him reportedly to believe that the actions were obstructive.

**Deutsche Bank:** The Minority believes that it is imperative to request documents from Deutsche Bank (see Appendix C), via subpoena if necessary, and interview key members of the bank with insight into money transfers and other activity linked to Russia, including whether there is any Russian involvement in Deutsche Bank’s loans and other transactions that could be of relevance to the Committee’s investigation. The Committee should seek testimony from senior officials in Deutsche Bank’s Risk Division, including but not limited to the Group Risk Office and Credit Risk Management teams, who can speak to any due diligence conducted after the 2016 U.S. election, as well as from individuals in Deutsche Bank’s personal wealth management division, including **Rosemary Vrablic**, Managing Director and senior private banker of Deutsche Bank’s private wealth management business. The Minority seeks to determine the extent of the bank’s involvement with Donald Trump and whether

there is any Russian connection to loans made by the bank to the Trump Organization.

**Trump Campaign Digital Operation:** The Committee ought to interview all relevant persons involved or associated with the Trump campaign's digital operation to determine whether the campaign coordinated in any way with Russia in its digital program. The Committee will not be able to fully evaluate the campaign's digital operation without speaking to a broader cross-section of individuals who can provide greater insight into the digital operation's day-to-day activities or its relationship with Cambridge Analytica. The Committee also must interview individuals from other companies who conducted technology-related work on behalf of the Trump campaign or on behalf of other entities being funded through independent expenditures to gain a full picture of whether there was any coordination between Russia's extensive social media efforts on Trump's behalf and the campaign itself.

For example, **Avraham (Avi) Berkowitz**, served as Assistant Director of Data Analytics on the Trump Campaign. He was also an associate of Jared Kushner and Brad Parscale. The Committee has reason to believe that Mr. Kushner may have dispatched Mr. Berkowitz to meet with Russian Ambassador Kislyak in December 2016. **Theresa Hong**, who served as Digital Content Director for the Trump campaign, should also be asked to testify. Ms. Hong has spoken to the press about the campaign's digital operation and her team's work alongside Cambridge Analytica.

**Cambridge Analytica:** Cambridge Analytica produced initial documents in response to the Committee's production request and the Committee interviewed CEO Alexander Nix by video-teleconference. This impractical arrangement was decided unilaterally by the Majority, despite Mr. Nix acknowledging during the interview that he travels regularly to the United States and would have been open to an in-person interview. In light of Mr. Nix's testimony, information that has come to light about the company's role in supporting the Trump campaign's digital operation, and his company's effort to acquire Wikileaks' database of hacked emails related to Hillary Clinton, it is imperative to interview a broader range of individuals employed by or linked to Cambridge Analytica. This includes key investor **Rebekah Mercer**; Chief Data Officer **Alex Taylor**; and **Julian Wheatland**, Chairman of Cambridge Analytica's parent company SCL Group. The Committee would also benefit by hearing from individuals responsible for campaign embed teams, and those at Cambridge Analytica headquarters to whom they reported, as well as leadership in the Political Affairs, Digital, and Product offices.

**Darren Blanton:** Mr. Blanton, founder and managing director of Colt Ventures, served as a transition advisor and reportedly met frequently with Stephen Bannon during the campaign. Mr. Blanton may be able to provide insight into reporting related to technology and social media-focused contracts with the Trump campaign that are of interest to congressional investigators.

**Jon Iadonisi:** Mr. Iadonisi and VizSense Inc. are reported to have conducted social-media work for the Trump campaign, and Mr. Iadonisi's White Canvas

Group reportedly undertook Turkey-related work related to Mr. Flynn, both areas of focus for the Committee's investigation.

**Aaron Nevins:** Mr. Nevins is a Florida political operative and blogger who reportedly messaged Guccifer 2.0 requesting hacked emails. Guccifer 2.0 reportedly replied by sending Mr. Nevins stolen Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee emails.

**National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS):** The Department of Homeland Security reported on September 22, 2016 that it had notified 21 states affected by the Russian hack of elections systems during the 2016 election. The Committee should engage the NASS and interview relevant individuals from their Executive Board and/or Elections Committee to understand how each state was affected by the 2016 attack, and to better understand how they are preparing for elections in 2018 and beyond.

**CrowdStrike:** The Committee needs to speak with two CrowdStrike employees who provided direct support to the DNC and interfaced with the FBI. These additional witnesses may be able to provide first-hand, technical insight into CrowdStrike's forensic examination of the DNC's servers and activity by Russian hackers.

## **Appendix C: Document Requests**

**Deutsche Bank:** Given public statements from the Trump Organization about the centrality of Russian investment in their holdings, Deutsche Bank’s history of laundering Russian money, and allegations that Russia may exert financial influence over the President, the Committee must request documents and hear testimony from Deutsche Bank, via subpoena if necessary, to evaluate allegations about money transfers and other activity linked to Russia and whether there is any Russian involvement in Deutsche Bank’s loans and other transactions with the Trump Organization; Paul Manafort and Rick Gates, along with any Manafort-linked entities; and other persons of interest to the Committee. In addition to required testimony, as outlined in Appendix B above, the Committee should specifically request documents from Deutsche Bank’s **Risk Division**, including but not limited to the **Group Risk Office** and **Credit Risk Management** teams and with regard to any due diligence undertaken vis-à-vis Trump transactions after the election, as well as from individuals in Deutsche Bank’s personal wealth management division, including Rosemary Vrablic, who may have knowledge of transactions and other activity of interest to the Committee.

**General Services Administration (GSA):** In a December 16, 2017 letter to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, a law and crisis management firm writing on behalf of Trump for America, Inc. (TFA) (the entity formed for the purpose of President Trump’s transition) asserted that the GSA “unlawfully produced TFA’s private materials, including privileged communications, to the Special Counsel’s Office,” which, in turn, reportedly has used these records extensively in interviews, “including portions that are susceptible to claims of privilege.”

The Special Counsel’s Office disputed the accusation, noting: “When we have obtained emails in the course of our ongoing criminal investigation, we have secured either the account owner’s consent or appropriate criminal process.” GSA also responded to press inquiries to clarify that GSA informed transition team members that, by using devices provided by GSA, materials “would not be held back in any law enforcement” requests. The TFA allegation against the Special Counsel and GSA raises deep concern that TFA may have in fact withheld from the Committee, potentially on unspecified privilege claims not recognized by Congress, responsive material that is relevant to the Committee’s investigation. The Minority therefore believes it is essential that the Committee request directly from GSA all transition-related holdings that were already shared with the Special Counsel’s Office to ensure that the Committee has access to the full scope of relevant material and can determine independently whether TFA improperly withheld material from the Committee pertinent to our investigation.

