Eco Health is the tasker that just keeps on giving.

I have warned we will see that one again and again.

-----Original Message-----
From: [b](6)
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 12:08 PM
To: [b](6)
Subject: RE: Atomic Veterans Commemorative Service Medal OSD005293-22 RES Final

That and ecohealth. Best taskers we've ever done.

-----Original Message-----
From: [b](6)
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 11:51 AM
To: [b](6)
Subject: RE: Atomic Veterans Commemorative Service Medal OSD005293-22 RES Final

LIES!!

-----Original Message-----
From: [b](6)
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 11:29 AM
To: [b](6)
Subject: RE: Atomic Veterans Commemorative Service Medal OSD005293-22 RES Final

That was a fun one

-----Original Message-----
From: [b](6)
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 10:04 AM
To: [b](6)

Cc: OSD Pentagon OUSD A-S List OASD NCB FO
<osd.pentagon.ousd-a-s.list.oasd-ncb-fo@mail.mil>
Subject: RE: Atomic Veterans Commemorative Service Medal OSD005293-22 RES Final
I figured you were, especially since you all built the package.

V/r

-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 10:01 AM
To: 
Cc: OSD Pentagon OUSD A-S List OASD NCB FO <osd.pentagon.ousd-a-s.list.oasd-ncb-fo@mail.mil>
Subject: RE: Atomic Veterans Commemorative Service Medal OSD005293-22 RES
Final

Thanks We're working it!

-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 9:58 AM
To: 
Cc: OSD Pentagon OUSD A-S List OASD NCB FO <osd.pentagon.ousd-a-s.list.oasd-ncb-fo@mail.mil>
Subject: FW: Atomic Veterans Commemorative Service Medal OSD005293-22 RES
Final

Team,

Great job, new medal approved.

DTRA notice the suspense dates in the memo:

The Director, DTRA, will provide the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)) a copy of its implementation guidance for the AVCSM program no later than December 31, 2022, or prior to publicly announcing the program if announcement occurs prior to December 31, 2022.

V/r

From: OSD Pentagon OUSD A-S Mailbox AS-ECO
Subject: Summary: House NDAA Passes 316 to 113

Senior Leaders,

Good morning. Last night, the House passed the FY22 NDAA by a vote of 316-113. The bill authorizes $740 billion in DoD spending - an increase of $25 billion over the President's request - and $28 billion for nuclear weapons programs under the Department of Energy. SASC approved similar funding levels in July and the full Senate is expected to take up the measure in the coming weeks.

High profile provisions included in the House-passed version include a 2.7% pay increase for service members, requiring women to register for the draft, and the establishment of a bipartisan commission to review U.S. involvement in Afghanistan over the last 20 years. The bill also includes provisions designed to strengthen U.S. alliances and pivots to Asia, especially through the new Pacific Deterrence Initiative.

Aside from CTR - which received a $105 million increase - DTRA funding was authorized at the levels from the President's request. Of the 487 amendments considered this week, notable items successfully added to the bill include:

- Blocks funding for any purpose to EcoHealth Alliance, Inc.
- Directs the Executive Agent to designate a Joint Program Executive Officer for the EOD Program and assigns the DTRA Director to manage the Defense-wide program element funding for the Program.
- Increases funding for the Development of Medical countermeasures Against Novel Entities (DOMANE) program by $4.5 million to allow for the rapid screening of all FDA approved compounds and other human safe compound libraries to identify optimal drug candidates for repurposing as medical countermeasures for COVID-19 and other novel and emerging biothreats.
- Creates the Global Health Security Agenda Interagency Review Council to implement the Global Health Security Agenda and to appoint a U.S. Coordinator for Global Health Security to coordinate such efforts.
- Establishes a National Security Commission on Synthetic Biology.
- DoD, in coordination with Agriculture, HHS, and DHS, is to develop an annex to the National Biodefense Strategy for a national biodefense science and technology strategy and implementation plan.
- Includes the Global Pandemic Prevention and Biosecurity Act, which seeks to address the source of highly infectious diseases beginning in animal species, including by reducing the sale and trade of live and fresh wildlife for human consumption, and addressing food insecurity associated with a reliance on local game and wildlife.
• Provides an apology to individuals and their families in NM, UT, ID, and other states who were exposed to radiation from nuclear testing.

• Requires reporting on recent security assistance programs to Mali, Guinea, and Chad

• Requires an annual report on and Congressional notification of U.S. efforts to counter malign foreign influence in Africa.

• Requires the Secretary of State to develop a strategy for engagement with Southeast Asia and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

• The U.S. is to work with state and non-state partners to shut down certain commercial wildlife markets, end the trade in terrestrial wildlife for human consumption, and build international coalitions to reduce the demand for wildlife as food, to prevent the emergence of future zoonotic pathogens. Authorizes USAID to undertake programs to reduce the risk of endemic and emerging infectious disease exposure and to help transition communities globally to safer, non-wildlife sources of protein.

Very Respectfully,

(b)(6)
Subject: Summary: House NDAA Passes 316 to 113

Senior Leaders,

Good morning. Last night, the House passed the FY22 NDAA by a vote of 316-113. The bill authorizes $740 billion in DoD spending - an increase of $25 billion over the President’s request - and $28 billion for nuclear weapons programs under the Department of Energy. SASC approved similar funding levels in July and the full Senate is expected to take up the measure in the coming weeks.

High profile provisions included in the House-passed version include a 2.7% pay increase for service members, requiring women to register for the draft, and the establishment of a bipartisan commission to review U.S. involvement in Afghanistan over the last 20 years. The bill also includes provisions designed to strengthen U.S. alliances and pivots to Asia, especially through the new Pacific Deterrence Initiative.

Aside from CTR - which received a $105 million increase - DTRA funding was authorized at the levels from the President’s request. Of the 487 amendments considered this week, notable items successfully added to the bill include:

- Blocks funding for any purpose to EcoHealth Alliance, Inc.
- Directs the Executive Agent to designate a Joint Program Executive Officer for the EOD Program and assigns the DTRA Director to manage the Defense-wide program element funding for the Program.
- Increases funding for the Development of Medical countermeasures Against Novel Entities (DOMANE) program by $4.5 million to allow for the rapid screening of all FDA approved compounds and other human safe compound libraries to identify optimal drug candidates for repurposing as medical countermeasures for COVID-19 and other novel and emerging biothreats.
- Creates the Global Health Security Agenda Interagency Review Council to implement the Global Health Security Agenda and to appoint a U.S. Coordinator for Global Health Security to coordinate such efforts.

- Establishes a National Security Commission on Synthetic Biology.

- DoD, in coordination with Agriculture, HHS, and DHS, is to develop an annex to the National Biodefense Strategy for a national biodefense science and technology strategy and implementation plan.

- Includes the Global Pandemic Prevention and Biosecurity Act, which seeks to address the source of highly infectious diseases beginning in animal species, including by reducing the sale and trade of live and fresh wildlife for human consumption, and addressing food insecurity associated with a reliance on local game and wildlife.

- Provides an apology to individuals and their families in NM, UT, ID, and other states who were exposed to radiation from nuclear testing.

- Requires reporting on recent security assistance programs to Mali, Guinea, and Chad

- Requires an annual report on and Congressional notification of U.S. efforts to counter malign foreign influence in Africa.

- Requires the Secretary of State to develop a strategy for engagement with Southeast Asia and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

- The U.S. is to work with state and non-state partners to shut down certain commercial wildlife markets, end the trade in terrestrial wildlife for human consumption, and build international coalitions to reduce the demand for wildlife as food, to prevent the emergence of future zoonotic pathogens. Authorizes USAID to undertake programs to reduce the risk of endemic and emerging infectious disease exposure and to help transition communities globally to safer, non-wildlife sources of protein.

Very Respectfully,
Thanks. Looking at the full list of QFR's, we (DTRA) are going to need to input/coordinate on several that are not directly addressed to us as well as coordinate our responses with the other witness organizations.

Rhys

Rhys Williams, PhD
Director (acting)
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----
From: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR \(\text{(USA)}\)
Sent: Fri, 14 May 2021 11:55:11 -0500
To: 
Cc: DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DTRA CMD GP; DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DAG Team; DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List LA Govt; DTRA Ft Belvoir Org List DTRA Directorate Directors; DTRA Ft Belvoir Org List DTRA Directorate Deputy Directors
Subject: RE: HASC ISO CWMD Hearing Thank Note & QFRs
Attachments: smime.p7s

Sir,

Please find attached a thank you letter and your QFRs (x4) for from last week’s HASC ISO CWMD hearing. Also attached for awareness is the complete list of QFRs for all witnesses. Question #4 for Ms. Walsh addresses the EcoHealth Alliance question. We are currently drafting the response for the March 15th letter from Rep. Reschenthaler (+12) and will have for your review next week before passback to OSD.

V/r,

[b](6)
FW: OMB review NonD/Ditem 319, DHS Report on Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Threats SUS 1200 Jul 8 NCB SUSPENSE: 6 July, 1600
Attachments: CBRN Report 2021 - OMB Review 06.27.2022.docx, smime.p7s

Please task to SI, CT, OB, RD, OI

Thanks.
Subject: FW: OMB review NonD/DItem 319, DHS Report on Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Threats SUS 1200 Jul 8 NCB SUSPENSE: 6 July, 1600

Team NCB,
Department of Homeland Security (DHS) would like you to review the CBRN Report for 2021.

NCB SUSPENSE: 6 July 1600

V/r

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2022 3:09 PM
To: OSD Pentagon OUSD A-S List OASD NCB FO <osd.pentagon.ousd-a-s.list.oasd-ncb-fo@mail.mil>
Cc: OSD Pentagon OUSD A-S Mailbox Legislative and Congressional Oversight FO <osd.pentagon.ousd-a-s.mbx.legislative-and-congressional.oversight@mail.mil>
Subject: OMB review NonD/DItem 319, DHS Report on Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Threats SUS 1200 Jul 8

Good Afternoon,

Attached for review a draft DHS (CWMD) annual report on Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Threats.

