

1. Dr. Hill explained that the National Security Council was hesitant about scheduling a White House meeting for President Zelensky prior to Ukraine parliamentary elections. The NSC also had concerns about President Zelensky's ties to certain Ukrainian oligarchs, which may impact how he implemented anti-corruption reforms. (pg. 76)

A. ... There was, you know, speculation in all analytical circles, both in Ukraine and outside, that he [Zelensky] might not be able to get a workable majority in the Ukrainian Parliament. And all of us are very cognizant of the dangers of writing congratulatory letters to people who can't form governments. We've had a number of letters, in fact, we had to pull back where heads of state that we congratulated then couldn't actually form a government.

And at that point, we were very hesitant to, you know, push forward with any invitation to Zelensky until we knew that he had a workable majority in the Rada and was then going to be able to form his own cabinet.

So myself and others were actually cautioning against extending an invitation at that particular point until we knew that Zelensky would form a government. We were also extremely concerned about Zelensky's relationship with the gentleman Igor Kolomoisky, the Ukrainian oligarch, who was --- the oligarch who was basically the owner of the TV and production company that Mr. Zelensky's famous Servant of the People program had bene part of.

2. Fiona Hill testified that it is not ridiculous for President Zelensky's team to examine allegations of corruption in prior Ukrainian administrations, including Burisma and 2016 Ukrainian election interference. (pg. 393-94)

Q. In answer to a kind of all's well that ends well suggestion about this situation, you said, in fact, the US-Ukraine relationship is now covered in scandal. I wonder to what extent is the Ukrainian government still looking to see how it should respond to the request for political dirt on the Bidens. Is that story over, or are they still waiting to see what happens in the United States now?

A. I'm sure they are still waiting to see how that happens. **But I'm sure that they also want to find out for themselves if there's any, you know, kind of thing there that they should be scared about or concerned about in any way.** Not scared, let's just say concerned about. And I was struck by the fact that their prosecutor announced that they were, you know, reviewing all of this again. And I think if I were President Zelensky and his new team, having been unfamiliar in actual fact with what was going on before --- remember, President Zelensky was engaged in making, you know, programs and playing a President on television. He wouldn't necessarily be familiar with all of this as well. **So it's not actually, you know, completely ridiculous that he would actually be asking to have some investigations for his own purposes to see, you know, quite what has transpired here.**

3. The Obama Administration played favorites in Ukraine elections. (pg. 78)

A. I also want to say that, you know, in this timeframe, **we were being very careful in the runup to the elections not to appear, as the previous administration had done, to tip our hat in the election.** And we all remember the notorious phone call that the Russians basically intercepted and then put on YouTube of Assistant Secretary Victoria Nuland talking to our Ambassador Geoff Pyatt at the time about decisions about who should be Prime Minister of Ukraine and the very damaging effect that that had.

4. Hill did not think it was a “bright idea” for Hunter Biden to be on Burisma’s Board. (pg. 445)

A. I don't know when that was stopped. I mean, again, I'll just say that I had to be reminded by Amos Hochstein about why Burisma was significant. I remembered, from when I was at the Brookings Institution, reading about Hunter Biden being appointed, thinking this **was not a bright idea**, and then I did not continue to follow this issue for a long period of time.

5. Ukraine was not singled out—foreign aid in general was being reevaluated for projects at home. (pg. 227-28)

Q. Sitting here today, do you have any other -- has your understanding changed about why the freeze was put in place?

A It hasn't actually because, you know, as I said, when I left, there wasn't an explanation, and foreign assistance overall was being frozen. And I haven't seen anything, at least in the public record, that would suggest that it was that the foreign assistance was being frozen for specific purposes at that point. I mean, this was also, remember, again, at the point of discussion about cutting back on lots of Pentagon projects for the building of the wall for Homeland Security purposes, the border wall. [p. 227]

A. But I did think that if it was political for whatever reason, the wall or, you know, you name it, it would have to be resolved at high levels in the interagency, and that Ambassador Bolton and Deputy National Security Advisor Kupperman would have to sit down with Mick Mulvaney and try to get to the bottom of what was going on. And, again there were other freezes of assistance because there was a move to push out the new foreign assistance strategy. [P. 228]

