

From Sen. Cotton

QUESTION 1: The Committee is concerned about NCTC's approach to IT Modernization to monitor threats, “connect the dots”, and share information to prevent terrorist attacks and deter national security threats.

A. If confirmed, what actions will you take to ensure NCTC is investing in commercial software and AI solutions to automate functions and reduce NCTC’s reliance on human system integrators?

Answer: If confirmed, I will conduct a comprehensive assessment of existing and available commercial software and AI solutions to evaluate ways to reduce NCTC's reliance on human system integrators.

B. If confirmed, do you commit to providing the Committee with an assessment within 90 days of:

- (1) The critical software capabilities that have been cut due to NCTC’s budget decisions?
- (2) The impact that any previous budgetary cuts have had on NCTC’s ability to perform its missions;
- (3) Whether NCTC is prioritizing funding for mission critical capabilities, and, if not, the rationale for NCTC’s funding priorities;
- (4) NCTC’s spending allocation on IT infrastructure improvements versus spending on mission software (such as TIDE, Screening and Vetting, and Targeting/Analytics), including quantifying for each category the funding allocated toward NCTC-build solutions versus commercial software; and
- (5) The functionality and all costs associated with TIDE, including a description of how TIDE is maintained, its critical dependencies, any existing risks for future performance, and (if such risks exist) how commercial software potentially could mitigate these risks.

Answer: Yes.

From Sen. Warner

QUESTION: At your confirmation hearing you confirmed that a foreign entity paid for your and your husband’s trip to Italy in July 2024. Can you confirm in writing that Pierre Louvrier and/or the Clementy Foundation paid for this trip and provide the total cost of travel, accommodations, and meals provided by foreign sponsors for this trip?

Answer: Clementy Foundation paid for flight, accommodations, and meals, as they did for other attendees, which included former WH Chief of Staff, Mick Mulvaney, and other American former senior leaders. The total cost was, EURO 19096.73.

QUESTION: During your confirmation hearing you alleged that you were not aware of any link between Louvrier and sanctioned Russian actors. Can you explain, specifically, what due diligence you did on Louvrier and the Clementy Foundation before accepting an international trip paid for by a foreign sponsor?

Answer: *I don't recall the specific documents reviewed for due diligence prior to the trip. This invite was at the request of former WH Chief of Staff, Mick Mulvaney, a devout Catholic who served on the board of the Foundation.*

QUESTION: In the event you searched for information on Pierre Louvrier, did your search not encounter the entry on French Wikipedia (discussing his investment activities in Russia and the impacts of Russian sanctions on his investments) nor articles from the Organized Crime and Corruption Reporting Project on his financial ties to sanctioned Russian oligarch Konstantin Malofeyev nor the multiple entries associated with Pierre Louvrier within the Panama Papers database maintained by the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists?

Answer: *I don't recall specific background sources I reviewed prior to going on the trip. This invite was at the request of former WH Chief of Staff, Mick Mulvaney, a devout Catholic who served on the board of the Foundation.*

QUESTION: Please disclose any international travel sponsored by a foreign sponsor you have taken since 2021.

Answer: *In addition to the Rome trip, I spoke at CPAC Mexico conference in Mexico City in 2024, and CPAC Mexico arranged the travel and accommodations.*

QUESTION: In response to a question from Sen. Gillibrand on your position on the Chips and Science Act, you said you “fully support the investment in building and strengthening our own domestic capabilities.” Yet on your Truth Social account in June 2022, you directly attacked the portions of that bipartisan law directing federal investment in domestic semiconductor capabilities, calling it a “Corporate welfare chip bill” that “transfers billions from pockets of regular Americans to coffers of giant corps like Intel, Micron Tech, etc.” Please clarify your answer to Sen. Gillibrand on whether you support U.S. investment in onshoring domestic semiconductor manufacturing or whether you continue to believe that such efforts are “corporate welfare.”

Answer: *I support strengthening domestic semiconductor manufacturing. However, I opposed the CHIPS and Science Act due to concerns with the approach and substance of the legislation.*

From Sen. Heinrich

QUESTION: In response to my question about your 2017 trip to Syria, you said you met with Nancy Pelosi and Steny Hoyer after your return, but did not meet with the Intelligence Community or Department of State because they did not express interest. Why didn't you reach

out to or coordinate with the Trump Administration's Intelligence Community and the Trump Administration's Department of State, either before the trip or after the trip?

Answer: I cleared the trip through House Ethics prior to departure and upon returning. I informed the Trump Administration about the trip when I returned.

QUESTION: In response to my question asking if you were aware that Ahmad Badreddin Hassoun, with whom you met in Syria in 2017, made threats to conduct suicide bomb attacks in the United States, you stated: "I was not and had not heard that until today." However, press reports indicate your staff made you aware of Hassoun's threats in 2017 and that you even left comments in an electronic draft of potential answers your congressional office was preparing to counter anticipated media questions about the cleric. Why did you deny knowledge of Hassoun's threats?