Suspense: 1200, Friday, 8 July 2022

LEAD AGENCY: USD(A&S)
STAFFING AGENCIES: ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, JOINT STAFF, USD(R&E), USD(P), USD(P&R), USD(I&S), USCYBERCOM, USNORTHCOM, USSTRATCOM, USTRANSCOM, DOD CIO, DIA, DTRA, NGA, NSA
INFORMATION AGENCIES: IG, ASD(LA), ATSD(PA), DGC(IA), DGC(I), DGC(P&HP), DGC(A&L), DGC(EE&I)

Very Respectfully,

[redacted]

GAO/OIG Audit Liaison
OUSD(A&S) | Legislative & Congressional Oversight (LCO)
O: [redacted]
C:

Pentagon 3D886

-----Original Message-----
From: osd.pentagon.ogc.mbx.olc@mail.mil <osd.pentagon.ogc.mbx.olc@mail.mil>
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2022 2:21 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: OLC Green Sheet - OLC DESIGNATOR NonD/DItem 319, DHS Report on Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Threats -- OMB Request for DoD Review
DATE: 06/29/22 02:20 PM EST

OLC DESIGNATOR NonD/DItem 319, DHS Report on Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Threats -- OMB Request for DoD Review

Suspense: 1200, Friday, 8 July 2022

We have published an action for which you are the LEAD AGENCY. Please log onto the Department of Defense Office of Legislative Counsel (OLC) Internet System to access the “Green Sheet” on the “Open Actions” page.

The “Green Sheet” contains subject documents for you to download and send to other concerned parties within your agency, as well as accompanying guidance. You also may submit your comments, etc. to the “Green Sheet” on the OLC Internet System. Thank you. OLC

https://olc.osd.mil/
Just a thought piece for tomorrow:

(5) Defense Threat Reduction Agency: On January 14, 2022, USRTK filed a lawsuit against the DTRA for violating provisions of the FOIA. The lawsuit, filed in U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, seeks: (1) finished intelligence, documents and reports about accidents, containment failures or deliberate release of biological agents from facilities in 21 countries around the world; (2) assessments of risks, hazards and efficacy of BSL-2, BSL-3 and BSL-4 containment schemes (including flaws, failings or weaknesses) in those same 21 countries; and, (3) grant proposals and other documents from the EcoHealth Alliance and Metabiota. Case 3:22-cv-00299-JCS.

This is 20-063

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, October 5, 2022 4:48 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Sen Paul's request

Ma'am,

Attached are associated documents and the email conversation with Senator Paul's staffer.

== SUMMARY ==
US Right to Know (USRTK) submitted two FOIA requests in the last two years. On 31 Aug 2020, USRTK submitted FOIA Request 20-063, which included the following questions:

(1) Containment failures and/or accidental or deliberate release of biological agents in dual-use biosafety research, along with assessments of the risks, hazards and efficacy of BSL-2, BSL-3 or BSL-4 containment schemes and/or assessments of the potential flaws or failings and weaknesses, in BSL-2, BSL-3 or BSL-4 research facilities in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Canada, China, Egypt, France, Germany, Georgia, India, Iran, Israel, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Russia, South Africa, Taiwan, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, and/or Thailand.

(2) Contracts, grants, grant proposals and communications about funding between DTRA staff and EcoHealth Alliance staff about specific contracts
and/or grants awarded by DTRA to EcoHealth Alliance, since January 1, 2014.

(3) Contracts, grants, and communications about funding between DTRA employees and employees of Metabiota, Inc. pertaining to specific contracts and/or grants awarded by DTRA to Metabiota, Inc. since January 1, 2013.

DTRA replied with 9,899 documents across several months.

In a letter dated 6 Oct 2021, USRTK submitted FOIA Request 22-008 asking copies of grant proposals, scientific and technical interim reports, reviewer response documents, policy-related documents, and email communications between DTRA staff and EcoHealth Alliance staff (email to or from the domain @ecohealthalliance.org, including attachments) about the following grants awarded by DTRA to EcoHealth Alliance, since January 2019: HDTRA120100026, HDTRA120100029, and HDTRA12110023.

DTRA responded to FOIA Request 22-008 via a letter dated 17 Feb 2022. USRTK received a total of 311 pages in response to its request.

Senator Rand Paul now requests unredacted versions of such responsive documents.

V/r,

(b)(6)

Legislative Liaison
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

(b)(6)
This strikes me as a witch hunt based on the political climate.

I just spoke with (b)(6) and she recommended I meet with you to discuss our review of CT’s grants with EHA. I meet with Dr. Pope in about 10-minutes but hope to get with you at some point today.

V/R,

(b)(6)

I’d like to have a conversation about this
Subject: FW: EcoHealth Alliance Grant Review (re: Progress Update) #21-092

FYSA.

The TRAC review is at the stage for an update brief to Dr. Pope tomorrow. I will back brief you on this when I’m in the building this week.

V/R,

-----Original Message-----
From: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA)
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 12:48 PM
To: [b](6)
Cc: [b](6)
Subject: RE: EcoHealth Alliance Grant Review (re: Progress Update) #21-092

Thank you.

V/r,
Rob

Robert S. Pope, Ph.D., SES
Director
Cooperative Threat Reduction
Dr. Pope,

Consider the below as our read ahead for tomorrow’s discussion.

V/R,

JR

OIG # 21-092: Review EcoHealth Alliance Grants IAW DASD TRAC Memo (dti 2-Dec-21)

DASD Threat Reduction and Arms Control (TRAC) requested a review of three out of seven grants awarded to EHA with a final report provided by the end of FY22 with the following objectives:

1.) To review all grant financial records for consistency with specific grant purposes and for compliance with legal requirements;

2.) To review all experimental records for proper and ethical data handling, reporting, and dissemination requirements and;

3.) To assess whether EHA’s internal grant handling processes continue to comply with DoD and USG guidelines that would allow for EHA to remain a potential candidate to compete for CTR funding.

GRANTS SELECTED FOR REVIEW:

1.) HDTRA 17-1-0037, Serological Biosurveillance for Spillover of Henipaviruses and Filoviruses at Agricultural and Hunting Human-Animal Interfaces in Peninsular Malaysia
   - Estimated cost: $3,653,165.39
   - Type of Grant Award: Cost Reimbursable
2.) HDTRA 17-1-0064, Understanding the Risk of Bat-Borne Zoonotic Disease Emergence in Western Asia
   - Estimated cost: $3,997,637.00
   - Type of Grant Award: Cost Reimbursable

3.) HDTRA 19-1-0033, Reducing the Threat of Rift Valley Fever through Ecology, Epidemiology, and Socio-Economics
   - Estimated cost: $4,986,873
   - Type of Grant Award: Firm Fixed Price

OIG PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS FOR EXTERNAL CONSIDERATION (i.e., RESPONSE TO DASD-TRAC):

1.) Although EHA invoicing creates confusion in accordance with award type and lacks sufficient detail, there is no evidence the invoices have been challenged by ONR or GOR(s).

2.) Scientific efforts to included ethical handling of data and dissemination appear sound.

3.) Current government oversight processes lack the rigor required to assess whether EHA, or any grantee, remains a viable partner.

OIG PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS FOR INTERNAL CONSIDERATION (i.e., RESPONSE TO DTRA, et al.):

4.) DTRA post-award Grant processes require review and improvement.
   - Grant pre-award processes and reviews are well documented and appear sound
   - Formal Grant Process has not been formalized and signed by the Head of Contracting Activity (HCA) as required
   - Grant awards were in accordance with prescribed law and regulation
   - Each grant file was missing required documentation
   - Grants are administered by Office of Naval Research (ONR), Boston
SI-FM and AC were unable to quickly determine ONR PoC(s) for the reviewed grants

No evidence GOR receives notification of invoices to review/approve prior to payment

AC and SI-FM do not know how ONR determines invoices are proper, correct, and legal prior to payment

Lack of interaction between DTRA and ONR post-grant award

GOR appointment does not require COR training

"Many" GORs have received COR training through DAWIA PM certification

Basic and Applied Research training requirement is insufficient to oversee a grant

No evidence GOR(s) reviewed quarterly/annual reports for scientific sufficiency against the Statement of Work (SOW)

No site visits were conducted to insure performance against SOW or that equipment claimed was purchased

From: Pope, Robert S <SSES.DTRA.COOP.THRT.REDUCT(USA)>

Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2022 7:24 PM

Subject: Re: EcoHealth Alliance Grant Review (re: Progress Update) #21-092

Thank you. I look forward to it.

Date: Thursday, April 28, 2022 at 1:56:25 AM

To: "Pope, Robert S <SSES.DTRA.COOP.THRT.REDUCT(USA)>"
Subject: RE: EcoHealth Alliance Grant Review (re: Progress Update) #21-092

Dr. Pope,

I request to have time with you next week to provide a progress update on the EHA review, per the TRAC memo. From the IG's perspective mainly, but inclusive of the entire effort.

Sir, if your calendar (or 6) is available any day except Thursday next week, that would be great for me. I'll adjust my calendar to make the time and meeting fit CT's needs.

V/R,

[Redacted]

Inspector General
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----
From: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA) [mailto:]
Sent: Thursday, December 2, 2021 2:29 PM
To: [mailto:]
Cc: [mailto:]

Subject: RE: EcoHealth Alliance grant review

[Redacted] - We received the formal task from NCB for this review. Do you have a suggestion what element(s) of DTRA are most appropriate to assist CT with this?

V/r,
Rob

Robert S. Pope, Ph.D., SES
Director
Cooperative Threat Reduction

-----Original Message-----
From: [mailto:]
Sent: Wednesday, November 24, 2021 8:25 AM
To: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA) [mailto:]
Cc: [mailto:]

[Redacted]
DIR (USA)  

Subject: Re: EcoHealth Alliance grant review

Dr. Pope,

I’ll get my Team together to review the details then get back to you shortly. It makes sense to not grade your own homework. The challenge is finding the right mix from DTRA to facilitate your needs. Thanks for letting me know!

V/R,

[Redacted]

Inspector General
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

From iPhone

From: "Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA)" [Redacted]
Date: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 at 5:46:49 PM

Subject: FW: EcoHealth Alliance grant review

JR,

Please see the attached draft tasking from NCB for DTRA to conduct a review of a select set of EcoHealth Alliance grants to verify that the funds were used for their intended purpose. My sense is the DTRA IG, Comptroller, Contracting Office, or some combination would be able to conduct this review so it isn't CT grading our own procedures. Is this something your office would want to lead when the formal tasking arrives?

V/r,
Rob

Robert S. Pope, Ph.D., SES
Director
Cooperative Threat Reduction

-----Original Message-----
From: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA)
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 5:44 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc:
Subject: RE: EcoHealth Alliance grant review

Sending on behalf as he has started his Thanksgiving leave.