**Snapchat and Imgur:** Based on public reporting that the Russian disinformation campaign reached several social media platforms beyond Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube, we recommend sending document request letters to Snapchat and Imgur asking them to study the scope and scale of the Russian campaign on their platforms. The Minority sent a document request on

March 7, 2018 to **Reddit** and **Tumblr**, which the Majority declined to join. We would further suggest that these companies coordinate with Twitter and Facebook in particular to share common markers and indicators of Russian activity. We would also recommend requesting a briefing from each of these companies alongside receipt of internal data and research relevant to the Committee's investigation.

**Facebook, Twitter, and Google:** The Committee convened an open hearing with executives from Facebook, Twitter, and Google on November 1, 2017 to inform the American public of the companies' initial findings about Russia's weaponization of social media prior to and during the 2016 U.S. elections.

As these companies have acknowledged, they and other technology companies need to conduct more extensive forensic investigation of their platforms to map out the entire network of covert personas and accounts that Russia deployed; how Russia amplified fake pages and accounts, including through paid advertising; and how Russian disinformation spread within and across platforms. The Committee, in parallel, must investigate how Russian disinformation spread beyond social media to infiltrate press reporting and public debate; whether and how the presidential campaigns used or were harmed by this covert influence operation; and propose policy and legislative changes that can help guard against future foreign government weaponization of technology platforms.

The Committee should therefore send all three companies follow-up letters requesting: (1) that these and other technology companies affected by the Russian influence campaign pool resources and conduct a joint investigation into the full scope and depth of the Russian influence campaign; and (2) that each company publish online an easily accessible and searchable public repository available to the entire online community of all content linked to malign Russian actors and identified as such.

**Kushner Companies and Observer Media:** As noted in Appendix B, the Committee should seek, in advance of a second interview, Jared Kushner's voluntary cooperation to produce, or compel via subpoena if necessary, additional material responsive to the Committee's parameters, which the Committee has reason to believe remains in Mr. Kushner's personal possession or in the possession of **Kushner Companies, Observer Media, and any other relevant entities** under Mr. Kushner's ownership or direction.

This request follows the Committee's September 29, 2017 request of Mr. Kushner's attorney, to which he never responded, for clarification regarding all of the specific email addresses Mr. Kushner used during the course of the campaign as well as the presidential transition, including personal or business email accounts (such as Kushner Companies and the Observer publication); the search methodology, including the specific search terms, used to identify documents responsive to the Committee's investigation; all messaging applications that Mr. Kushner used during the campaign as well as the presidential transition, including but not limited to SMS, iMessage, Whatsapp, Facebook Messenger, Signal, Slack, Instagram, and Snapchat; the scope of the search conducted on these messaging platforms, including the date range and search criteria; and whether Mr. Kushner or his attorneys have identified

responsive exchanges on these messaging platforms, including with individuals linked directly or indirectly with President Trump’s presidential campaign and transition, including individuals involved in assisting the campaign’s digital and online activity, as well as with any foreign nationals linked directly or indirectly to foreign governments, to include the Russian Federation.

**Bayrock Group:** Founded by Tefvik Arif, Bayrock Group employed Felix Sater as Chief Operating Officer and was involved in several Trump-branded properties of interest to the Committee. The Committee should request documents from the company to help clarify Bayrock’s financial dealings, including with Russia, as well as Mr. Sater’s activities.

**Estate of Peter Smith:** The Committee must send a production letter to the estate of Peter Smith. The Committee has thus far only interviewed a small number of individuals tied to Mr. Smith’s effort to solicit assistance from actors on the dark web, including possibly Russian individuals, to acquire “missing” emails linked to Clinton, and has reason to believe that Mr. Smith was, in fact, in contact with the Trump campaign.

**KLS Research LLC:** The Committee should also send a letter to the LLC formed by Peter Smith to facilitate his operation to find and disseminate Hillary Clinton’s “missing” emails.

**Colt Ventures:** As explained in Appendix B, the Committee should seek documents from Darren Blanton and his company Colt Ventures, which the Trump campaign reportedly contracted for “data management services” and is an investor in VizSense, a social-media company reported to have conducted work on behalf of the campaign and Michael Flynn.

**VizSense Inc. and White Canvas Group:** As explained in Appendix B, the Committee should also seek documents from VizSense Inc. and White Canvas Group, both of which are tied to Michael Flynn associate Jon Iadonisi. VizSense is reported to have conducted social-media work for the Trump campaign and Mr. Flynn’s firm, while White Canvas Group reportedly undertook Turkey-related work for Mr. Flynn.

**Russian-American Chamber of Commerce in the USA:** In advance of interviewing Sergei Millian (see Appendix B), the Committee should also request documents from the organization he founded, the Russian-American Chamber of Commerce in the USA.

**DMP International LLC:** The Committee should request documents from DMP International LLC, which Paul Manafort listed in his Foreign Agents Registration Act disclosures. In his disclosures, DMP International LLC describes \$17.1 million in receipts from Ukraine’s pro-Russian Party of Regions, for a net total of \$13.2 million from the Ukrainian political party. This information is important for the Committee to review in light of several indictments of Paul Manafort secured by the Special Counsel.

**Cendyn:** Cendyn is a cloud computing company that hosted the Trump Organization and may be able to shed light on allegations that the Trump

Organization and Russia-based Alfa Bank shared a data link that transmitted large volumes of data during the election. The Minority asks that the Committee send Cendyn a document production letter, to include a request for underlying data that can help the Committee evaluate these allegations.

**Bridges LLC:** Bridges LLC is a limited liability company reportedly begun by Paul Erickson and Maria Butina (see Appendix B) in South Dakota. Given Mr. Erickson and Ms. Butina’s attempt to facilitate a meeting between Donald Trump and Vladimir Putin through their connection to the National Rifle Association, we recommend seeking records relative to any donations made to the NRA during the campaign, in particular to determine whether foreign money was funneled to the organization to support the candidate Trump.

**Right to Bear Arms:** Right to Bear Arms is a Moscow-based entity begun by Maria Butina and Alexander Torshin (see above). We suggest requesting records related to meetings between this group and Trump Campaign associates, and records related to any funding provided to the National Rifle Association during the campaign.

