

UNCLASSIFIED

The timeline of events, as evidenced by the attached documents, is as follows:

Key Intelligence Manipulated and Withheld from the American People by the IC:

BEFORE THE ELECTION

- August 31, 2016 — A DHS official tells former DNI James Clapper that there was “no indication of a Russian threat to directly manipulate the actual vote count.”
- September 2, 2016 — The FBI requests for the whistleblower’s pre-election assessment on alleged Russian election activity in an upcoming, pre-election ICA to be “softened,” given the FBI was “uncomfortable” implying that there was “definitive information that Russia does intend to disrupt our elections.”
- September 9, 2016 — An ODNI and PDB official says that an upcoming PDB should make clear that Russia “probably is not trying...to influence the election by using cyber means” to target election infrastructure. Several IC officials agree.

MEMORANDUM FOR:

SUBJECT:

Director of National Intelligence Tulsi Gabbard.

Intelligence Community suppression of intelligence showing “Russian and criminal actors did not impact” the 2016 presidential election via cyber-attacks on infrastructure.

UNCLASSIFIED

The lead author on the PDB agrees.

UNCLASSIFIED

- September 12, 2016 — The IC publishes an Intelligence Community Assessment (ICA) on cyber threats to the election. The report finds “foreign adversaries do not have and will probably not obtain the capabilities to successfully execute widespread and undetected cyber attacks” on election infrastructure. Two days later, the IC publishes the aforementioned PDB with near identical findings. It finds that foreign adversaries do not have the capability to “covertly overturn the vote outcome.”

- October 7, 2016 — ODNI and DHS suppress the above September intelligence findings in their press release that states with “confidence” the Russian government directed the DNC and DCCC hacks.”

Their statement omitted the fact that the FBI and NSA had “low confidence” in attributing the data leaks from these entities to Russia.

- o Note: There is still supporting evidence indicating the Russian government directed hacking of the DNC and DCCC.

- November 6, 2016 — Donald J. Trump defeats Hillary Clinton and wins the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election.

AFTER THE ELECTION

- December 7, 2016 — The IC is working on a new PDB examining the potential impact of cyber hacks on the election results. DNI Clapper’s office develops talking points based on the PDB’s findings:

- o “Foreign adversaries did not use cyberattacks on election infrastructure to alter the US Presidential election outcome”

- o “We have no evidence of cyber manipulation of election infrastructure intended to alter results”

UNCLASSIFIED

- December 8, 2016 — IC officials discuss the draft PDB, which finds that “Russian and criminal actors did not impact recent US election results by conducting malicious cyber activities against election infrastructure.” The group also decides the PDB will be published the following day, due to “high administration interest.”

UNCLASSIFIED

A few hours later, after initially co-authoring the PDB, the FBI (led by FBI Director James Comey) inexplicably withdraws from coordinating on the product and notifies other IC officials that the FBI will be drafting a dissent. Later in the afternoon, a senior PDB official kills the PDB “based on some new guidance.” The post-election PDB, which once again assessed that Russia did not hack the election, was never published.

UNCLASSIFIED

- December 9, 2016 — The Obama White House gathers top cabinet officials for a National Security Council Principals Committee (PC) Meeting. James Clapper, John Brennan, Susan Rice, John Kerry, Brian McKeon, Loretta Lynch, Andrew McCabe, and Avril Haines are among those in attendance. After the

meeting, in an email titled “POTUS Tasking on Russia Election Meddling,” Director of National Intelligence James Clapper’s assistant sends an email to ODNI leaders tasking them with the creation of an “assessment per the President’s request.” ODNI leads the effort, along with CIA, FBI, NSA, and DHS.

UNCLASSIFIED

Specifically, the assessment will address the following questions:

That same day, Deep State officials in the IC begin leaking blatantly false intelligence to the Washington Post, as proven by the unpublished PDB and previous IC products, claiming that Russia used “cyber means” to influence “the outcome of the election.” Later that evening, another leak to the Washington Post falsely alleges that the CIA “concluded in a secret assessment that Russia intervened” in the election to help President Trump.

UNCLASSIFIED

At this point, there is no official IC assessment that contains that conclusion.

- December 14, 2016 — IC officials again leak to the media, this time claiming that IC officials believe “with a high level of confidence” that Russian President Vladimir Putin was personally involved in the “U.S. Election Hack.”
- December 16, 2016 — Though President Obama admits there is no “evidence of machines being tampered with” during the election, he says he was concerned that potential hacks “could hamper vote counting and affect the actual election process.” “What I was concerned about in particular was making sure that [Wikileaks/Clinton emails] wasn’t compounded by potential hacking that could hamper vote counting and affect the actual election process itself. And so in early September, when I saw President Putin in China, I felt that the most effective way to ensure that, that didn’t happen was to talk to him directly. And tell him to cut it out.” – President Obama on hacking the vote.

Reality: Multiple IC assessments before and after the election consistently showed no credible reporting of Russian intent or capability to do what President Obama alleges.

- Late December 2016 — Due to the ODNI Whistleblower’s questioning his leadership about why an IC assessment was being created that contradicted multiple IC assessments, the whistleblower is immediately removed from emails regarding the drafting of the Obama-ordered IC assessment. The whistleblower is sidelined, despite the fact that they led the ICA on similar topics in September, just months prior.

- Late December 2016/Early January 2017 — The National Intelligence Officer for Cyber pressures the ODNI Whistleblower to accept a number of findings in the Obama ICA, including that the Russian government had a preference for President Trump. “As for the 2017 ICA’s judgement of a decisive Russian preference for then-candidate Donald Trump, I could not concur in good conscience based on information available, and my professional analytic judgement.” – ODNI Whistleblower

UNCLASSIFIED

The ODNI Whistleblower will later recall that his superior said, “you need to trust me on this,” and referenced reporting the ODNI Whistleblower was “not allowed to see.”

- January 6, 2017 — The Obama administration shares the unclassified ICA with the public. It falsely alleges, based in part on “further information” that had “come to light” since the election, that Putin directed an effort to help President Trump defeat Hillary Clinton. This “further information” is later confirmed to be the Steele Dossier.

The assessment also:

- o Suppresses intelligence from before and after the election showing Russia lacked intent and capability to hack the 2016 election.
- o Deceives the American public by claiming the IC did not assess the “impact” of Russian activities.
- o Reality: The IC did, in fact, assess for impact. The unpublished December PDB stated clearly that Russia “did not impact” the election through cyber hacks on the election.
- o Assesses Russia was responsible for leaking data from the DNC and DCCC, while failing to mention that the FBI and NSA previously expressed LOW CONFIDENCE in this attribution.

ALMOST THREE YEARS LATER

- September 18, 2019 — The ODNI Whistleblower assists in a FOIA request related to the Obama ICA. Specifically, an IC official asks the ODNI Whistleblower to search for material related to the Steele Dossier, as it “was a factor” in the Obama ICA. This revelation shocks the ODNI Whistleblower, who had been told that DNI Clapper viewed the Steele Dossier as “untrustworthy.”

UNCLASSIFIED

“The assertion...was in contradiction to what [the National Intelligence Officer for Cyber Issues] had previously implied, and at no time during the prior three

years had any of the [National Intelligence Council] staff members suggested to me that the IC viewed the “Steel Dossier” [sic] material as credible.” – ODNI Whistleblower recalls learning of the Steele Dossier’s inclusion in the ICA.