We look forward to a review of a selected set of DTRA CTR EHA grants -- likely conducted by DTRA’s IG, Comptroller, Contracting Office, or some combination thereof.

We've added a few suggested edits via tracked changes in the attached that would provide additional clarity in a couple of areas.

We recommend you remove the phrase "the possibility exists that they may be expending some grant funds on efforts beyond the purposes specified in the grant agreement." If this letter gets FOIA’d someday, DoD doesn't need to deal with explaining this sentence that could indicate our oversight office thinks something is not right. This sentence doesn't add any necessary information to the direction to DTRA in the letter but could cause numerous problems down the line.

Have a Happy Thanksgiving.

V/r,
Rob

Robert S. Pope, Ph.D., SES
Director
Cooperative Threat Reduction

-----Original Message-----
From (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 1:11 PM
To: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA)
Subject: FW: EchoHealth Alliance grant review

FYI - we knew this one in-coming soon, but it looks close to being finalized. Any concerns or questions?

-----Original Message-----
From: <mailto:>

Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 12:59 PM

Hope you are both well. I mentioned doing a review of the EHA grants to ensure that they are using the money in accordance with the parameters outlined in the grant documents. Given the large proportion of grants awarded to EHA and the fact that most are awarded near or at the maximum amount I think it's worth doing a review to make sure that the money is being spent for the intended purposes. This coupled with the increased attention from the Hill makes it ripe in my mind for a focused review. Attached is a draft memo that we pulled together. Let me know if you have any questions/concerns.
Just want to ensure we're doing our due-diligence with this

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 9:23 AM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Miller, Craig G SES DTRA OFFICE OF THE DIR (USA)

Subject: FW: EcoHealth Alliance Grant Review (re: Progress Update) #21-092

[b](6)

I just spoke with [redacted] and she recommended I meet with you to discuss our review of CT's grants with EHA. I meet with Dr. Pope in about 10-minutes but hope to get with you at some point today.

V/R,

JR

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 2:39 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]

Subject: RE: EcoHealth Alliance Grant Review (re: Progress Update) #21-092

I'd like to have a conversation about this

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
YSA.

The TRAC review is at the stage for an update brief to Dr. Pope tomorrow. I will back brief you on this when I’m in the building this week.

V/R,

-----Original Message-----
From: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA)
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 12:48 PM
To: <mailto:>
Cc: <mailto:>
Subj: RE: EcoHealth Alliance Grant Review (re: Progress Update) #21-092

Thank you.

V/r,

Rob

Robert S. Pope, Ph.D., SES
Director
Cooperative Threat Reduction
Dr. Pope,

Consider the below as our read ahead for tomorrow’s discussion.

V/R,

JR

OIG # 21-092: Review EcoHealth Alliance Grants IAW DASD TRAC Memo (dt 2-Dec-21)

DASD Threat Reduction and Arms Control (TRAC) requested a review of three out of seven grants awarded to EHA with a final report provided by the end of FY22 with the following objectives:

1.) To review all grant financial records for consistency with specific grant purposes and for compliance with legal requirements;

2.) To review all experimental records for proper and ethical data handling, reporting, and dissemination requirements and;

3.) To assess whether EHA’s internal grant handling processes continue to comply with DoD and USG guidelines that would allow for EHA to remain a potential candidate to compete for CTR funding.

GRANTS SELECTED FOR REVIEW:

1.) HDTRA 17-1-0037, Serological Biosurveillance for Spillover of Henipaviruses and Filoviruses at Agricultural and Hunting Human-Animal Interfaces in Peninsular Malaysia
   - Estimated cost: $3,653,165.39
Type of Grant Award: Cost Reimbursable

2.) HDTRA 17-1-0064, Understanding the Risk of Bat-Borne Zoonotic Disease Emergence in Western Asia
   - Estimated cost: $3,997,637.00
   - Type of Grant Award: Cost Reimbursable

3.) HDTRA 19-1-0033, Reducing the Threat of Rift Valley Fever through Ecology, Epidemiology, and Socio-Economics
   - Estimated cost: $4,986,873
   - Type of Grant Award: Firm Fixed Price

OIG PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS FOR EXTERNAL CONSIDERATION (i.e., RESPONSE TO DASD-TRAC):

1.) Although EHA invoicing creates confusion in accordance with award type and lacks sufficient detail, there is no evidence the invoices have been challenged by ONR or GOR(s).

2.) Scientific efforts to included ethical handling of data and dissemination appear sound.

3.) Current government oversight processes lack the rigor required to assess whether EHA, or any grantee, remains a viable partner.

OIG PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS FOR INTERNAL CONSIDERATION (i.e., RESPONSE TO DTRA, et al.):

4.) DTRA post-award Grant processes require review and improvement.

   - Grant pre-award processes and reviews are well documented and appear sound
   - Formal Grant Process has not been formalized and signed by the Head of Contracting Activity (HCA) as required
   - Grant awards were in accordance with prescribed law and regulation
Each grant file was missing required documentation
Grants are administered by Office of Naval Research (ONR), Boston
SI-FM and AC were unable to quickly determine ONR PoC(s) for the reviewed grants
No evidence GOR receives notification of invoices to review/approve prior to payment
AC and SI-FM do not know how ONR determines invoices are proper, correct, and legal prior to payment
Lack of interaction between DTRA and ONR post-grant award
GOR appointment does not require COR training
“Many” GORs have received COR training through DAWIA PM certification
Basic and Applied Research training requirement is insufficient to oversee a grant
No evidence GOR(s) reviewed quarterly/annual reports for scientific sufficiency against the Statement of Work (SOW)
No site visits were conducted to insure performance against SOW or that equipment claimed was purchased

From: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THORT REDUCT (USA)
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2022 7:24 PM
To: [b][6]
Cc: [b][6]

Subject: Re: EcoHealth Alliance Grant Review (re: Progress Update) #21-092

Thanks I look forward to it.

Date: Thursday, April 28, 2022 at 1:56:25 AM
To: "Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THORT REDUCT (USA)"
Cc: [b][6]

Subject: RE: EcoHealth Alliance Grant Review (re: Progress Update) #21-092

Dr. Pope,

I request to have time with you next week to provide a progress update on the EHA review, per the TRAC memo. From the IG's perspective mainly, but inclusive of the entire effort.

Sir, if your calendar (or [b](6)) is available any day except Thursday next week, that would be great for me. I'll adjust my calendar to make the time and meeting fit CT's needs.

V/R,

[b](6)

Inspector General
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----
From: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA) <mailto:[b](6)>
Sent: Thursday, December 2, 2021 2:29 PM
To: [b](6)
Cc: <mailto:>
<mailto:>

Subject: RE: EcoHealth Alliance grant review

We received the formal task from NCB for this review. Do you have a suggestion what element(s) of DTRA are most appropriate to assist CT with this?

V/r,
Rob

Robert S. Pope, Ph.D., SES
Director
Cooperative Threat Reduction

-----Original Message-----
From:[b](6)
<mailto:[b](6)>
Sent: Wednesday, November 24, 2021 8:25 AM
To: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA) [b](6)
<mailto:[b](6)>
Cc:[b](6)
<mailto:[b](6)>
Subject: Re: EcoHealth Alliance grant review

Dr. Pope,

I’ll get my Team together to review the details then get back to you shortly. It makes sense to not grade your own homework. The challenge is finding the right mix from DTRA to facilitate your needs. Thanks for letting me know!

V/R,

Inspector General
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

From iPhone

--- Original Message ---
From: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA)
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 5:44 PM

JR,

Please see the attached draft tasking from NCB for DTRA to conduct a review of a select set of EcoHealth Alliance grants to verify that the funds were used for their intended purpose. My sense is the DTRA IG, Comptroller, Contracting Office, or some combination would be able to conduct this review so it isn’t CT grading our own procedures. Is this something your office would want to lead when the formal tasking arrives?

V/t,
Rob

Robert S. Pope, Ph.D., SES
Director
Cooperative Threat Reduction
Subject: RE: EcoHealth Alliance grant review

Sending on [redacted] behalf as he has started his Thanksgiving leave.

We look forward to a review of a selected set of DTRA CTR EHA grants -- likely conducted by DTRA's IG, Comptroller, Contracting Office, or some combination thereof.

We've added a few suggested edits via tracked changes in the attached that would provide additional clarity in a couple of areas.

Have a Happy Thanksgiving.

V/r,
Rob

Robert S. Pope, Ph.D., SES
Director
Cooperative Threat Reduction

-----Original Message-----
From [redacted]

<mailto:ma@ous.gov>
FYI - we knew this one in-coming soon, but it looks close to being finalized. Any concerns or questions?

-----Original Message-----
From: Terrell, Leila A OUSD OUSD A-S (USA) <leila.a.terrell.civ@mail.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 12:59 PM

Hope you are both well. I mentioned doing a review of the EHA grants to ensure that they are using the money in accordance with the parameters outlined in the grant documents. Given the large proportion of grants awarded to EHA and the fact that most are awarded near or at the maximum amount I think it’s worth doing a review to make sure that the money is being spent for the intended purposes. This coupled with the increased attention from the Hill makes it ripe in my mind for a focused review.
Attached is a draft memo that we pulled together. Let me know if you have any questions/concerns.
Sent: Mon, 7 Feb 2022 13:08:07 -0500
To:  
Subject: RE: OSD010438-21 EcoHealth -- package content question
Attachments: smime.p7s

-----Original Message-----
From:  
(b)(6)
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 1:08 PM
To:  
(b)(6)
Cc:  
(b)(6)
Subject: RE: OSD010438-21 EcoHealth -- package content question

Copy - are there any other 'annual reports' to include? Last call before this goes final - thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From:  
(b)(6)
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 12:55 PM
To:  
(b)(6)
Cc:  
(b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: RE: OSD010438-21 EcoHealth -- package content question

I would recommend that the package becomes whole, if the USD would like to send out the attachments we included.

-----Original Message-----
From:  
(b)(6)
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 12:50 PM
To:  
(b)(6)
Cc:  
(b)(6)
Subject: RE: OSD010438-21 EcoHealth -- package content question

Good day - thank you for the documents.

We have 2x COAs:

(b)(5)
Let me know if we need to schedule a quick phone call A&S-DTRA-NCB to discuss. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: b(6)
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 12:08 PM
To: b(6)
Cc: b(6)
Subject: RE: OSD010438-21 EcoHealth -- package content question

Attached is part of the package DTRA submitted. We included 1 Annual Report.