**Center for Political and Foreign Affairs:** Founded by Fabien Bausser, the Paris-based organization helped coordinate Donald Trump Jr.’s October 2016 visit to Paris, during the final stretch of the presidential election. Bausser and his spouse, Randa Kassis, the president and founder of the group “Movement of the Pluralistic Society” with acknowledged ties to Russian officials, hosted Mr. Trump’s Paris trip, which is of investigative interest to the Committee, including with whom he met while on his trip and at whose financial expense. The Committee should request relevant documents from the Center for Political and Foreign Affairs, Kassis’ Movement of the Pluralistic Society, and from Bausser and Kassis to help clarify the purpose of and details surrounding Mr. Trump’s visit at the height of the campaign.

**Ritz Carlton:** The Committee should send Ritz Carlton a request for records relating to Donald Trump’s 2013 visit to Moscow, which can help clarify outstanding questions about the Miss Universe pageant and Donald Trump’s stay in Moscow.

**Four Seasons Hotels and Resorts:** The Committee should request from Four Seasons Hotels and Resorts relevant records regarding the Four Seasons Resort Seychelles, which can help clarify outstanding questions about meetings held at the hotel in January 2017 involving Erik Prince and Kirill Dmitriev, the CEO of the Russian Direct Investment Fund, the Russian government’s sovereign wealth fund.

**ACU Strategic Partners:** The Committee should request document production from ACU Strategic Partners, including correspondence between Alex Copson and Michael Flynn (see Appendix B).

## **Appendix D: Compulsory Process**

**Donald Trump Jr.:** In his December 6, 2017 voluntary interview, Donald Trump Jr. asserted attorney-client privilege to avoid testifying about the substance of communications with his father in 2017. These conversations pertain to important matters under investigation. It is the Minority's view that this assertion of privilege, invoked based on Trump and Trump Jr. having attorneys present for at least one phone call, is meritless and merely an effort to shield non-privileged direct communications between father and son on matters unrelated to seeking, obtaining, or providing legal assistance from counsel. The Committee should approve a subpoena to compel Trump Jr. to disclose the substance of communications with his father.

**Michael Cohen:** In light of information the Committee has become aware of since the Committee's October 24, 2017 interview of Mr. Cohen, including new testimony and documents produced to the Committee, the Committee must conduct a follow-on interview with Mr. Cohen. In particular, the Committee should compel Mr. Cohen's production of all documents and communications related to the 2015-2016 Trump Tower Moscow Letter of Intent signed by then-candidate Trump, as well as travel, phone, and transaction records and other documents to verify his denials of claims that he met with Russian officials during the campaign.

**Jared Kushner:** The Committee interviewed Mr. Kushner on July 25, 2017. The Committee has learned a great deal about the Trump campaign's activities with respect to Russia since Mr. Kushner's initial interview. The Committee should bring Mr. Kushner back, via subpoena if necessary, for a follow-up interview to discuss several matters requiring additional inquiry, including activities relating to Michael Flynn, George Papadopoulos, Cambridge Analytica, his June 9, 2019 Trump Tower meeting, contact with foreigners of interest, and his professional business dealings and loans which may have connections to Russia.

**Corey Lewandowski:** Mr. Lewandowski, Trump's first campaign manager, refused during his March 8, 2018 interview—his second appearance before the Committee—to answer questions regarding his communication with President Trump regarding former FBI Director Comey, Special Counsel Mueller, and Attorney General Sessions, as well as his communications with certain administration officials pertaining to the June 9, 2016 meeting at Trump Tower. A subpoena is necessary to compel Mr. Lewandowski's cooperation.

**Stephen Bannon:** One of the Russia investigation's few, bipartisan subpoenas was issued to Mr. Bannon, whom the White House had barred from answering relevant questions based on an expansive claim of executive privilege that extends into the transition period and continues after Mr. Bannon left the White House. The White House has since permitted Mr. Bannon to answer only two dozen scripted, yes-or-no questions, while prohibiting him from answering a wide range of other questions related to the transition, his tenure at the White House, and even his communications since leaving the administration. The Committee should therefore initiate a contempt process to compel the White House to permit Mr. Bannon to testify to Congress fully and without constraints.

**Hope Hicks:** Unlike with Stephen Bannon, the Majority refused to issue a subpoena to compel Ms. Hicks' testimony after the White House barred her, without formally invoking executive privilege, from answering questions related to various transition matters and her tenure in the Trump Administration. This double standard is inexplicable. The Committee must issue a subpoena and, if necessary, move to initiate contempt proceedings to compel the White House to permit Ms. Hicks to testify to Congress fully and without constraints. The subpoena should also compel production of any relevant materials produced by Hicks, including any notes she may have taken regarding events of interest.

**Jefferson Beauregard Sessions III:** In his November 30, 2017 interview, Attorney General Sessions refused to answer questions from the Committee that pertained to his conversations with President Trump about Russia's interference and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Special Counsel's Russia investigations, including whether President Trump ever instructed AG Sessions to take any action to frustrate or obstruct the Russia investigation under the Department of Justice's purview. It is in the Committee and Congress' strong interest to compel AG Sessions's testimony on this matter to clarify whether and to what extent President Trump or his associates have sought to place undue pressure on the DOJ or FBI for political ends.

**Erik Prince:** In light of recent press reports that call into question Mr. Prince's November 30, 2017 testimony, Mr. Prince should be compelled to reappear before the Committee. Moreover, Mr. Prince produced to the Committee immediately prior to his November 30, 2017 testimony less than 25 pages of documentation of little to no relevance to the Committee's investigation. He did not produce any records related to his interaction with the Trump Organization or campaign, including with any persons who may be linked to the Russian government or companies. He also did not produce any material related to his travel to the Seychelles, including information that can shed light on the purpose of his visit, his meetings and discussions while there, and any follow-up since the visit. The Committee should issue a subpoena with specific instructions to Mr. Prince and to his company, **Frontier Services Group**, to compel production of responsive material to the Committee, which the Minority has reason to believe is in Mr. Prince and/or his company's possession.

**Randolph "Randy" Credico:** Mr. Credico, who Roger Stone identified publicly as his intermediary with Julian Assange and WikiLeaks, informed the Committee on November 20, 2017, via his attorney, that he declined to participate in a voluntary, transcribed interview. On December 12, 2017, pursuant to a late November 2017 Committee subpoena, Mr. Credico's attorney informed the Committee that Mr. Credico would assert his 5th Amendment rights and decline to answer any questions. The Committee should explore with Special Counsel whether he has any prosecutorial equities that would preclude providing immunity and requiring Mr. Credico to answer our questions.

