

President Biden. Rather, in referencing Burisma and 2016 election interference, it was clear to me that he, Mr. Yermak, was only talking about whether any Ukrainians had acted inappropriately.

At this time, I was focused on our goal of getting President Zelensky and President Trump to meet with each other, and I believed that their doing so would overcome the chronically negative view President Trump had toward Ukraine. I was seeking to solve the problem I saw when we met with President Trump in the Oval Office on May 23.

As a professional diplomat, I was comfortable exploring whether there was a statement Ukraine could make about its own intentions to investigate possible corruption that would be helpful in convincing Mr. Giuliani to convey to President Trump a more positive assessment of the new leadership in Ukraine.

On August 16, Mr. Yermak shared a draft with me, which I thought looked perfectly reasonable. It did not mention Burisma or 2016 elections, but was generic. Ambassador Sondland and I had a further conversation with Mr. Giuliani who said that in his view, in order to be convincing that this government represented real change in Ukraine, the statement should include specific reference to Burisma and 2016. Again, there was no mention of Vice President Biden in these conversations.

Ambassador Sondland and I discussed these points, and I edited the statement drafted by Mr. Yermak to include these points to see how it looked. I then discussed it further with Mr. Yermak. He said that for a number of reasons, including the fact that Mr. Lutsenko was still officially the prosecutor general, they did not want to mention Burisma or 2016. I agreed and the idea of putting out a statement was shelved.

These were the last conversations I had about this statement, which were on or about August 17 to 18. My last contact with Mr. Giuliani, according to my records, was