Please let me know if you intend to include these as part of the whole? If so, it would be worth noting the attachments.

Thanks,

-----Original Message-----
From: b(6)
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 11:30 AM
To: b(6)
Subject: RE: OSD010438-21 EcoHealth -- package content question

Thank you Ma’am - let me know what you think / find out - thank you - Lt Col

-----Original Message-----
From: b(6)
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 11:13 AM
To: b(6)
Subject: RE: OSD010438-21 EcoHealth -- package content question

Working it...

-----Original Message-----
From: b(6)
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 10:49 AM
To: b(6)
Cc: b(6)
Subject: RE: OSD010438-21 EcoHealth -- package content question

Attached is the package that was staffed for USD signature.

Please advise if this package is missing any attachments or if the letter just need to be changed - thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From:
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 10:46 AM
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: OSD010438-21 EcoHealth -- package content question

Are we just looking at the DTRA provided information?

Thanks,

-----Original Message-----
From:
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 10:45 AM
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: OSD010438-21 EcoHealth -- package content question
Importance: High

Good day - we would like to close out this package ASAP.

Please help address a question on the content of the package and letters to the senators.
Thanks.

Pozdrawiam Serdecznie ~ Very Respectfully,

Military Assistant to USD(A&S)

Pentagon, Room 3E1010
Only issue I’m seeing, is the

-----Original Message-----
From: (b)(6)
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 9:27 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: SD Heartburn Letter pt. 2 // Suspense: tomorrow, 18 November, 1600 // Preliminary Overview of FY22 Senate NDAA Amendments

No, ma’am. Our two objections - EOD and EcoHealth - are being worked differently. Our EOD objection is already in the spreadsheet and that language looks good. With EcoHealth, we are in contact with SASC staff. Dr. Pope discussed it directly with the key SASC PSM. An informal response to SASC minority staff is being worked through TMT presently.

Thanks,

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----
From: (b)(6)
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:57 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: FW: SD Heartburn Letter pt. 2 // Suspense: tomorrow, 18 November, 1600 // Preliminary Overview of FY22 Senate NDAA Amendments

(b)(6)

Anything additional we need to add?

Thanks,

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----
From: (b)(6)
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:53 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: FW: SD Heartburn Letter pt. 2 // Suspense: tomorrow, 18 November,
1600 // Preliminary Overview of FY22 Senate NDAA Amendments

Team,

Short fused burn on this tasker, please push heartburn items by 1300 today
if you have any. If no replies I am racking that up as a negative
response.

V/r

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:23 PM
Please see below position on this request. Let me know if you need Sen. Paul's original letter.

V/R,

DTRA Legislative Affairs
Email: 
Phone: 

----- Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2022 8:26 AM
To: 

Subject: RE: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

(b)(5)
ATTENTION: The information contained in this communication is protected by attorney-client privilege, may contain attorney work product, and/or may contain information that is otherwise protected from release under applicable law, including but not limited to the Privacy Act of 1974 and the Freedom of Information Act. Do not distribute this communication further without the express permission of the sender. If you are not the intended recipient or received this communication in error, please delete the information in the communication and contact the sender immediately.

---Original Message---

From: [b](6)
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2022 4:03 PM
To: [b](6)
Cc: [b](6)

Subject: RE: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

*HTML*

Good Afternoon [b](6) All,

[b](6) thank you for looping me[b](6) thank you very much for your reply
and guidance in your earlier email.

BLUF: I have some concerns, as I know several on this email thread do, about
the nature of, and justification for, this RFI. While I know that BTRP, CTR, DTRA, and DoD want to be responsive, as appropriate, to a Member of Congress, the requested material pertains to a series of FOIA requests from earlier this year (more than 90 days ago) that were subject to redaction pursuant to exclusion or exemption for permissible reason(s). CTR has been consistently responsive to similar RFIs and FOIA requests on similar subjects. I know that this is an RFI and not a FOIA request. However:

- This RFI was sent from Senator Paul’s personal Member office, and not on HSGAC Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations (PSI) letterhead;
- Additionally, the HSGAC PSI Rules of Procedure do not, by my reading, empower an individual Member to conduct their own investigations or require production of requested or subpoenaed documents or individuals;
- The RFI makes no mention of an ongoing investigation by the Committee or Subcommittee;
- Rather, it makes reference to a previous hearing on related technology and/or research;
- It also makes reference to HSGAC and PSI, but does not claim that the Request is on behalf of the Committee or Subcommittee;
- A decision to pursue an alternative COA would not invoke FOIA statute.

For these reasons, I would respectfully request that we arrange a time to speak by phone tomorrow to discuss potential alternative options (partial response, alternative response, decline, etc.). I have also attached DoDI 5400.04 (attachment 540004p.pdf, dated 2009 but referenced in subsequent DoDIs as recently as 2022, so I believe still current) with provisions that I believe may be relevant in this case highlighted on pp. 8 and 10 as they pertain to the release of FOUO (CUI) information to an RFI OBO a constituent or outside party, as well as to the option to propose an alternative response subject to approval at the ASD level.

If [redacted] are willing, I would also respectfully recommend that we engage with OSD/LA to determine what precedent exists for alternative COAs that may inform our options. I believe we may have an understanding with Senator Paul’s office that we have some flexibility on the response date - is that correct?

I recognize that we have an obligation to be responsive and, as appropriate, transparent with the Legislative Branch and the public; however, the information in question was redacted for permissible reasons; Members of Congress and their staff are not legally bound to hold unclassified information in confidence; any inadvertent public release of this
information may have negative implications; and CTR, DTRA, DoD, and our Interagency partners have routinely and recently seen information about our program misconstrued, misrepresented, and used by our foreign adversaries as fodder for public disinformation campaigns against USG.

I am available for a call tomorrow with the exception of 0900-1100 and 1400-1500, but will certainly make every effort to accommodate others’ schedules if those windows are the only ones that work. I am also available by phone on Friday afternoon. Thank you.

Very Respectfully,

(b)(6)

Strategy & Plans Team Lead, BTRP A&AS
Cooperative Threat Reduction
Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Noblis, Inc.

Desk: (b)(6)
Mobil
NIPR (b)(6)
SIPR
JWIC

-----Original Message-----
From: (b)(6)  
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2022 1:21 PM  
To: (b)(6)  
Cc: (b)(6)  

Subject: RE: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Good afternoon,

I'm looping in on our handful of current Congressional RFI's (including this Rand Paul request) to help with some background research as well as DTRA's Legislative Affairs team. is going to follow up shortly with some questions and clarifications to help advise CTR on preparing DTRA's response for your office and LA.

V/r,

Senior Operations Manager

Biological Threat Reduction Department

Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Subject: RE: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Good Morning
v/r,

-----Original Message-----

From: <mail>

Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 9:32 AM

To: <mail>

Cc: <mail>

Subject: RE: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Good morning

v/r,
-----Original Message-----

From: <mail>

Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 9:00 AM

To: <mail>

Cc: <mail>

Subject: RE: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Hi folks,

The FOIA Office has all the clean docs for 20-063 and 22-008 and will send

to <mail>

Al doesn't need tasking.
-----Original Message-----

From: [redacted]

Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 8:38 AM

To: [redacted]

Cc: [redacted]

Subject: FW: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Importance: High

Good Morning.

Referencing the subject above and tasker:


>
Please issue to AL immediately as they responded to and closed out FOIA 22-008. CTR has nothing to do with that one.

We are actively working the 22-063 to meet your suspense of 9/28.

Thank you

v/r

Contractor, Amyx Inc., Team Noblis

CTR DAG TMT Tasker Lead

DTRA CT
Subject: RE: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Sure,

Requests 20-063 and 22-008 were from an organization named U.S. Right to

Know (USRTK). Request 20-063, dated August 31, 2022, asked for the

following information:

1. Containment failures and/or accidental or deliberate release of
biological agents in dual-use biosafety research, along with assessments of

the risks, hazards and efficacy of BSL-2, BSL-3 or BSL-4 containment schemes

and/or assessments of the potential flaws or failings and weaknesses, in

BSL-2, BSL-3 or BSL-4 research facilities in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Canada,

China, Egypt, France, Germany, Georgia, India, Iran, Israel, Kazakhstan,

Malaysia, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Russia, South Africa, Taiwan, Ukraine,

the United Kingdom, and/or Thailand.

2. Contracts, grants, grant proposals and communications about

funding between DTRA staff and EcoHealth Alliance staff about specific

contracts and/or grants awarded by DTRA to EcoHealth Alliance, since January

1, 2014.

3. Contracts, grants, and communications about funding between
DTRA employees and employees of Metabiota, Inc. pertaining to specific contracts and/or grants awarded by DTRA to Metabiota, Inc. since January 1, 2013.

They sued earlier this year due to lack of response to its FOIA request.

Due to volume of the responsive documents, USRTK received a total of five interim responses and sixth (final) response to its request.

Request 22-008, dated October 6, 2021, asked for a copy of grant proposals, scientific and technical interim reports, reviewer response documents, policy-related documents, and email communications between DTRA staff and EcoHealth Alliance staff (email to or from the domain @ecohealthalliance.org, including attachments) about the following grants awarded by DTRA to EcoHealth Alliance, since January 2019: HDTRA12010026,
HDTRA12010029, and HDTRA12110023.

In a letter dated February 17, 2022, USRTK received a total of 311 pages in response to its request.

Let me know if you have any more questions.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 4:34 PM

To: (b)(6)

<in>
<in>
Subject: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Importance: High

Team FOIA,

Ms. Hersman just received a letter from Senator Rand Paul wherein he references two FOIA Requests - 20-063 and 22-008. Are you able to offer any background on what those two requests entailed, who they came from, etc?

Thanks,
Legislative Liaison

Defense Threat Reduction Agency
I think we need to discuss strategy at this point...

The committee request dates back a while. The original was dated 18 Nov 2021. We answered but, there were two follow-ups, one minor one on 28 Mar 2022 and then this latest on 17 Aug 2022 which stated that we failed to answer one of the questions, i.e. that we provide all documents and communications re Eco Health. This latest request CT is close to completing. However, the letter from Senator Paul is being answered by the FOIA office. Even if we were to answer Senator Paul's question, CT should ensure it is in line with their other responses.

V/r,

Thanks!

---
I will definitely run that down. When I contacted A&S, they felt Sen Paul might be circumventing the process.

(1) Containment failures.

(2) Contracts, grants, communications, between DTRA and EcoHealth Alliance.