**Lee Stranahan:** Employed by Russian outlet Sputnik, Mr. Stranahan never responded to the Committee's May 9, 2017 interview and production letter, which the Committee sent electronically. The Committee should issue Mr. Stranahan a subpoena for production and appearance.

**Twitter:** Per Majority and Minority consultation with the House’s Office of General Counsel in mid-September 2017, and the Minority’s renewed request on October 16, 2017, the Committee should issue a subpoena to Twitter to produce Direct Messages from and between the Twitter handles identified as relevant to this investigation, including those of Guccifer 2.0, WikiLeaks, and Julian Assange. Twitter, in response to the Committee’s June 29, 2017 request for voluntary cooperation, stated it could not comply with the Committee’s request absent compulsory process.

**WhatsApp:** The Committee should likewise issue a subpoena to WhatsApp for messages exchanged between key witnesses of interest.

**Apple:** The Committee should seek records reflecting downloaded encrypted messaging apps for certain key individuals.

**White House:** After firing FBI Director James Comey on May 9, 2017, President Trump tweeted on May 12, 2017: “James Comey better hope that there are no “tapes” of our conversations before he starts leaking to the press!” On June 9, 2017, the Committee sent White Counsel Donald McGahn a letter requesting that, “the White House inform the Committee if there exist now, or at any time have existed, any recordings, memoranda, or other documents within the possession of the White House which memorialized conversations between President Donald J. Trump and former FBI Director James Comey.” On June 23, 2017, the Committee received a response letter from the Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs referring the Committee to “President Trump’s June 22, 2017, statement regarding this matter” as its official response. The letter quotes in full the President’s statement that was made in the form of successive tweets on Twitter, in which the President stated that he has “no idea whether there are ‘tapes’ or recordings” of his conversations with James Comey and that the President “did not make” and does “not have any such recordings.”

On June 29, 2017 the Committee sent the White House a second bipartisan letter urging the White House to appropriately and fully comply with the Committee’s June 9 request and clarifying that, should the White House not respond fully, “the Committee will consider using compulsory process to ensure a satisfactory response.” The Committee made clear that the President’s statement on Twitter, and the White House’s letter referring to the President’s statement, were only partially responsive to the Committee’s request. By only referring to the President’s statement, the White House’s letter did not clarify for the Committee whether the White House has any responsive recordings, memoranda, or other documents.

The White House responded that same day—June 29, 2017—stating: “To clarify, the White House’s previous response to your letter advising you that the White House has no recordings, together with the President’s public statements on the matter, constitute our response to your request.” As the Minority made clear to the Majority at the time, the White House’s two responses are woefully inadequate and sidestep the Committee’s explicit requests by not acknowledging or addressing (1) whether “recordings, memoranda, or other documents” at “any time have existed” within the “possession of the White House which

memorialized conversations between President Donald J. Trump and former FBI Director James Comey”; and (2) whether any memoranda or other documents “exist now” in the White House’s possession memorializing the same.

The Minority has a good faith reason to believe that the White House does in fact possess such documentation memorializing President Trump’s conversations with Director Comey. Subsequent press reporting revealed the existence of a memorandum reportedly composed by President Trump and Stephen Miller that referenced President Trump’s communications with Director Comey. The Committee should subpoena to the White House to produce all responsive documents.

**Phone and Other Communication Records:** The Trump Organization and Donald Trump Jr. have produced records that redact phone metadata related to communications with specific phone numbers. Based on the timing of these calls, the Committee must determine whether some of these calls may be between Trump Jr. and Donald J. Trump, including calls concerning the Trump Tower meeting. The Committee should therefore request, via compulsory process if necessary, that the Trump Organization disclose to the Committee the phone numbers that have been redacted and produce, if applicable, any other call records between Trump Jr. and Donald J. Trump during key periods during the election and transition, and since the inauguration.

## Supplement II –

### The Comey Memos

#### RYBICKI, JAMES E. (DO) (FBI)

From: COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)  
Sent: Saturday, January 07, 2017  
To: MCCABE, ANDREW G. (DO); BAKER, JAMES A. (OGC) (FBI);  
RYBICKI, JAMES E. (DO) (FBI)  
Cc: COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)  
Subject: My notes from private session with PE on 1/6/17

What follows are notes I typed in the vehicle immediately upon exiting Trump Tower on 1/6/17. Although I wrote this less than five minutes after the meeting and have tried to use actual words spoken, including quoting directly in some places, I have not used quotation marks throughout because my purpose was to capture the substance of what was said. I am not sure of the proper classification here so have chosen SECRET. Please let me know of it should be higher or lower than that.

Notes begin here:

During my briefing on the [REDACTED] material in the main body of the meeting, I mentioned the derog files on [REDACTED] I said we were doing that.

At the conclusion of our session, the COS asked whether there is anything we haven't mentioned that they should know or that might come out. I said there was something that Clapper wanted me to speak to the PE alone or in a very small group. COS asked whether the group of COS, VPL, and PE was okay or whether I wanted to be alone. I told him it was up to the PL. who quickly said that he and I would meet alone.

After others left the room, we sat at the table. He began by telling me that I had had one heck of a year but that I had conducted myself honorably and had a great reputation. He said I was repeatedly put in impossible positions. He said you saved her and then they hated you for what you did later, but what choice did you have? He said he thought very highly of me and looked forward to working with me, saying he hoped I planned to stay on. I assured him I intended to stay. He said good.

I then executed the session exactly as I had planned. I told him that I wanted to meet with him to tell him more about what is in the reports written by [REDACTED] although I didn't use that name). I said that the written reports themselves were [REDACTED] and the content know at IC senior level and that I didn't want him caught cold by some of the detail. I then explained that the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I said, the Russians allegedly had tapes involving him and prostitutes at the Presidential Suite at the Ritz Carlton in Moscow from about 2013. He interjected, “there were no prostitutes; there were never prostitutes.” He then said something about him being the kind of guy who didn’t need to “go there” and laughed (which I understood to be communicating that he didn’t need to pay for sex). He said “2013” to himself, as if trying to remember that period of time, but didn’t add anything. He said he always assumed that hotel rooms he stayed in when he travels are wired in some way. I replied that I do as well.