Answer: I have no recollection of this specific information being presented to me eight years ago.

From Sens. Heinrich, Ossoff, and Wyden

QUESTION: The Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act (RISAA) that reauthorized Section 702 of FISA included an expanded definition of electronic communications service provider. According to the Department of Justice and the Committee leadership, this language was intended only to encompass the kind of provider at issue in a FISA Court/ FISA Court of Review case, the opinions of which were authorized for public release on August 23, 2023. The Committee passed language in the Fiscal Year 2025 Intelligence Authorization Act that would have narrowed the RISAA language to bring it into conformity with its actual purpose, as articulated by the Department of Justice and Committee leadership. Do you support the Committee's effort to ensure that statutory FISA authorities are consistent with their national security purpose and not unnecessarily broad?

Answer: I support the legislative role of the Committee, and I am committed to upholding the law. I understand that the expanded definition of electronic communications service provider in RISAA was intended to address an issue described in a classified FISC opinion. If confirmed, I look forward to studying that opinion and consulting with the Attorney General on any proposed changes to the definition.

From Sen. Gillibrand

QUESTION: In your response to the question about why you tweeted thirteen months ago that it was shortsighted for the U.S. to allow Japan to build up its defense architecture, you indicated that there was "history" between Japan and China which had "ramifications" for "our own security interests". What aspect of history between Japan and China do you believe the intelligence community is not already aware? Increasing Japanese defense spending has been a priority for multiple administrations, including the first Trump administration. You stated you looked forward to providing your historical analysis on Sino-Japanese relations to the President, do you plan to advise him to reverse course on this policy priority? As the recipient of the single

largest foreign material sales case to date, authorized during the first Trump administration, what specific investments in U.S. defense technology is Japan making which are “escalatory” in your view and caused you to make that post?

Answer: If confirmed as DNI, I will provide the President and policymakers with timely, accurate, and unbiased intelligence to inform their decision-making. My role would be to present the best possible intelligence to the President and ensure the IC is well-positioned to execute his desired foreign policy approach.

Questions from Senator Wyden

QUESTION: You testified that a former official who fails to submit a book for pre-publication review should not have a security clearance. How would you improve the pre-publication review process so that it is more fair and transparent and thus less likely to result in the publication of classified material?

1. Would you require that all IC reviewing agencies provide a substantive response to submitters within a specific period of time established in a transparent public policy, after which the submitter may publish his or her material?
2. If yes, what should that time period be and should it be different for books, magazine articles, social media posts, and other publications?
3. Do you agree that the response provided by that set time period must specify what language is and is not classified, and that classification should be the only basis for redactions?
4. Do you agree that a person is not obligated to submit for pre-publication review material that he or she does not personally know to contain or be derived from classified matters?
5. Do you believe there should be an appeals process and, if so, should it be centralized? What due process rights do you believe should be included in the appeals process?

Answer: If confirmed as DNI, I look forward to studying the current prepublication process across the IC and working with this Committee to ensure the review process is fair, transparent, and timely.

QUESTION: If you identify illegal Intelligence Community programs or operations, or programs or operations whose declassification is in the public interest, will you seek to declassify those matters?

Answer: I am committed to upholding the law and would take immediate corrective action if I learned of an illegal IC program or operation, as well as evaluate whether the public interest in disclosure would outweigh any harm to national security. I am also committed to ensuring the

IC fulfills its obligation under Section 501 of the National Security Act of 1947 to ensure that any illegal intelligence activity is promptly reported to the congressional intelligence committees along with any corrective action that has been taken or will be taken in connection with that activity.

QUESTION: Do you support the work of the Public Interest Declassification Board (PIDB) and will you push for it to be fully resourced to fulfill its statutorily mandated mission?

Answer: Yes.

QUESTION: Public law directs that the PIDB have a separate line item in the President's budget request (Section 708(b) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-527, as amended)). Will you ensure that this statutory requirement is adhered to?

Answer: Yes.

QUESTION: Do you agree that Inspectors General cannot be fired without regard to the notification requirement in 5 U.S.C. 403(b) ("If an Inspector General is removed from office or is transferred to another position or location within an establishment, the President shall communicate in writing the reasons for any such removal or transfer to both Houses of Congress, not later than 30 days before the removal or transfer.")? If yes, what would you do if directed to fire an Inspector General in contravention of that requirement?

Answer: Yes. If confirmed as DNI, I lack the authority to fire an Inspector General. Only the President can remove an Inspector General.

QUESTION: You testified at your hearing that: "Under John Brennan's leadership, the CIA abused its power to spy on congress to dodge oversight, lied about doing it until he was caught, and yet has never been held responsible." This episode was documented by the CIA Inspector General in its July 18, 2014, report on "Agency Access to the SSCI Shared Drive on RDINet," which is available on the CIA's website.