(3) Contracts, grants, communications, between DTRA and Metabiota, Inc.

V/r,

-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2022 4:57 PM
To: 
Subject: RE: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Thanks!

-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 1:22 PM
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Attached is the original FOIA request and Sen. Paul’s letter from yesterday. Request #2 below on Eco Health communications, is something CT is already working on in response to a letter from the Chair/Ranking from Senate Homeland Security Subcommittee on Investigations.

V/r,

Legislative Liaison
Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Subject: RE: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Sure,

Requests 20-063 and 22-008 were from an organization named U.S. Right to Know (USRTK). Request 20-063, dated August 31, 2020, asked for the following information:

1.) Containment failures and/or accidental or deliberate release of biological agents in dual-use biosafety research, along with assessments of the risks, hazards and efficacy of BSL-2, BSL-3 or BSL-4 containment schemes and/or assessments of the potential flaws or failings and weaknesses, in BSL-2, BSL-3 or BSL-4 research facilities in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Canada, China, Egypt, France, Germany, Georgia, India, Iran, Israel, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Russia, South Africa, Taiwan, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, and/or Thailand.

2.) Contracts, grants, grant proposals and communications about funding between DTRA staff and EcoHealth Alliance staff about specific contracts and/or grants awarded by DTRA to EcoHealth Alliance, since January 1, 2014.

3.) Contracts, grants, and communications about funding between DTRA employees and employees of Metabiota, Inc. pertaining to specific contracts and/or grants awarded by DTRA to Metabiota, Inc. since January 1, 2013.

They sued earlier this year due to lack of response to its FOIA request.
Due to volume of the responsive documents, USRTK received a total of five interim responses and sixth (final) response to its request.

Request 22-008, dated October 6, 2021, asked for a copy of grant proposals, scientific and technical interim reports, reviewer response documents, policy-related documents, and email communications between DTRA staff and EcoHealth Alliance staff (email to or from the domain @ecohealthalliance.org, including attachments) about the following grants awarded by DTRA to EcoHealth Alliance, since January 2019: HDTRA12010026, HDTRA12010029, and HDTRA12110023.

In a letter dated February 17, 2022, USRTK received a total of 311 pages in response to its request.

Let me know if you have any more questions.
----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 4:34 PM

To: (b)(6)

Subject: Senator Rand Paul: FOIA Request No. 20-063 and 22-008

Team FOIA,

Ms. Hersman just received a letter from Senator Rand Paul wherein he references two FOIA Requests - 20-063 and 22-008. Are you able to offer any background on what those two requests entailed, who they came from, etc?

Thanks,

(b)(6)

Legislative Liaison
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

(b)(6)
Page 57 of 57

Withheld pursuant to exemption

(REDacted)

of the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act
From: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA)
Sent: Mon, 27 Feb 2023 17:37:29 +0000
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: [Non-DoD Source] Media Inquiry: DoD funding EcoHealth Alliance
Attachments: smime.p7s
Importance: High

--- Original Message ---
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 7, 2021 3:24 PM
To: Hann, Ronald K Jr SES DTRA RD (USA); Kuhlsha, Michael A SES DTRA RD (USA); Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: [Non-DoD Source] Media Inquiry: DoD funding EcoHealth Alliance
Importance: High

Hi Dr. Hann,
I wanted you and the leaders to know that OSD PA has us on alert too for any queries on this. BLUF: While this has been on our radar now for some time, we have not received any queries but will continue to monitor.

V/r,

Chief, Public Affairs
Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA)

NIPR:
SIPR:
JWICS:

--- Original Message ---
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 7, 2021 3:08 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: [Non-DoD Source] Media Inquiry: DoD funding EcoHealth Alliance

[REDACTED] we did not see any queries from the Daily Mail on the story they did over the weekend, but it looks like they are re-using a lot of stuff that came out last year. Washington Times' Bill Gertz had a query early May, specifically about 'was any funding tied to the Wuhan lab?' (ANSWER: no) and Daily Caller (Kerr?) had a question about a contract (shared publicly available contract info), but nothing from any reporter at the Daily Mail.
This seems to be a re-hash of a story that came out half a year ago  
(https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/ecohealth-alliance-hid-pentagon-funding/) I haven’t had time to do a complete comparison yet, but from the first look of it, I wouldn’t be surprised if this ‘new’ story is almost cut-and-paste from the old one. I know questions were asked when this first came out a year or so ago -- we can probably track that down if needed...

But again, the short answer, no, we did not get any queries from Daily Mail. Please let me know if there is anything else we can do to help.

**(side note: our team in Albuquerque is tracking down the pictures for Walter Pincus -- if the pictures were previously digitized, we should get them soon; if not, they’ll have to locate the original photos or negatives and get those scanned)**

--- Original Message ---

From: [b][6]
Sent: Monday, June 7, 2021 1:26 PM
To: DTRA Ft Belvoir Org Mailbox DTRA Public Affairs
<dra.belvoir.org.mbx.dtra-public-affairs@mail.mil>
Subject: FW: [Non-DoD Source] Media Inquiry: DoD funding EcoHealth Alliance

Hi all,

Have you worked any queries related to this?

DOD Spokesperson
Defense Press Operations

Office
Cell:
Room #2D961
Good afternoon teammates!

Would either of you be able to address this query?

Thanks,

The Duty

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation. I'm writing a story this afternoon about the Pentagon granting nearly $40 million to EcoHealth Alliance, the charity that has close ties to and has transferred taxpayer funds to the Wuhan Institute of Virology. The WIV is a the center of allegations that COVID-19 could have accidentally leaked into the human population due to a lab leak.
The Daily Mail
Caution-https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-9652287/The-Pentagon-funnel
ed-39million-charity-funded-Wuhan-lab.html > reported these figures in a
story over the weekend.

Does the Department of Defense have any comment about its financial
relationship with EcoHealth Alliance?

Best,

--

Andrew Kerr
Investigative Reporter

Daily Caller News Foundation

(704)770-5938

@AndrewKerrNC
#2 of 9 FOIA 23-017

Rhys M. Williams, PhD
Executive Director
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 1:56 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DTRA CMD GP; DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DAG Team; DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List LA Govt; DTRA Ft Belvoir Org List DTRA Directorate Directors; DTRA Ft Belvoir Org List DTRA Directorate Deputy Directors
Subject: RE: HASC ISO CWMD Hearing Thank Note & QFRs

Sir,

Copy all, we are definitely planning on executing that plan.

V/r,

Chief of Legislative Affairs
Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Office: (978) 632-5582
Cell: (978) 632-5618

-----Original Message-----
From: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA)
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 12:55 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DTRA CMD GP; DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DAG Team; DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List LA Govt; DTRA Ft Belvoir Org List DTRA Directorate Directors; DTRA Ft Belvoir Org List DTRA Directorate Deputy Directors
Subject: RE: HASC ISO CWMD Hearing Thank Note & QFRs

Thanks. Looking at the full list of QFR's, we (DTRA) are going to need to input/coordinate on several that are not
directly addressed to us as well as coordinate our responses with the other witness organizations.

Rhys

Rhys Williams, PhD
Director (acting)
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 11:26 AM
To: Williams, Rhys M; SES DTRA DIR (USA) <[Redacted]>
Cc: DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DTRA CMD GP <[Redacted]>; DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DAG Team <[Redacted]>; DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List LA Govt <[Redacted]; DTRA Ft Belvoir Org List DTRA Directorate Directors <[Redacted]>; DTRA Ft Belvoir Org List DTRA Directorate Deputy Directors <[Redacted]>
Subject: HASC ISO CWMD Hearing Thank Note & QFRs

Sir,

Please find attached a thank you letter and your QFRs (x4) for from last week’s HASC ISO CWMD hearing. Also attached for awareness is the complete list of QFRs for all witnesses. Question #4 for Ms. Walsh addresses the EcoHealth Alliance question. We are currently drafting the response for the March 15th letter from Rep. Reschenthaler (+12) and will have for your review next week before passback to OSD.

Yrs,

[Redacted]
#3 of 9 FOIA 23-017

Rhys M. Williams, PhD
Executive Director
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2021 8:07 AM
To: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP TIRT REDUCT (USA) [redacted] Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA) [redacted]
Cc: DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DTRA CMD GP <dtra.belvoir.dir.list.dtra-cmd-gp@mail.mil>; Hann, Ronald K Jr SES DTRA RD (USA) <ronald.k.hann2.civ@mail.mil>
Subject: RE: HASC RFI on EcoHealth Alliance

Sir,

Gentlemen, OUSD(R&E)/Basic Research Office (DASD Nair) is the OPR for DoD and is consolidating the information for a single response to HASC (and also for a separate RFI for Sen. Marshall on the same topic).

V/r,

[b][redacted][b]

Chief of Legislative Affairs
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----
From: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP TIRT REDUCT (USA) [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 4:33 PM
To: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA) [redacted]
Cc: DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DTRA CMD GP <dtra.belvoir.dir.list.dtra-cmd-gp@mail.mil>; Hann, Ronald K Jr SES DTRA RD (USA) <ronald.k.hann2.civ@mail.mil>; Vitali, Michael R CIV (USA) <michael.r.vitali.civ@mail.mil>
Subject: RE: HASC RFI on EcoHealth Alliance

The tasker came to DTRA from OSD LA. It is not clear who in PNT is responding, but the response will come from PNT and not DTRA.

V/r,

Rob
-----Original Message-----
From: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA)
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 4:31 PM
To: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA)
Cc: DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DTRA CMD GP <dtra.belvoir.dir.list.dtra-cmd-gp@mail.mil>; Hann, Ronald K Jr SES DTRA RD (USA)

Subject: Re: HASC RFI on EcoHealth Alliance

Rob,

Copy. I assume that the feedback to the RFI will ultimately come from up in the PTN and not directly from us - we are feeding into the process.

Rhys

From: "Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA)" <mailto:Robert.S.Pope@DTRA.DOD.MIL>
Date: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 at 4:26:16 PM
To: "Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA)" <mailto:Rhys.M.Williams@DTRA.DOD.MIL>
Cc: "DTRA Ft Belvoir DIR List DTRA CMD GP <dtra.belvoir.dir.list.dtra-cmd-gp@mail.mil>

Subject: HASC RFI on EcoHealth Alliance

Dr. Williams,

For your situational awareness, late yesterday DTRA received an RFI from the HASC regarding DTRA work with EcoHealth Alliance. Most of the RFI includes questions we have answered before stating CTR didn’t fund any work in China. The new part of this RFI is a request for copies of “the agreements, initial research reports and all progress/final reports.” We have those assembled for transmission and will route to the FO with the rest of CT’s tasker response. We’re also sending all of this to TRAC and CWMD-Policy for their review and awareness.

