Ambassador Gordon Sondland

1. Ambassador Sondland testified that President Trump told him there was no *quid pro quo* with Ukraine.

   **Q.** So when you telephoned the President, tell us what happened?

   **A.** Well, from the time that the aid was held up until I telephoned the President there were a lot of rumors swirling around as to why the aid had had been held up, including they wanted a review, they wanted Europe to do more. There were all kinds of rumors. And I know in my few previous conversations with the President he’s not big on small talk so I would have one shot to ask him. And rather than asking him, “Are you doing X because of X or because of Y or because of Z?” I asked him one open-ended question: What do you want from Ukraine? And as I recall, he was in a very bad mood. It was a very quick conversation. He said: I want nothing. I want no *quid pro quo*. I want Zelensky to do the right thing. And I said: What does that mean? And he said: I want him to do what he ran on. And that was the end of the conversation. I wouldn’t say he hung up on me, but it was almost like he hung on me. [pp. 105-106]

   ***

   **Q.** But the President was clear about in his response to you, what was he clear --

   **A.** He said: I want nothing. I don’t want to give them anything and I don’t want anything from them. I want Zelensky to do the right thing. That’s what he -- and he kept repeating no *quid pro quo* over and over again. [128].

2. Ambassador Sondland testified that his primary objective was to secure a White House meeting between Presidents Trump and Zelensky. Ambassador Sondland further testified that his number one responsibility is not U.S.-Ukraine policy—rather America’s relationship with the European Union.

   **Q.** And so, given that it’s a central role for your ambassador responsibilities, you didn’t think it was important to understand what the United States media was saying about Ukraine?

   **A.** As I said, my objective was to get President Zelensky a meeting at the White House. That was my objective.

   **Q.** That wasn’t my question. My question was, did you think it was part of your central responsibilities over Ukraine to be aware of what press reports in the United States media were saying about Ukraine policy?
A. I think it was more the job of the Charge or the Ambassador to Ukraine and the Special Envoy. You had two full-time people on Ukraine.

Q. Okay. So what was -- so your only objective was to get a meeting. You didn’t care about what other people were saying?

A. My objective was to get a meeting, because I thought that that would begin to solidify the relationship between Ukraine and the United States, which would then help me bring the EU to the table, because my number one responsibility is our relationship with the European Union. [pp. 66-67]

3. Ambassador Sondland testified a White House meeting would be in the best interest of America and help maintain a positive relationship with Ukraine.

Q. And that advocation for the meeting, your advocating for that meeting was in the sole interest, best interest of the United States and our national security. Is that correct?

A. That is correct

Q. 100 percent?

A. 100 percent.

Q. Not 99, 100 percent in the best interest of our country. Is that correct?

A. In my view, yes.

Q. Okay. And so, in advocating for this meeting, in advocating to make sure that the new President Zelensky was, indeed, set on a new path, you were very encouraged that he was serious about addressing corruption. Is that correct?

A. That is correct. [pp. 324-325]

4. Ambassador Sondland affirmed that U.S. foreign aid can be held up in countries all around the world for various reasons. Ambassador Sondland further testified that countries other than the United States are concerned about providing assistance to Ukraine because of corruption.

Q. And you have seen foreign aid get leveraged in countries all around the world for difference reasons, correct?

A. That is correct. [p. 257]

***

Q. So they have a condition to giving additional foreign aid. So you’re saying – this is groundbreaking – so you’re saying that someone other than –

A. I walked right into that one.
Q. -- other than [President] Donald J. Trump is concerned with corruption, and they might withhold foreign aid based on that. Is that correct, Ambassador? I can tell by your smile it’s a yes, is that correct. Are we correct?

***

A. To answer your question, Representative, the Ukrainians – the Europeans are always very careful about when they contribute money to anything and they always have a list of requirements, some of which are a mile long.

Q. So in your diplomatic speak, is that a yes?

A. Yes. [p. 249]

5. Ambassador Sondland testified that he did not necessarily take on a leadership role involving Ukraine matters. In fact, Ambassador Sondland noted that Chargé d’affaires, Bill Taylor and Special Envoy, Kurt Volker were primarily responsible for U.S.-Ukraine policy.

Q. When did you understand that you were supposed to take on a leadership role with Ukraine policy?

A. I was not taking on a leadership role.

Q. So what role --

A. I was taking on a support role.

Q. And who was to take on a leadership role?

A. The Charge. He’s the bilateral Ambassador. It’s his full-time job. And then also Ambassador Volker, who’s a Special Envoy to Ukraine. [p. 51]

6. Ambassador Sondland testimony rebutted some of the hyperbolic claims asserted from the August 12, 2019 anonymous whistleblower’s complaint.

Q. I’m ready to ask my question now. The last hour you walked me through all four or five conversations you had with Mr. Giuliani. Any of those conversations possibly -- could they possibly be characterized as you and Ambassador Volker trying to contain the damage to U S national security?

A. Not the direct conversations I had with Mr. Giuliani, because, again, they just -- they were really applying to the press statement.

Q. Right.

A. I didn’t think this the press statement constituted damage to national security.

Q. Okay. So nothing that you did on a call to Rudy Giuliani could fairly be characterized as containing the damage?

A. I think it’s an exaggeration. [pp. 261-262]
Q. Well, during the same timeframe, multiple U.S. officials told me Ukrainian leadership is led to believe that a meeting or phone call between President Trump and President Zelensky would depend on whether Zelensky showed a willingness to play ball on the issues that had been publicly aired by Lutsenko and Mr. Giuliani.

A. Well, that appears not to be true because the phone call happened without any precondition. The phone call happened on the 25th and I don’t believe anything was agreed upon by the Ukrainians by the time the phone call happened.

Q. Did you ever hear a U.S. official use the term “play ball”?

A. I’ve never heard that expression from anyone.

Q. Because it is in quotes?

A. I don’t recall ever hearing that. [p. 264]

Q. Page 4. I just want to clarify that the last sentence of the first paragraph under Roman III -- this is the sentence we reviewed before with “navigate” and “demands.” “Based on multiple readouts of these meetings” -- and “these meetings” refer to the meetings on July 26th?

A. Yes.

Q. -- “Ambassadors Volker and Sondland reportedly provided advice to the Ukrainian leadership about how to ‘navigate’ the demands that the President has made.” But on July 26th, you were not aware the President had any demands. Is that correct?

A. Well, I think we were aware at that point that the President wanted -- I think this was still in the vanilla corruption part of the continuum. Because, again, we didn’t get a transcript of the actual call until, I think, September.

Q. Right.

A. So this whole notion of investigating the Bidens I don’t believe would’ve come up in that meeting because we weren’t aware of it.

Q. Okay. So, during that meeting, I mean, if I understand your testimony, the statement didn’t come up --

A. I don’t remember it coming up.

Q. Okay.

A. Didn’t flag it for me. [pp. 311-312]