1. Besides Director Brennan, who else do you believe should be held accountable for the actions of the CIA? To the extent names are redacted, you may refer to titles.
2. What reforms would you put in place to ensure that no element of the Intelligence Community can again commit these abuses?

Answer: If confirmed as DNI, I am committed to upholding the Constitution, ensuring that laws and policies are followed, and hold accountable those who do not uphold this standard. I will assess what reforms may be necessary to prevent such abuses.

QUESTION: In your written responses to questions, you agreed that the collection activities detailed in the Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General's December 2024 report "A Review of the Department of Justice's Issuance of Compulsory Process to Obtain Records of Members of Congress, Congressional Staffers, and Members of the News Media" constitute a

“significant breach of the constitution and separation of powers.” Do you believe there should be accountability for the actions described in the OIG report?

Answer: Yes.

QUESTION: As described in the OIG report, 28 C.F.R. 50.10(c)(5)(v) requires that, in investigations or prosecutions of unauthorized disclosures of national defense information or classified information, the DNI shall make a certification that reaffirms the IC’s “continued support for the investigation or prosecution.” Will you withhold that certification if you believe that the targets are congressional members or staff targeted solely based on their constitutionally authorized oversight duties?

Answer: If confirmed as DNI, any decision whether or not to make a certification would be based on the specific facts and circumstances of that case, including the harm of unauthorized disclosure and an evaluation of whether the information remains properly classified.

QUESTION: Do you agree with the district court’s December 2, 2024, opinion in *United States v. Agron Hasbajrami* that U.S. person queries of Section 702 of FISA could, in some circumstances, violate the Fourth Amendment?

Answer: If confirmed, I would rely on the Office of General Counsel and the Department of Justice to evaluate the implications of judicial decisions on Section 702.

QUESTION: Do you support the limitations, detailed in EO 14086, with regard to authorized and unauthorized purposes for which SIGINT may be conducted? Please describe any areas where you believe those limitations should be expanded, reduced, or otherwise modified?

Answer: Regardless of my personal views, I am committed to complying with laws and policies with regard to authorized and unauthorized purposes for which SIGINT may be conducted. If confirmed, I look forward to studying EO 14086 and evaluating whether any modifications may be necessary.

QUESTION: What other aspects of EO 14086 do you agree or disagree with?

Answer: (see above)

QUESTION: Do you agree that there should be no modifications made to EO 14086, nor superseding orders issued, unless such modifications or orders are made public?

Answer: (see above)

QUESTION: You testified at your hearing that “Former DNI James Clapper lied to this committee in 2013, denying the existence of programs that facilitated the mass collection of millions of Americans’ phone and internet records — yet was never held responsible.” What would you do if an employee of the Intelligence Community or anyone in the administration made

a misrepresentation to Congress or to the public related to intelligence matters? If that person refused to correct the public record, would you do so personally?

Answer: If confirmed as DNI, I'm committed that I and all who work for me will be truthful and transparent with Congress, and as appropriate, the public. I'm committed to enforcing our obligations to be transparent and responsive to the oversight committees to the full extent of abilities.

QUESTION: You testified at your hearing about the seriousness of the Salt Typhoon breach. Will you use your position to advocate for policies, practices or legislation to strengthen cyber protections in the telecommunications sector?

Answer: Yes

QUESTION: Do you agree that a diverse workforce is necessary if the IC is going to effectively spy on, translate, understand, engage with, and analyze a diverse world? If yes, what institutional changes would you make to ensure that diverse workforce?

Answer: If confirmed as DNI, I will create a culture that focuses on recruiting and retaining IC professionals based on merit, diversity of views and experiences that can best serve our national security interests.

QUESTION: In your written responses to Committee questions, you emphasized the “success derived from... building a strong team with a diverse set of complimentary experience and skills.” What institutional changes would you make to ensure that the IC employs a diverse set of complimentary experiences and skills?

Answer: (see above)

QUESTION: Do you commit to providing the Committee the National Intelligence Priorities Framework (NIPF)?

Answer: I am committed to keeping the Committee currently and fully informed of all intelligence activities, consistent with the law.

Questions from Senator Young

QUESTION: You stated during your hearing that, “Edward Snowden broke the law and I do not agree with how he chose to release information and the extent of the information and intelligence that he released.”

1. Was there any venue or action for him to release the full extent of the information detailing intelligence programs that he leaked that you would have supported, based on the avenues available at that time? For the purpose of this question, an answer other than “yes” or “no” will be considered unresponsive. If “yes”, please explain.

Answer: Yes. Mr. Snowden could have reported his concerns to an Inspector General, the leadership of the agency he contracted with, or the congressional intelligence committees.