I said I wasn’t saying this was true, only that I wanted him to know both that it had been reported and that the reports were in many hands. I said media like CNN had them and were looking for a news hook. I said that it was important that we not give them an excuse to write that the FBI has the material or [REDACTED] and that we were keeping it very close-hold. He said he couldn’t believe they hadn’t gone with it. I said it was inflammatory stuff that they would get killed for reporting straight up from the source reports.

He then started talking about all the women who had falsely accused him of grabbing or touching them (with particular mention of a ‘stripper’ who said he grabbed her) and gave me the sense that he was defending himself to me. I responded that we were not investigating him and the stuff might be totally made up but it was being said out of Russia and our job was to protect the President from efforts to coerce him. I said we try to understand what the Russians are doing and what they might do. I added that I also wanted him to know this in case it came out in the media.

He said he was grateful for the conversation, said more nice things about me and how he looks forward to working with me and we departed the room.

JBC

1/28/17

I had dinner with President Trump in the Green Room at the White House last night at 6:30 pm. We sat facing each other at a small oval table set for two and placed in the center of the room. There were two servers (who I had the chance to chat with a bit because I arrived about 10 minutes early; they were both retired Navy submariners and we had a fun discussion about height clearance in submarines). The servers were only in the room when they delivered food or retrieved plates.

The conversation, which was pleasant at all times, was chaotic, with topics touched, left then returned to later, making it very difficult to recount in a linear fashion. Normally I can recall the pieces of a conversation and the order of discussion with high confidence. Here, given the nature of it, there is a distinct possibility that, while I have the substance right, the order was slightly different. It really was conversation-as-jigsaw-puzzle in a way, with the pieces picked, then discarded, then returned to.

The President spoke an overwhelming majority of the time. He never asked me an open-ended question or left it to me to choose a topic of conversation. There were almost no periods of silence during the 1 hour and 20 minutes, except once or twice when the President paused as the servers entered. I felt comfortable throughout, although never relaxed, given the focus conversation required.

At various times, he talked about the inauguration and crowd size, the campaign and his effective use of free media (“earned media”), the extraordinary luxury of the White House (which he favorably compared to Mar-a-lago), his many activities during the day and week, his young son’s height, the viciousness of the campaign (where I interjected about Adams and Jefferson: he said he had been given a book about it, which was upstairs), how he had not been mocking a handicapped reporter, had not assaulted any of the women who claimed he did (reviewing in detail several of the allegations), and many other things. I will attempt to recount in some detail only those parts that related in some way to my work.

He touched on my future at various points. The first time he asked “so what do you want to do,” explaining that lots of people wanted my job (“about 20 people”), that he thought very highly of me and had heard great things, that the people of the FBI really like me, but he would understand if I wanted to walk away given all I had been through, although he thought that would be bad for me personally because it would look like I had done something wrong, that he of course can make a change at FBI if he wants, but he wants to know what I think. There was no acknowledgment by him (or me) that we had already talked about this twice.

I responded by saying that he could fire me any time he wished, but that I wanted to stay and do a job I love and think I am doing well. I explained that I never expected to be back in government but had found this job hugely rewarding and wanted to serve out my term. I added that I was “reliable” in one way but not in the way political people sometimes use the term. I explained that he could count on me to always tell him the truth. I said I don’t do sneaky

things, I don't leak, I don't do weasel moves. But I was not on anybody's side politically and could not be counted on in that traditional political sense, which I said I thought was in the president's best interest. He asked whether the FBI leaks and I answered that of course in an organization of 36,000 we were going to have some of that, but I said I think the FBI leaks far less than people say. I predicted he, like all Presidents, would discover the entire government leaks like crazy and explained that it often comes from the first or second hop out from those actually working on the sensitive thing.

He replied that he needed loyalty and expected loyalty. I did not reply, or even nod or change my facial expression, which he noted because we came back to it later.

The conversation then swerved into a long discussion of the email investigation (which we returned to at least once more). This was where I spoke the most and laid out for him my thinking (with frequent interruption) in a manner similar to my discussions with Senators Feinstein and Grassley during our one-on-ones. The one detail I added was about the AG directing me not to use the word "investigation."

He knew the sequence of events extremely well, breaking them down in his lexicon into Comey One, Comey Two, and Comey Three developments and he walked through how he saw each played out during the campaign, in great detail. He asked whether it was true "there was a revolt" after Comey One. I said that was nonsense and I had worked hard to see if folks has concerns. I added that I surely didn't need to tell him that the media sometimes gets stuff wrong. I explained that the investigators all agreed there was no case; he said he disagreed and thought there was a case. He asked me at several points how I had held up under all the abuse. I explained the freedom comes from doing the right thing in the right way, surrounded by people who are helping make the decisions in the same way.

At this point he asked me (and asked again later) whether "your guy McCabe" has a problem with me, explaining that "I was pretty rough on him and his wife during the campaign." I explained that Andy was a true professional and had no problem at all. I then explained what FBI people are like, that whatever there personal views, they strip them when they step into their bureau roles and actually hold "political people" in slight contempt, without regard to party.

At about this point, he asked me to compare AG Holder and AG Lynch. I said I thought AG Holder was smarter and more sophisticated and smoother than AG Lynch, who I added is a good person. He said Holder and President Obama were quite close. I replied that they were and it illustrated, in my view, a mistake Presidents make over and over again. Because they reason that problems for a President often come from Justice, they try to bring Justice close, which paradoxically makes things worse because an independent DOJ and FBI are better for a President and the country. I listed off John Mitchell, Ed Meese, an Al Gonzales as examples of this mistake and he added Bobby Kennedy.

At about this point, he turned to what he called the "golden showers thing" and recounted much of what he had said previously on that topic. He repeated that it

was a complete fabrication and “fake news.” I explained again why I had thought it important that he know about it. I also explained that one of the reasons we told him was that the media, CNN in particular, was telling us they were about to run with it. He said it bothered him if his wife thought there was even a one percent chance it was true in any respect. He said he had spoken to people who had been on the Miss Universe trip with him and reminded him that he didn’t stay over night in Russia for that. He said he arrived in the morning, did events, then showered and dressed for the pageant at the hotel (he didn’t say the hotel name) and left for the pageant. Afterwards, he returned only to get his things because they departed for New York by plane that same night. He said he thought maybe he should ask me to investigate the whole thing to prove it was a lie. I did not ask any questions. I replied that it was up to him, but I wouldn’t want to create a narrative that we were investigating him, because we are not and I worried such a thing would be misconstrued. I also said that it is very difficult to disprove a lie. He said “maybe you’re right,” but several times asked me to think about it and said he would also think about it.