6. Vice President Pence has been “extremely good” and has “stepped up” on foreign relations for the U.S. Government. (pg. 184-185)

A. Because the Vice President played actually a very important foreign policy and diplomatic role in terms of his outreach, and *especially this Vice President* like, you know, predecessors has really kind of stepped up where there's been a conflict or where

there's been some special care needed, you know, for a country that, you know, perhaps isn't one of the top allies but, you know, certainly might need some attention. And, you know, Vice President Pence has been, you know, *extremely good about stepping up* when asked, you know, to go and, you know, give speeches for Munich Security Council1. conference and other settings, for example.

7. Dr. Hill confirmed that President Trump was known to be very skeptical about corruption in Ukraine. (pg. 118)

Q. And Volker, he related to us that the President had a deep-rooted skeptical view on Ukraine and their corruption environment. Is that something you can attest to?

A. I think the President has actually quite publicly said that he was very skeptical about corruption in Ukraine. And, in fact, he's not alone, because everyone has expressed great concerns about corruption in Ukraine.

8. Dr. Hill testified that security assistance to Ukraine had been held up before “at multiple junctures” during her time at the National Security Council. (pgs. 303-304)

Q. On the issue of the security assistance freeze, had assistance for Ukraine ever been held up before during your time at NSC?

A. Yes.

Q. For what --- and what was that?

A. At multiple junctures. You know, it gets back to the question that [Republican staff] asked before. There's often a question raised about assistance, you know, a range of assistance –

Q. But for Ukraine specifically?

A. Yeah, that's correct.

9. Contrary to how Democrats portray their actions, Dr. Hill testified that Ambassador Volker and Ambassador Sondland were always trying to act in the best interest of the United States. (pg. 117)

Q. But Volker's initiatives here and Sondland's initiatives here, is it your testimony that you believe they were trying to do what's in the best interests of the United States?

A. I do believe that they were trying to do that.

Q. All right. And they're men of integrity?

A. I know Kurt Volker definitely to be a man of integrity. And in terms of Gordon Sondland, based on my interactions with him, I've already expressed the concerns, but I can't say that he's not a man of integrity. And he definitely was very enthusiastic in all of our initial meetings about serving the United States, serving the President, and really trying to do as good a job as possible to also patch up our relations with the European Union, which were quite rocky.

10. Dr. Hill testified that security assistance to Ukraine had been held up before “at multiple junctures” during her time at the National Security Council – even with bipartisan support for the assistance. (pgs. 303-304)

Q. On the issue of the security assistance freeze, had assistance for Ukraine ever been held up before during your time at NSC?

A. Yes.

Q. For what --- and what was that?

A. At multiple junctures. You know, it gets back to the question that [Republican staff] asked before. There's often a question raised about assistance, you know, a range of assistance –

Q. But for Ukraine specifically?

A. Yeah, that's correct.

Q. Okay. Even though there's been bipartisan support for the assistance?

A. Correct.

11. Dr. Hill testified that President Trump's decision to support Ukraine with lethal defensive weapons was a more “robust” policy than that of the Obama Administration. (pg. 196)

Q. President Trump's Ukraine policy with forwarding lethal defensive weapons to the Ukraine, is it fair to say that that is a much more robust aid policy?

A. That's correct.

12. Dr. Hill testified that Christopher Steele's reporting contained in the Steele dossier was likely the result of a bogus Russian misinformation campaign. (pgs. 390-91)

A. ...And this is why I was concerned about the Steele report because that is a vulnerability. Christopher Steele going out and looking for information. He's obviously out there soliciting information. What a great opportunity to, basically, you know, present him with information that he's looking for that can be couched some truth and some disinformation.

13. Dr. Hill testified that Christopher Steele—a foreign national—should not be involved in getting political dirt on American political candidates. (pg. 437)

A. a foreign national. I don't believe it's appropriate for him [Steele] to have been hired to do this. And, again, I think I already expressed my shock and surprise when I learned that he had been involved in this.