

From: (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV
To: (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV; (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV
Cc: (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV; (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV; (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV;
 (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV
Subject: FW: HPSCI Letter to ODNI on COVID Origins
Date: Friday, August 5, 2022 12:05:02 PM

Classification: (b) (3) (A)

Classified By: (b) (6), Branch Chief
 Derived From: ODNI CG
 Declassify On: 20471231
 =====

FYI -(b) (6)

We are hoping to contribute to the NIC's response, they have until 18 August. Do either of you want to walk through this?

Thanks, (b) (6)

From: (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV
Sent: Friday, August 5, 2022 10:40 AM
To: (b) (3), (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (3), (b) (6); (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV
 (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV (b) (6);
 (b) (6) DOE HQ USA GOV -(b) (6)
Subject: RE: HPSCI Letter to ODNI on COVID Origins

Classification: (b) (3)

(b) (3) (A), (b) (6)
 =====

(b) (3), (b) (6) – please consider this a preliminary response and thank you for continuing to include us in answering the HPSCI request. I've yet to coordinate with our congressional liaison and I want to talk with (b) (6) next week (he's out right now). That said, I wanted to continue sharing some of our thinking and provide you our continued support.

I agree with (b) (3), (b) (6) that HPSCI is taking things out of context, but I do think clarifying what we were saying in the Q&A analysis section implicated in the request is warranted. For that reason, we welcome the chance to contribute text on this clarification in any response that we craft. I also want to (b) (6) to make sure I fully understand the context and motivation for our Q&A analysis. My recollection is that we did that brief Secretary Note (S-1) to provide a high-level summary to Secretary Granholm on the basis for our position because of her known interest in our support to the 90-day study. It was one of the earliest and highest visibility issues our office was doing in her first year. We also were anticipating requests for briefings, so we were leaning forward on preparing