We returned to the topic of my job and in response to his question I explained how I had ended up with the position and that I had been pleasantly surprised that President Obama thought of the role the way I did: He wanted competence and independence and didn’t want the FBI involved in policy. He wanted to be able to sleep at night knowing the FBI was well run.

The President then spoke again about being glad I wanted to stay. He said Mattis said great things about me, as did Sessions. He explained he had asked a lot of people about me and heard great things. He then returned to loyalty, saying “I need loyalty.” I replied that he would always get honesty from me. He paused and said that’s what he wants, “honest loyalty.” I replied “you will get that from me.” (It is possible we understood that phrase differently, but I chose to understand it as consistent with what I had said throughout the conversation: I will serve the President with loyalty to the office, the country, and the truth. I decided it would not be productive to push the subject further.)

About this point he asked about “your guy McCabe” and whether he was “going to be okay.” I again affirmed Andy’s ability and professionalism and said the President would come to see and benefit from both.

He then asked who I thought I should “deal with” and he suggested Reince Priebus. I explained that in the prior administration my WH contacts were with the COS, or the people in Mike Flynn’s job and Tom Bossert’s job. He said “Reince doesn’t know we are having dinner,” but he will tell him and that I should deal with Reince. He then went on to explain that he has serious reservations about Mike Flynn’s judgment and illustrated with a story from that day in which the President apparently discovered during his toast to Teresa May that ██████████ had called four days ago. Apparently, as the President was toasting PM May, he was explaining that she had been the first to call him after his inauguration and Flynn interrupted to say that ██████████ had called (first, apparently). It was then that the President learned of ██████████ call and he confronted Flynn about it (not clear whether that was in the moment or after the lunch with PM May). Flynn said the return call was scheduled for Saturday, which prompted a heated reply from

the President that six days was not an appropriate period of time to return a call from the [REDACTED] of a country like [REDACTED] (“This isn’t [REDACTED] we are talking about”). He said that if he called [REDACTED] and didn’t get a return call for six days he would be upset. In telling the story, the President pointed his fingers at his head and said, “the guy has serious judgment issues.” I did not comment at any point during this topic and there was no mention or acknowledgment of any FBI interest in or contact with General Flynn.

As we got up, he said we should have my family back for dinner. When I didn’t reply, he added, “or a tour, whatever you think is appropriate,” As we stepped from the Green Room, he said “Reince knows were are having dinner” (the opposite of what he said earlier) “deal with him: I will tell him.” He then walked me into the East Room. I said I been there before when President Obama held a big dinner for senior staff and appointees around Christmas. We then shook hands and parted.

JBC

*JBC 1/28/17*

I went to the White House today for a 4 pm “meet and greet” with COS Reince Priebus. As I walked in from West Exec, I saw and briefly chatted with Bill Priestap and Jen Boone, who were there to do a defensive briefing [REDACTED].

As I waited in the West Wing lobby, Mike Flynn stopped by and sat down. We chatted for about five minutes about his new job, the challenges in building a staff, and working with folks who had never been in government before, how he maintains fitness, etc. There was no mention of by either of us of [REDACTED].

COS Priebus’s assistant came and got me and took me to his office. He greeted me and we sat with his desk between us. He explained that this was a chance to get acquainted, and he guided the conversation in a variety of directions.

Early in our conversation he brought of the immigration order and asked if I was a lawyer. He asked if I agreed that the order appear facially valid. I said I did, as I believed OLC had; the President has broad authority in the area. I added that because immigration was not an FBI issue, I had not followed the court discussion carefully and did not know what considerations there might be beyond the face of the order.

We touched on a variety of subjects, including “how the [REDACTED] ended up in the report.” I explained that the analysts from all three agencies agreed it was relevant and that portions of the material were corroborated by other intelligence. They discussed whether [REDACTED] and decided it made most sense to [REDACTED]. I said I agreed with that decision and thought it very important that it be included and briefed to a select audience. He pressed again and said that the material was [REDACTED]. I explained that the primary source [REDACTED] much of it was consistent with and corroborative of other intelligence, and that the incoming president needed to know the rest of it was out there.

I explained to him that at our dinner the President had expressed interest in having me investigate the Golden Showers thing. I repeated what I had told the President about not wanting to create a narrative that we were investigating him.

He then asked about leaks of the fact of [REDACTED] and that it was briefed to the incoming president. I said I didn’t know where it came from but I suspect it came from folks who have left government. He asked whether it could have come from the FBI. I said it was possible but extremely unlikely in view. We talked about leaks in general and I explained my view that they almost always come from one or two hops out and that every president is plagued by them. He asked if we had ever caught an FBI leaker. I said we had, but it was a rare thing because it almost always turned on our willingness to go after reporter records. He then recalled the Obama administration conflict with James Rosen of Fox.

He then mentioned the leak of the read-outs of the Presidents calls with foreign leaders.

He then asked me if this was a “private conversation.” I replied that it was. He then said he wanted to ask me a question and I could decide whether it was appropriate to answer. He then asked, “Do you have a FISA order on Mike Flynn?” I paused for a few seconds and then said that I would answer here, but that this illustrated the kind of question that had to be asked and answered through established channels. I said the answer [REDACTED] I then explained that the normal channel was from DOJ leadership to the WH counsel about such things.

[REDACTED] I would normally make sure the AG and DAG were aware and they would likely inform the WH Counsel and he could decide whether to inform the COS. I explained that it was important that communications about any particular case go through that channel to protect us and to protect us and to protect the WH from any accusations of improper influence.

He said he understood and then asked me what I would talk to Denis McDonough about. I said two kinds of things: policy, like Going Dark, and particular operational issues if we were facing a terror threat or there was an intelligence operation that was sensitive. He would call me to cut through the clutter and find out directly what he needed to know. Reince responded that that was helpful and he hoped I would call him to offer thoughts whenever I thought they would benefit from them, whether not it related to the FBI. He said they would welcome the feedback. I said I would.

He said he understood my dinner with the President had gone very well and that he was interested in my staying on. I repeated what I had told the President, including that we had agreed not to announce anything. Reince asked me how it worked and I explained that I had a ten-year term and, although the President could fire me anytime he liked, I would just continue my term. There was nothing to announce.