V/r,

Rob

Robert S. Pope, Ph.D., SES
Director
Cooperative Threat Reduction
From: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA)
Sent: Mon, 27 Feb 2023 17:41:07 +0000
To: [Redacted]
Subject: TW: HOT -- Washington Times Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute
Attachments: smime.p7s
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Rhys M. Williams, PhD
Executive Director
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2021 6:33 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Times Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

We follow several DoD Directives which tells us that at an agency level, we must coordinate directly with OSD PA on all media matters. Whether it’s a notification of the query or critical guidance, we solicit OSD PA’s input. If the media query involves a topic that is sensitive in nature, such as CTR elements, we take precautions to safeguard or prevent any release of delicate information. Our first step when we get CTR media queries is to coordinate and inform OSD PA and the same procedure occurs when we get other requests from Tier 1 media interviews, request for information or public speaking engagements for our agency principals. For media interviews, we request the questions ahead of time from the news outlets for the appropriateness of even conducting the interview and before we agree to conduct an interview.

For any media interview we conduct, we notify OSD PA before and after the event. Based on the interview, we can anticipate the type of news story the reporter may or may write. Finally, for media queries that are sensitive in nature we do not provide answers to the reporter until the responses are heavily vetted by OSD PA. OSD PA also provides additional talking points and other support to enhance and further DOD messaging. Hope this explains our process.

V/r,

[Redacted]
Chief, Public Affairs
Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA)

[Redacted] (Work)
[Redacted] (Work Cell)

[Redacted]
SIPR
JWIC
-----Original Message-----
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 4:52 PM
To: [REDACTED] (US)
Cc: [REDACTED]; DTRA Ft Belvoir SI List
SI-PA Govt <dtra.belvoir.si.list.si-pa-govt@mail.mil>; Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THIRT REDUCT (USA) [REDACTED]; Latinski, Hunter F SES DTRA SI (USA) [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Times Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

Thank you - I appreciate your partnership. Please advise how DTRA PA informs and seeks guidance from OSD PA about media inquiries that are related to the DoD CTR Program and that specifically ask for insight into strategies related to the DoD CTR Program.

Best,

-----Original Message-----
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 4:37 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; DTRA Ft Belvoir SI List
SI-PA Govt <dtra.belvoir.si.list.si-pa-govt@mail.mil>; Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THIRT REDUCT (USA) [REDACTED]; Latinski, Hunter F SES DTRA SI (USA) [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Times Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

Thank you. We will continue coordinating appropriately going forward and will include CWMD Policy for media queries. We appreciate your support.

V/r,

[REDACTED]

Chief, Public Affairs
Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA)

-----Original Message-----
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 2:39 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Thank you again for coordinating the draft response with CWMD Policy. DASD Richard Johnson has, as edited in the attached and copied below for ease of reference. Rationale: this responds to the exact question posed.

Q2: Is it DTRA’s conclusion that none of its grant money to EcoHealth Alliance was used at the Wuhan Institute of Virology?
A2: Yes, we find that no portion of such grant funds were used to support work at the Wuhan Institute of Virology, or any other laboratory in the People’s Republic of China (PRC).

Separately, CWMD Policy would like OSD PA to clarify the coordination process for media inquiries related to the DoD CTR Program and any of the underlying programs. I’ve cc’d OSD Leg Af to likewise clarify the coordination process for Congressional inquiries related to the DoD CTR Program and any of the underlying programs. In each instance, CWMD Policy needs to be included in the clearance process.

Many thanks,

------Original Message------
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 12:50 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Times Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

Hello,

Please find attached the actual query that we received on Tuesday evening from Bill Gertz [Redacted] on my team acknowledged to Mr. Gertz that we received his query, however, we have not provided any information to him. Because similar media queries have come up in the past, we asked Dr. Rob Pope, DTRA’s CTR director, to prep responses to align with our previous statements in open source on the topic. Dr. Pope recommended short, factual responses, which are in alignment with responses prior to the Congressional queries on this topic.

I am also attaching the following: the email from Mr. Gertz, the media query sheet (an internal PAO document here at DTRA) and the responses that were prepared in case we engaged.

Yesterday morning, I advised my Public Affairs team to stand down and to coordinate with [Redacted] our OSD PA portfolio manager as we normally do. Moving forward, we do not plan to provide any information to Mr. Gertz.

I hope this paints a clearer picture of the query activity. I welcome any additional questions and concerns.

V/r,
-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 11:02 AM
To: 
CC: 
Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Post Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

Hello,

Will comply. Am bringing this request to the attention to the DTRA PA Chief for leadership coordination.

Please stand by...

Very respectfully,

[Redacted]

Detect...Deter...Defeat!

-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 10:55 AM
To: 
CC: 
Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Post Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

[Redacted] update: please have DTRA send the actual press inquiry AND the proposed response to CWMD Policy for coordination.

Best,

-----Original Message-----
From: 

Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 10:53 AM
To:
PA
C C
DT
Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Post Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

Thank you DASD CWMD asks that DTRA formally send the proposed DTRA responses to CWMD Policy for coordination.

Will you relay that message to DTRA leadership?

Many thanks,

-----Original Message-----
From:
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 9:56 AM
To:
C C
C C
DT
Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Post Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

Good day all,
In response to your additional questions:

Q: Is it because DTRA has received additional media inquiries?
A: Yes, the reporter sent an inquiry for additional information to the DTRA PA mailbox

Q: Is it because DTRA wants to be prepared for expected inquiries?
A: No, DTRA has already prepared/vetted responses to this subject matter from a previous inquiry

Q: Is there a Washington Post inquiry? Or did someone mix up the Washington Times and the Washington Post?
A: No, there is not an inquiry from the Washington Post, the email subject line was incorrect...the inquiry was from the Washington Times

DTRA’s response:

Q1: What about the funding that was done for the bat-borne zoonotic disease emergence and bat coronavirus emergence? Was that work done at the Wuhan Institute of Virology, where it is known that they conducted extensive bat coronavirus research?
A1: No.

Q2: Is it DTRA’s conclusion that none of its grant money to EcoHealth Alliance was used at the Wuhan Institute of Virology?
A2: The grant was made by DoD’s Biological Threat Reduction Program (BTRP), and we find that no portion of such grant funds were used to support work at the Wuhan Institute of Virology, or any other laboratory in the People’s Republic of China (PRC).

Will stand by for additional questions...

Very respectfully,
Public Affairs
COR: HDTRA121C0025 - Shield Analysis Technologies LLC.
Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Detect...Deter...Defeat!

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 6:43 PM
To: [redacted]
CC: [redacted]
DTI
Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Post Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

Hello,

Additional questions from DASD CWMD:

- Why is DTRA providing a response to the Washington Times Online article? (it seems to us that the responses Dr Williams and Dr Vann provided at the May 4 hearing answered the question from Congressional representatives)
  - Is it because DTRA has received additional media inquiries?
  - Is it because DTRA wants to be prepared for expected inquiries?
  - Is there a Washington Post inquiry? Or did someone mix up the Washington Times and the Washington Post?

CWMD Policy needs to understand what the response is intending to do, and we also need to review whatever DTRA puts together.

Thank you

-----End of Original Message-----
Adding DTRA PA here.

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]

Date: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 at 6:00:20 PM

Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Post Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

CWMD Policy needs to chop on the DTRA response.

Thanks,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]

Subject: RE: HOT -- Washington Post Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

Hi [redacted]

I've received no queries to that effect. I've cc'd [redacted] who works our DTRA portfolio -- she says there's a response in the works to that piece.
USA

Department of Defense Spokesman

Office of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs

1400 Defense Pentagon (2D961), Washington, DC 20301-1400

From: [email]
Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 5:34 PM
To: [email]

Subject: FW: HOT -- Washington Post Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

checking to see if you've received any media enquiries related to this Washington Times Online article, "Best of our knowledge: Pentagon officials deny Wuhan Institute of Virology given defense funds"

Many thanks,

JD, LLM 1 Director, CTR Policy 1 Office of the Secretary of Defense, Homeland Defense & Global Security [email]

From: [email]
Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 2:31 PM
To: [email]
Subject: Re: HOT -- Washington Post Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

this is the first I've heard of it.

Best,

Lt Col, USAF

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense
for Legislative Affairs

Subject: FW: HOT -- Washington Post Question Re: DTRA, EcoHealth Alliance, and the Wuhan Institute

Has OSD LegAf fielded any questions related to this article?

Many thanks,

-----Original Message-----
From: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA)
Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 11:54 AM
To: [redacted]
FYSA -- Today's article from Bill Gertz (included in today's Defense Morning Clips):

-----------------------------

'Best of our knowledge'. Pentagon officials deny Wuhan Institute of Virology given defense funds
Washington Times Online, May 4 (1751) | Bill Gertz

Pentagon officials offered a qualified denial Tuesday when questioned on whether any of the nearly $40 million in defense money given to a non-government organization may have been used for research at the Chinese military-linked Wuhan Institute of Virology, a suspected potential origin point for the COVID-19 pandemic.

Rys Williams, acting director of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, and Brandi Vann, acting assistant defense secretary for nuclear, chemical and biological defense programs, told a House Armed Services subcommittee hearing that all the funds they reviewed from DTRA and other government sources did not go to the Chinese institute following reviews of grants to EcoHealth Alliance, a New York-based NGO that worked closely with the WIV.

"We have done a thorough look at all of our programmatic activities to ensure that at least the Defense Threat Reduction Agency's funding to this NGO was not provided, to the best of our knowledge, into the Wuhan Institute of Virology," Mr. Williams told the House panel that focuses on special operations.

Mr. Williams said DTRA reviews all activities related to NGOs "to make sure that the risk for government funding is minimized and in keeping with the traditions and the boundaries of the federal acquisition process but equally in policy as well."

Ms. Vann, the acting assistant defense secretary, added that other defense agencies involved in nuclear, chemical and biological (NCB) programs reviewed funding of EcoHealth Alliance research and found no links to the Chinese lab.

"We also across the NCB did a thorough review to identify any potential access or investment into the Wuhan laboratory, and we have not identified any," she said in response to questioning from Mississippi Rep. Trent Kelly, the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee. "It is something that we continue to watch to ensure that our investments are not going to places where they should not be," she noted.