QUESTION: If a Snowden-like unauthorized disclosure by a member of the Intelligence Community were to occur under your watch that threatened to expose lawfully authorized foreign intelligence programs, but which also exposed potential violations of civil liberties of American citizens, how would you handle that situation and what response would you recommend the President take to such a disclosure?

Answer: Assuming an unauthorized disclosure has already taken place, if confirmed, I would take every measure available to limit the national security harm potentially created by such an exposure, including the protection of any national security personnel whose work may be compromised. Second, I would coordinate and cooperate fully with partners in the IC and law enforcement to take every necessary action under the law to investigate the disclosure. Third, I would undertake any necessary reforms or adjustments to security protocols or other agency operations to prevent further unauthorized disclosures., including my plan, that was outlined in the hearing.

- 1. Proper oversight to make sure there are no illegal or unconstitutional programs.*
- 2. Minimize access to highly sensitive intelligence including security clearance and classification reform, that has bi-partisan support.*
- 3. Inform every person in the workforce about all legal options for whistleblowers – the IG, Ombudsman, and the Intel Committee.*
- 4. Establish direct hotline to the DNI for whistleblowers.*

Those who go outside these channels and break the law will be held accountable under the law.

QUESTION: On June 3, 2019, you posted on Twitter: “If it wasn’t for Snowden, the American people would never have learned the NSA was collecting phone records and spying on Americans. **As president, I will protect whistle-blowers who expose threats to our freedom and liberty** [emphasis added].” As you know, Snowden’s actions were not covered by the Intelligence Community Whistleblower Protection Act, even if the explicit protections in the ICWPA had applied to IC contractors at the time.

1. If confirmed, do you still support “protect[ing]” Intelligence Community employees, contractors, or subcontractors who commit unauthorized disclosures of foreign intelligence programs? For the purpose of this question, an answer other than “yes” or “no” will be considered unresponsive. If “yes”, please explain.

Answer: No.

2. If confirmed, do you still support “protect[ing]” Intelligence Community employees, contractors, or subcontractors who commit unauthorized disclosures of intelligence programs that reveal violations of Americans’ civil liberties? For the purpose of this question, an answer other than “yes” or “no” will be considered unresponsive. If “yes”, please explain.

Answer: No.

QUESTION: If confirmed, through your leadership role and role in the financial management and prioritization of the Intelligence Community, would you abide by and respect the holding of any federal district court, any federal circuit court, or the Supreme Court of the United States that upheld the constitutionality and legality of an intelligence program, even if it is one to which you personally object? For the purpose of this question, an answer other than “yes” or “no” will be considered unresponsive. If “no”, please explain.

Answer: Yes.

QUESTION: Resolving clause (3) of H.Res.1162, which you introduced as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives on September 30, 2020, states: “the Federal Government should drop all charges against Edward Snowden.”

1. Do you personally believe the federal government should still pursue criminal prosecution of Edward Snowden for the entire extent of his unauthorized disclosure of intelligence programs? For the purpose of this question, an answer other than “yes” or “no” will be considered unresponsive. If “yes”, please explain.

Answer: As stated previously, Edward Snowden broke the law through his unauthorized disclosure of classified information. However, the decision of whether to continue to pursue prosecution is not mine to make. If confirmed, I will not attempt to influence the President, the Attorney General or any other official on this case.

In the hearing, you repeatedly stated that Snowden broke the law. If you agree he broke the law, why did you sponsor legislation to encourage all charges to be dropped?

Answer: Edward Snowden broke the law through his unauthorized disclosure of classified information. He should have raised his concerns to the IC Inspector General, IC Ombudsman, or Congressional Intelligence Committee members. As a Member of Congress, part of my responsibility was to advocate for changes to policies that did not comport with the law. I introduced the Resolution, and it did not receive a vote. As a strong defender of Americans' Fourth Amendment rights, I was deeply concerned about the information Edward Snowden released regarding illegal and unconstitutional U.S. Government programs that conducted mass surveillance of Americans. I support the work Congress did, including the Senate Intelligence Committee, in passing bipartisan legislation to end those programs and enact significant civil liberties reforms to uphold Americans' Fourth Amendment rights. The Director of National Intelligence is not a policy-making role. If confirmed, I am committed to providing apolitical, unbiased, accurate intelligence reporting to the President and policymakers in order to keep Americans safe.

QUESTION: Will you commit to personally working with the Committee to reauthorize and advance any additional reforms of Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act while retaining the underlying authorities to perform foreign intelligence?

Answer: *Yes. I commit to working with this committee throughout its consideration of reauthorizing and reforming Section 702.*

QUESTION: What specific reforms will you seek prior to reauthorization of Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act in 2026?

Answer: *If confirmed as DNI, I will assess the implementation of existing reforms and provide feedback to your committee, and I look forward to working with the committee on any specific reforms the President has outlined.*