During the conversation, Reince also touched the email investigation, offering his view that the Clinton team had misplayed my final announcement and should have pushed it harder as good news. He also said, reflectively, that it wasn't the Russians' fault that she failed to campaign in Michigan, and it wasn't my fault that she set up her email the way she did. He then pressed me on why it wasn't chargeable “gross negligence,” and I took him through the facts and the law. At some point I added that it also wasn't my fault the Huma Abedin forwarded emails to Anthony Weiner.

Reince then took me to the Oval Office to greet the President on my way out. The President was seated behind his desk, speaking to Sean Spicer. He introduced me to Mr. Spicer, who shook my hand and departed. Reince stayed, seated to my right as I sat in a chair facing the President.

The President then spoke about a variety of topics, touching on the email investigation (wondering aloud what it would have been like to run against Bernie Sanders if I had recommended charging Hillary Clinton). He asked (as

he had at our dinner) whether my deputy had a problem with him, and recounting how hard he had been on the campaign trail saying “the number 2 guy at the FBI took a million dollars from the Clintons.” I again explained that Andy McCabe was a pro. He asked whether he had ever mentioned to me the campaign attacks. I said “never,” and again explained he was a true pro and you would come to value him. I said if he had it to do over again I’m sure he would urge his wife not to run, but that the guy put everything aside and did his job well.

The President talked about the leak of the “read-outs” from his calls with Australia and Mexico, explaining that the leaks couldn’t have come from the “other side,” and he understood we were helping look into that. Reince interjected that “Kellogg” was looking at it and we were helping. I said I would follow up to find out what was going on.

The President brought up the “Golden Showers thing” and said it really bothered him if his wife had any doubt about it. He then explained, as he did at our dinner, that he hadn’t stayed overnight in Russia during the Miss Universe trip. Twice during this part of the conversation, Reince tried to interject a comment about the [REDACTED] and “why it was even in there,” but the President ignored him. The President said “the hookers thing” is nonsense but that Putin had told him “we have the most beautiful hookers in the world.” (He did not say when Putin had told him this and I don’t recall [REDACTED].

He then pivoted to the Russians wanting an apology from Bill O’Reilly. I said I had seen that and O’Reilly’s reply which was to “call him in 2023.” The President then said that O’Reilly’s question about whether he respected Putin had been a hard one.

[REDACTED] He said he does respect the leader of a major country and thought that was the best answer. He then said, “You think my answer was good right?” I said the answer was fine, except the part about killers, because we aren’t the kind of killers that Putin is. When I said this, the President paused noticeably. I don’t know what to make of it, but he clearly noticed I had directly criticized him.

The conversation then moved to other pleasantries and we wrapped up with a handshake.

*JBC*

JBC 2/8/2017

I attended an Oval office homeland threat briefing for the President today. The meeting was scheduled for 4 pm but was delayed by a prior meeting, which was apparently related to the ongoing litigation over the immigration executive order. The AG and Sec DHS were in the earlier meeting and remained in the Oval when my meeting began, at about 4:15.

There were about a dozen people in the Oval for the homeland session. I sat facing the President over the Resolute Desk in a semi-circle of chairs. DD/CIA sat to my left and D/NCTC to my right. Staff members occupied the couches and chairs behind me. Tom Bossert perched on the arm of a couch to steer the session. I noticed Jared Kushner and Stephen Bannon by face. Mike Dempsey and the VP's NSA were also there, and two or three others (I think including Reince Priebus).

At the completion of the session, the President thanked everyone and said he wanted to speak to me alone. The AG lingered momentarily by my chair, but the President thanked him and said he wanted to speak with Jim. He repeated this at least one more time to usher people out. Everyone left except Jared Kushner, who stopped by my chair to shake hands and exchange pleasantries, including a few brief words about the challenges of the email investigation. The President joined in this brief exchange but then told Mr. Kushner that he wanted to meet with me. That left the two of us alone.

He began by saying he wanted to "talk about Mike Flynn." He then said that, although Flynn "hadn't done anything wrong" in his call with the Russians (a point he made at least two more times in the conversation), he had to let him go because he misled the Vice President, whom he described as "a good guy." He explained that he just couldn't have Flynn misleading the Vice President and, in any event, he had other concerns about Flynn, and had a great guy coming in, so he had to let Flynn go.

He asked me if I had seen Sean Spicer's press briefing today and I replied that I hadn't. He said he had done a great job of explaining why they did what they did. He then asked if "you saw my Tweet this morning," and quickly added that "it is really about the leaks." He then reviewed in some detail the leaks of his calls with the leaders of Mexico and Australia, including how the calls had gone, how he assumed that calls he made on "this beautiful phone (touching the gray phone on the desk)" were confidential, how it couldn't have come from the Mexicans or Australians, how the transcripts actually include things he doesn't remember saying ("and they say I have one of the world's greatest memories"), and that it makes us look terrible to have these things leaking. He then referred at length to the leaks relating to Mike Flynn's call with the Russians, which he stressed was not wrong in any way ("he made lots of calls"), but that the leaks were terrible.

I tried to interject several times to agree with him about the leaks being terrible, but was unsuccessful. When he finished, I said I agreed very much that it was terrible that his calls with foreign leaders leaked. I said they were classified and he needed to be able to speak to foreign leaders in confidence. [NOTE: because this is an unclassified document, I will be limited in how I describe what I said next]. I then explained why leaks purporting to be about FBI intelligence

operations were also terrible and a serious violation of the law. I explained that the FBI gathers intelligence in part to equip the President to make decisions, and if people run around telling the press what we do, that ability will be compromised. I said I was eager to find leakers and would like to nail one to the door as a message. I said something about it being difficult and he replied that we need to go after the reporters, and referred to the fact that 10 or 15 years ago we put them in jail to find out what they know, and it worked. He mentioned Judy Miller by name. I explained that I was a fan of pursuing leaks aggressively but that going after reporters was tricky, for legal reasons and because DOJ tends to approach it conservatively. He replied by telling me to talk to "Sessions" and see what we can do about being more aggressive. I told him I would speak to the Attorney General.

At about this point, Reince Priebus opened the wall door by the clock and the President sent him away, saying he would be another minute or two and he knew people were waiting.

He then returned to the topic of Mike Flynn, saying that Flynn is a good guy, and has been through a lot. He misled the Vice President but he didn't do anything wrong in the call. He said, "I hope you can see your way clear to letting this go, to letting Flynn go. He is a good guy. I hope you can let this go." I replied by saying, "I agree he is a good guy," but said no more.