Mr. Kelly asked the two defense officials "what kind of risk assessment or risk analysis we've conducted and how the Wuhan Institute of Virology became the partner of choice for U.S. government agencies, given its ties to the PLA," he said, using the acronym for People's Liberation Army, the Chinese military.

A State Department fact sheet made public in January for the first time disclosed that the WIV was engaged in covert biological weapons research with the PLA. Chinese officials at the WIV have denied the institute works with the PLA.

According to the fact sheet, the WIV is engaged in "secret military activity."

"Secrecy and non-disclosure are standard practice for Beijing," the fact sheet said. "For many years the United States has publicly raised concerns about China's past biological weapons work, which Beijing has neither documented nor demonstrably eliminated, despite its clear obligations under the Biological Weapons Convention."

The collaboration at the institute includes both publication and secret military projects including classified research and laboratory animal experiments. The work between WIV and PLA has been underway since 2017.

Director of National Intelligence Avril Haines told Congress last month that U.S. intelligence agencies
believe the pandemic began either through a leak from a Chinese laboratory or from an animal host. Many scientists and mainstream news outlets for months dismissed all suggestions the virus could have come from a lab as a conspiracy theory.

A list of grants and contracts for EcoHealth Alliance posted on the website of Independent Science News shows DTRA and the Pentagon provided the group with $38.9 million since 2014. DTRA’s funding included $6.49 million between 2017 and 2020 for what the agency called “understanding the risk of bat-borne zoonotic disease emergence in Western Asia.”

According to DTRA, the grant was used for research aimed at “combating or countering weapons of mass destruction” and was to be carried out between 2017 and 2022. It is not clear if the work is ongoing.

The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) provided EcoHealth Alliance with $3.7 million in funding from 2014 to 2019, and the National Institutes of Health gave the group $2.5 million between 2009 and 2012. The NIAID funds went to a program called “understanding the risk of bat coronavirus emergence.”

A spokesman for EcoHealth Alliance did not return an email and phone call seeking comment.

EcoHealth Alliance President Peter Daszak has worked closely with WIV virologist Shi Zhengli, known as the “Bat Woman of Wuhan” for her work on bat viruses and has been a vocal critic of the Wuhan lab transmission theory. He was also part of the World Health Organization team that investigated the virus origin earlier this year that called the lab theory “extremely unlikely” and not worth pursuing. Critics say the WHO report was influenced by the Chinese government that sought to play down the lab leak theory.

China, according to the Trump and Biden administrations, has engaged in disinformation in a bid to deflect criticism from its handling of the outbreak’s earliest days. The Chinese government refused to provide virus samples to international virus hunters and initially hid the infectiousness of the virus from the world.

More than 3 million people have died since the pandemic broke out in Wuhan in December 2019.

---

Vfr,
Rob

Robert S. Pope, Ph.D., SES
Director
Cooperative Threat Reduction
From: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA)
Sent: Mon, 27 Feb 2023 17:42:20 +0000
To: [blank]
Subject: FW: UK Article on DTRA funding of Virus
Attachments: smirne.p7s
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Rhys M. Williams, PhD
Executive Director
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----
From: Luotan, Hunter F SES DTRA S1 (USA)
Sent: Monday, June 7, 2021 9:03 AM
To: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA)
Subject: RE: UK Article on DTRA funding of Virus

This is going to have a hard time going away - nice to see that David Franz is also involved...

-----Original Message-----
From: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA)
Sent: Monday, June 7, 2021 7:36 AM
To: kulashra, Michael A SES DTRA RD (USA)
Cc: Pope, Robert S SES DTRA COOP THRT REDUCT (USA); Hane, Ronald K Jr SES DTRA RD (USA); Lutinski, Hunter F SES DTRA S1 (USA)
Subject: RE: UK Article on DTRA funding of Virus

Plus Rob and Hunter - see attached.

Mike,
Thanks. This is not the first time this has arisen. I was asked about it during recent congressional testimony (I’ve cut/pasted the draft response that is going back to the Hill this week). The EHA work was funded by CTR and has been reviewed very closely to assure that funding was properly conducted and overseen.

Rhys

QFR submitted by Kelly, Trent
Subcommittee on Intelligence and Special Operations Reviewing Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction for Fiscal Year 2022 Tuesday, May 4, 2021

Question for The Honorable Jennifer Walsh: According to USA Spending, DTRA has provided EcoHealth Alliance grants for research to support its Biodefense mission. EHA in recent years has chosen the Wuhan Institute of Virology as a research partner in recent years through an NIH grant. As noted in the State Department Fact Sheet of 1/15/21, the Wuhan Institute of Virology has troubling links to the Chinese military. Is EHA still a grantee of DTRA? What type of risk analysis does DTRA do to ensure that its research dollars are wittingly or unwittingly funding a malign actor such as China? Has EHA’s relationship with the WIV and China disqualified it as the partner of choice for DOD and DTRA?
While the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) has provided funding to EcoHealth Alliance (EHA), no portion of any funds awarded by DTRA to EHA are for work at the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV) or for any other activity in the People's Republic of China (PRC).

DTRA will continue to execute the requirements-based Chemical Biological Defense Program (CBDP) and Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) missions with sound program management practices. For each grant DoD awards to support CTR’s biological threat reduction mission, the Program engages with applicants early in the project development process to ensure they understand there can be no transfer of funds to parties other than those DoD authorizes as sub-recipients. DoD CTR’s program managers, who are certified DoD acquisition professionals, carefully review each grant proposal to ensure that no prohibited activities (technical or fiscal) are included as any part of a funded project. Additionally, DoD performs regular oversight of all grants through required financial and technical reporting, meetings with stakeholders, and site visits to ensure that research is conducted only as authorized.

Rhys Williams, PhD
Director (acting)
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----
From: Kaliasha, Michael A SES DTRA RD (USA) [b][8]
Sent: Monday, June 7, 2021 6:56 AM
To: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA) [b][8]; Hann, Ronald K Jr SES DTRA RD (USA) [b][8]
Subject: UK Article on DTRA funding of Virus

Rhys/Ron:

Jim Ward came across this article that alleges that DTRA was involved in funding gain of function experimentation at the Wuhan lab that created the Corona virus. For your SA.

Mike

From: [b][8]
Sent: Monday, June 7, 2021 6:29 AM
To: [b][8]
Subject: Article

Sir,

Here it is.

Jeff
Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android < Caution--https://go.onelink.me/107872968?pid=InProduct&c=Global_Internal_YGrowth_AndroidEmailSig__AndroidUsers&af_wl=ym&af_sub1=Internal&af_sub2=Global_YGrowth&af_sub3=EmailSignature >
----- Forwarded Message -----

From: [redacted]

To: [redacted]

Cc: 

Sent: Sun, Jun 6, 2021 at 15:01

Subject: Hmmm....

So, I warned the PAO and the front office and Chem/Bio about this before I left DTRA. An intrepid blogger had discovered this connection in late January 2020 and posted it on a popular blog (Zero Hedge) along with grant numbers, certifying officials, etc.)

In short, DTRA was funding gain of function experimentation in bat coronaviruses in Wuhan. I suspect, even the money that went from NIH may have originated from DTRA.

DTRA may get its 15 minutes of fame.

Perhaps you would like to alert DTRA PAO. The link is to the RedState blog article which has a link to the Daily Mail (UK) article.

Money quote from RedState:

"Research papers published by the two on coronaviruses identify the grant funding as having come from USAID and PREDICT. But that limited attribution didn't reveal that the funding distributed through PREDICT had, in part, come from the Defense Department — specifically the DOD "Defense Threat Reduction Agency.""

Why Was the US Department of Defense Funding Bioweapons Research at Wuhan? - RedState < Caution-https://redstate.com/shipwreckedcrew/2021/06/06/why-was-the-us-department-of-defense-funding-bioweapons-research-at-wuhan-n391796 >

From the Daily Mail:

Sub headline that reads:
Grants from the Pentagon included $6,491,025 from the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) from 2017 to 2020.

The article states, "Grants from the Pentagon included $6,491,025 from the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) from 2017 to 2020 with the description: 'Understanding the risk of bat-borne zoonotic disease emergence in Western Asia.'"

The Pentagon funneled $39 million to a charity that funded Wuhan lab | Daily Mail Online

The Pentagon funneled $39 million to a charity that funded Wuhan lab

Josh Boswell

Federal data seen by DailyMail.com reveals The Pentagon gave $39 million to charity EcoHealth Alliance (EHA), w...

I would NOT assume anyone in PAO is doing anything about this or is even aware. I would urge you to make them at least aware, and Dr. K as well.

Jim W
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Rhys M. Williams, PhD
Executive Director
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

-----Original Message-----

From: Williams, Rhys M SES DTRA DIR (USA)
Sent: Mon, 27 Feb 2023 17:43:12 +0000
To: Lutinski, Hunter F SES DTRA SI (USA)
Attachments: SI Weekly Report 10-14 MAY 2021.docx, smime.p7s

Subject: FW: SI Weekly Report 10-14 May 21

Sir,

On behalf of Mr. Lutinski: We plan to have the OA6 final draft report for senior leader review early next week. The exercise team has been working with MG Fletcher to close loopholes in the exercise approval process to ensure greater visibility and oversight of Agency exercise participation. STED has started the second cycle of selecting STRI research projects and will brief you on the program next Monday. PA is following up on all hands questions and we finally received a tentative timeline for the FY23-27 PBR.

Details attached.

Thank you very much.

v/r

Chief of Staff
Strategic Integration Directorate
DTRA
SI Weekly Report

We plan to have the OA6 final draft report for senior leader review early next week. The exercise team has been working with MG Fletcher to close loopholes in the exercise approval process to ensure greater visibility and oversight of Agency exercise participation. STED has started the second cycle of selecting STRI research projects and will brief you on the program next Monday. PA is following up on all hands questions and we finally received a tentative timeline for the FY23-27 PBR.

PLEX:

The OA6 team is on track to deliver the draft final report on 17 May for senior leader review. The sequencing of concepts into operational themes is complete. Detailed writing of the OA6 narrative is occurring in parallel and nearing completion. The Training and Exercises Division provided an In-Progress Review on the next DTRA Joint Training Plan and a JTP process map brief focused on existing processes and touch points to MG Fletcher to provide him greater visibility and oversight on all DTRA supported exercises. The team also completed preparations for the upcoming Joint CWMD Planning Course (JCPC) which will be presented at the FA52 Course at Fort Belvoir, 24-28 May.

STED:

We started 26 white paper reviews for our second cycle of the FY21 BAA while conducting two FY21 project kickoff briefs (Preventing Strategic Deterrence Failure in DPRK and US-ROK Dialogue about DPRK Deterrence) from our first cycle. We are crafting the next steps of the program that enables the evolution of the assessment process to provide strategic maneuver room for the director.

Public Affairs:

We will follow up on the ADIR’s All Hands to ensure the video is made available to everyone and assist in producing written answers to the questions submitted during the broadcast. PA continues coordination with HR on Executive Media Training; AAPI Heritage Month video blogs; Agency workforce messaging and other FO Public Affairs direct support. PA received another media query from the Economist regarding the ADIR’s recent HASC testimony and DTRA funding to the EcoHealth Alliance; we are waiting on the reporter to respond with more specific questions/topics, and will coordinate with CTR and OSD Policy CTR point person. We anticipate a website rollout date of May 28th, and are moving forward with dtra.mil directorate pages aligned with the Detect, Deter, Defeat messages from the communications playbook.
### Comptroller:

**Date:** May 13, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appn SM</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Obl.</th>
<th>Obl. %</th>
<th>Exp.</th>
<th>Exp. %</th>
<th>OSD Goal</th>
<th>Variance from OSD Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>627.6</td>
<td>358.7</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>177.0</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M - OCO</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>297.5</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT&amp;E</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>567.9</td>
<td>311.9</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>-25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT&amp;E - OCO</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>-36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT&amp;E</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>549.4</td>
<td>534.0</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>418.0</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT&amp;E - OCO</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>155.6</td>
<td>151.1</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>-17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P,DW</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P,DW - OCO</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P,DW</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P,DW - OCO</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P,DW</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P,DW - OCO</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>360.2</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>373.7</td>
<td>345.3</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>122.3</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>350.2</td>
<td>334.0</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>259.6</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
1. The variance from OSD Goal is based on obligations for O&M, CTR, and P,DW. For RDT&E, the variance is based on expenditures.

**Revised FY 2022 President’s Budget Schedule:**

- Program/Budget Review (Short list of items/ 5 DMAGs)
- Program Budget Decisions
- OSD financial systems open for input (CIS, PRCP, SDCS, SNaP)
- Budget submission to OMB ($ only)
- President’s Budget exhibits due to OSD

**May 27**

Revised President’s Budget released.

OSD Comptroller staff is finalizing the PB22 rollout exhibits given the announcement that the President will submit the budget request to Congress on 27 May. We received a FY23-27 PBR draft timeline and will ensure our internal processes aligns to it:

- POM/BES Database Submissions due ~July 30th
- POM Briefs to Program-Resource Management Group (PRMG)/ Deputy’s Management Action Group (DMAG) ~July 28th - August 6th
- Issue Nominations ~August 20th
- BES Budget Exhibits due ~September 3rd
- Concurrent Program and Budget Review ~September 3rd - November 19th
- Budget Lock ~December 13th
- Databases Lock ~December 17th
- FY 2023 President's Budget Rollout ~February 7, 2022
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Subject: Weekly Legislative Update - 05.04.21

Senior Leaders,

Good afternoon. Attached is this week’s legislative update. Thank you to
the entire team in preparing Dr. Williams for his testimony before the House
Committee on Armed Services subcommittee on Intelligence and Special
Operations today.
The full transcript and video of the hearing will be available tomorrow. We
expect to receive questions for the record by the end of this week.

Have a great evening!

Yrs,

Chief of Legislative Affairs
Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Office
Cell:
HEADLINES

- Senate: Not in session this week. Returning next week for votes.
- House: Committee work only this week. Returning next week for votes. HASC-ISO held their annual CWMD posture hearing today. A summary can be found below.

HEARINGS OF INTEREST

FY22 DoD CWMD Strategy, Policy & Programs
- May 4, 1100
- House Armed Services - Intelligence & Special Operations Subcommittee
- Witnesses:
  - [redacted] (A/ASD-Homeland Defense & Global Security)
  - [redacted] (A/ASD-NCB)
  - [redacted] (Deputy Commander, USSOCOM)
  - Dr. Rhys Williams (A/DIR, DTRA)
- The virtual hearing was attended by eight of fifteen members on the Subcommittee. Chairman Gallego opened the hearing by expressing his concern over a possible weaponized COVID-like virus. He also asked the panel about the quality of our CWMD efforts with allies like South Korea, India and Japan. Ranking Member Kelly highlighted the threat of poisoning from biological agents as evidenced by recent Russian activity and how we preserve or strengthen international norms in the chem/bio arena. He also asked specifically about DoD grant funding for EcoHealth Alliance and their subsequent work with the Wuhan Institute of Virology — Secretary Austin recently received a letter on this topic from a separate group of House Members.
- Rep. Bacon asked Dr. Vann if Iran was our number one threat for nuclear proliferation and if there were concerns with Iran colluding with Al Qaeda and WMD. He finished by commenting on the current status of Open Skies. Rep. Waltz, a green beret and former Director of the OSD Afghanistan policy desk, inquired on what CIED capabilities we are leaving behind in Afghanistan and what the withdrawal plan looked like. Other members raised questions about synthetic biology, fentanyl, the Korean Peninsula, and the impact of the withdrawal from Afghanistan on CWMD efforts including the Pakistan nuclear program. A number of questions were deferred to a classified discussion or written response.

POSTURE HEARING RECAP

United States Nuclear Deterrence Policy and Strategy
- April 28 (SASC-Strategic Forces)
- While the hearing was sparsely attended, SASC full committee Chairman Reed did join and asked questions. As expected, there was agreement among panelists and witnesses that nuclear
modernization is necessary and no-first-use policies should be rejected. Moving beyond those points, Franklin Miller discussed expanding deterrence into the realms of space, cyber, AI, and advanced conventional forces. Meanwhile, Dr. Bracken advocated for a more nuanced approach to war and deterrence as he pointed out that surprise attacks get too much study, while accidental war receives short shrift. He also characterized China as a nation highly unlikely to engage in arms control as they see it as a western “trick” and urged a bit of perspective in that they are surrounded by five nuclear armed countries that are more likely to bring devastation to them than the United States.

- Chairman King offered likely the most salient point of the hearing when he spoke about the threat emanating from a non-state actor getting a hold of a nuclear weapon, in which case the strategy shifts decidedly away from deterrence and toward reliable intelligence. During Chairman Reed’s line of questioning he lamented the loss of traction on arms control, wherein Dr. Bracken pointed out that no internal lobby for it exists as the U.S. abolished the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. To turn the corner, arms control must fit the 21st century and recognize China’s skepticism stance and Russia’s transactional motivations. Dr. Roberts offered that “competition serves our interest more than cooperation in these areas.” Much time was also spent discussing the U.S. model of placing sole nuclear launch authority in the hands of one person. However, it was largely determined that no other viable alternative was available.

Substantive questioning wrapped up with Sen. Rosen where she advocated for increased NC3 cyber security and preventing the resumption of explosive nuclear testing. Chairman King then concluded with his final concerns: (1) the best way to avoid a nuclear war is to modernize our nuclear force and (2) preventing a terrorist group from possessing a nuclear weapon.

STRATCOM & SPACECOM: FY22 Posture Hearing

- April 21 (HASC)

- Although he refrained from questions, Chairman Cooper made a very brief statement where he shared two concerns: moving SPACECOM to Alabama and the lack of urgency from some of his colleagues in recapitalizing the triad. However, most members of the panel on both sides expressed their support for modernizing the ground based leg, with the exception of Rep. Garamendi. The latter strenuously challenged ADM Richard by highlighting the prior STRATCOM Commander’s apparent support for one more life extension of the Minuteman III. Other related topics included NC3, no-first-use, and plutonium pit production.

STRATCOM & SPACECOM: FY22 Posture Hearing

- April 20 (SASC)

- The hearing included generally bipartisan support for modernizing the ground based leg of the triad. Members sought to highlight the cost of not modernizing, the benefits gained from increased cyber defenses, and the comparison to Russia and China’s significant head start in the area. Sen. Warren marked the exception when she stated that STRATCOM likes spending “$44.5 billion a year on nuclear weapons... but I don’t.” She also asked for ADM Richard’s commitment to not undermine the President’s Nuclear Posture Review. Other Senators focused on how cutting ICBMs would impact arms control negotiations and the stress it would place on the other legs of the triad. Of interest to DTRA, Sen. Shaheen asked about the benefits we gain from New START with inspections and data exchanges. Also, Sen. Cotton pointed out that a sole purpose nuclear policy would also “undermine our ability to deter chemical or biological attacks.” On space matters, both Senators King and Gillibrand advocated for some manner of international norms in space. The former also spoke of the risk we take with large U.S. satellites,
instead of seeking a “constellation of small satellites that would be harder to disable.”

CONGRESSIONAL ENGAGEMENTS

- HASC Intelligence & Special Operations Subcommittee Hearing on Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (4-May-2021)

NOMINATIONS

- Department of Defense:
  - USD A&S (referred to SASC on April 12)
  - USD Comptroller (referred to SASC on April 12)
  - USD Intelligence & Security (referred to SASC on April 12)
  - Director, CAPE (referred to SASC on April 15)
  - Secretary of the Army (referred to SASC on April 15)
  - ASD Strategy, Plans & Capabilities (referred to SASC on April 22)
  - Secretary of the Air Force (referred to SASC April 28)
  - ASD-NCB (referred to SASC April 27)
  - General Counsel (referred to SASC April 28)
  - ASD-SO/LIC (referred to SASC April 28)
  - Under Secretary of the Air Force (referred to SASC April 28)
  - USD for Research & Engineering (referred to SASC April 28)

- Other National Security Posts:
  - Director, National Counterterrorism Center (referred SSCI on April 19)
  - Inspector General, CLA (referred to SSCI on April 19)
  - General Counsel, DHS (referred to SHSGAC on April 19)
  - Director, CISA (Referred to SHSGAC on April 22)
  - Administrator, NNSA (Referred to SASC on April 22)
  - National Cyber Director (referred to SHSGAC on April 27)
  - Inspector General-Intelligence Community (announced April 27)
  - Under Secretary of State for Arms Control & International Security (hearing April 28)
  - Special Representative, Bureau of International Security & Nonproliferation (referred to SFRC April 29)

CRS REPORTS OF INTEREST

- State Sponsors of Acts of International Terrorism (4-May-2021)