The President then wrapped up our conversation by returning to the issue of finding leakers. I said something about the value of putting a head on a pike as a message. He replied by saying it may involve putting reporters in jail. "They spend a couple days in jail, make a new friend, and they are ready to talk." I laughed as I walked to the door Reince Priebus had opened.

As I walked out the Vice President was standing just outside the door, waiting. We shook hands. There was a large group with him, including Priebus and the newly sworn-in Secretary of HHS, Tom Price. I walked through the group and away from the Oval office, went downstairs, and exited onto the West Executive Drive. On the way out downstairs, I saw John Kelly gathered with staff. I stopped to greet him and he told me he has previously accepted an invitation to speak to HRT at Quantico about leadership and wondered if it was still okay to do it. I said by all means; that would be great.

JBC  
2/14/17

*JBC 2/14/17*

**Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)**

From: James B. Comey  
Sent: Wednesday, March 01, 2017 12:06 PM  
To: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)  
Subject: Call from POTUS

Categories: D Followup

Just called to check in and see how I'm doing. I said I'm doing great, have a lot going on. I added that Jeff Sessions has hit the ground running with a great speech on violent crime. He talked about Sessions a bit, then last night's speech. Said he heard I'm doing great. Hopes I take good care of myself and come by to say hello when I'm at WH. That's it.

3/30/17

The President called me on my CMS phone at 8:13 am today (March 30, 1917). The call lasted 11 minutes (about 10 minutes when he was connected). We were connected by Royal Crown switchboard.

He began by joking that I was getting more publicity than he. I replied that I hate it. He then said he was trying to run the country and the cloud of this Russia business was making that difficult. He said he thinks he would have won the health care vote but for the cloud. He went on at great length, explaining that he has nothing to do with Russia (has a letter from the largest law firm in DC saying he has gotten no income from Russia). was not involved with hookers in Russia (can you imagine me. hookers? I have a beautiful wife and it has been very painful). is bringing a personal lawsuit against Christopher Steele. always advised people to assume they were being recorded in Russia. has accounts now from those who travelled with him to Miss Universe pageant that he didn't do anything, etc.

He asked what he could do to lift the cloud. I explained that we were running it down as quickly as possible and that there would be great benefit, if we didn't find anything, to our Good Housekeeping seal of approval, but we had to do our work. He agreed, but then returned to the problems this was causing him, went on at great length about how bad he was for Russia because of his commitment to more oil and more nukes (ours are 40 years old).

He said something about the hearing last week. I responded by telling him I wasn't there as a volunteer and he asked who was driving that, was it Nunes who wanted it? I said all the leadership wanted to know what was going on and mentioned that Grassley had even held up the DAG nominee to demand information. I said we had briefed the leadership on exactly what we were doing and who we were investigating.

I reminded him that I had told him we weren't investigating him and that I had told the Congressional leadership the same thing. He said it would be great if that could get out and several times asked me to find a way to get that out.

He talked about the guy he read about in the Washington Post today, (NOTE: I think he meant Sergei Millian) and said he didn't know him at all. He said that if there was "some satellite" (NOTE: I took this to mean some associate of his or his campaign) that did something. it would be good the find that out, but that he hadn't done anything and hoped I would I find a way to get out that we weren't investigating him.

As the conversation ended, he said that he hadn't brought up the McCabe thing because I had said he was an honorable guy (NOTE: I think he meant that he "hadn't brought it up" in this conversation, but he could have meant something else). I repeated that he was. He then said he hadn't brought it up but that McAuliffe is close to the Clintons and had given him money but I had said he was an honorable guy. I repeated that he (Andy) was an honorable person.

He finished by stressing that he was trying to make deals for the country, the cloud was hurting him (and mentioned going to G-7 with it hanging over him), and he hoped I could find a way to get out that he wasn't being investigated.

I told him I would see what we could do and that we would do the work well and as quickly as we could.

10:05; I called the Acting Attorney General and relayed the substance of the above and said I was telling him so he could decide what guidance to give me, if any.

JBC

*JBC 3/30/17*

I returned the president's call this morning at 8:26 am EDT. We spoke for about four minutes. He said he was following up to see if I did what he had asked last time – getting out that he personally is not under investigation. I replied that I had passed the request to the Acting AG and had not heard back from him. He spoke for a bit about why it was so important: He is trying to do work for the country, visit with foreign leaders, and any cloud, even a little cloud gets in the way of that. They keep bringing up the Russia thing as an excuse for losing the election. I explained that Dana Boente was not the acting AG on this after Jeff Sessions recused himself. He said maybe he would have his people reach out to Dana. I said that that was the way to handle it -- he should have the White House Counsel call the Acting Attorney General and make the request. He said that was what he would do.<sup>1</sup> He then added, "Because I have been very loyal to you, very loyal, we had that thing, you know."<sup>2</sup> I did not reply, or ask him what he meant by "that thing."<sup>3</sup> Instead I said again that the way to handle it was to have the White House Counsel call Dana Boente. He said that's what he would do.

He then switched topics and began to talk about Egypt and its leader, saying Obama didn't like the guy [REDACTED]. He mentioned the Coptic church bombings and how horrible they were. He said that three Americans had been killed by an Egyptian soldier and the Egyptian leader had raised it with him. I interrupted to say that I thought he meant [REDACTED] and an incident in Jordan. He agreed and said [REDACTED] had told him he wanted to bring the soldier to justice quickly, but that the FBI was in some way asking them to delay. He said [REDACTED]. I replied that I would dig into it but that I did not believe it to be true that the FBI was delaying a Jordanian prosecution. In fact, we were working very closely with the American families and had told them that we wanted the Jordanians to bring justice and if they did not we would try to bring the killer to the United States. He asked me to follow up and make sure that we were working well with the Jordanians and helping them quickly bring the killer to justice. I told him I would. He then said that I was doing a great job and wished me well. The call ended.

JBC 4/11/17

---

<sup>1</sup> I don't know the President well enough to give a high-confidence read here from a phone call, but I perceived him to be slightly annoyed by my reply.

<sup>2</sup> His use of these words did not fit with the flow of the call, which at that point had moved away from any request of me, but I have recorded it here as it happened.

<sup>3</sup> I assumed when he said this that he was reaching back in his memory to our conversation about loyalty at our private dinner, which was sufficiently awkward to make it difficult for him to say I had promised to be loyal, which is where I thought he was headed in the comment.