

EXECUTIVE SESSION  
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

INTERVIEW OF: BRAD PARSCALE

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Washington, D.C.

The interview in the above matter was held in Room HVC-304, the Capitol,  
commencing at 2:10 p.m.

Present: Representatives Conaway, King, LoBiondo, Rooney,

Ros-Lehtinen, Gowdy, Schiff, Himes, Speier, Quigley, Swalwell, Castro, and Heck.

Appearances:

For the PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE:

[REDACTED]

For BRAD PARSCALE:

CHRIS TODD, ESQ.

DANIEL S. GUARNERA, ESQ.

JAMES WEBSTER, ESQ.

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C.

SUMNER SQUARE

1615 M STREET, N.W.

SUITE 400

WASHINGTON, DC 20036

██████████ Good afternoon all. This is an unclassified transcribed interview of Brad Parscale.

Thank you for speaking to us today. For the record, I am ██████████ ██████████ for the majority of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. There are others in the room that will speak to you and they will announce themselves to you as that occurs during the process.

Before we begin, just a few security reminders. I am sure you guys did already so. No electronics, gadgets, gizmos, all outside please. There is a secure, safe space, even though this is unclassified.

I just wanted to state a full rules of the road on the record. The questioning will be conducted by Members and staff during their allotted time period. Some questions may seem basic, but that is because we need to clearly establish facts and understand the situation.

Please do not assume we know any facts you have previously disclosed as part of any other investigation or review. We ask that you give complete and fulsome replies to questions based on your best recollection. If a question is unclear or you're uncertain in your response, please let you us know. And if you do not know the answer to a question or cannot remember, simply say so.

During the course of this interview we'll take any breaks that you desire.

The interview, as I said, will be transcribed. There is a reporter making a record of these proceedings so we can easily consult a written compilation of your answers later.

Because the reporter cannot record gestures, we ask that you answer verbally. If you forget to do this, you might be reminded to do so. You may also

be asked to spell certain terms or unusual phrases that we're not familiar with.

You are entitled to have counsel present for you for this interview, and I see that you have exercised that right.

If counsel could please state their names for the record.

MR. TODD: Sure. It's Chris Todd, and I'm with Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick, the law firm here in town. And with me is Jim Webster and Daniel Guarnera, and Guarnera is G-u-a-r-n-e-r-a.

[REDACTED] Thank you.

To ensure confidentiality, we ask that you do not discuss the interview with anyone other than your attorneys. Consistent with the committee's rules and procedure, you and your counsel, if you wish, upon request will have a reasonable opportunity to inspect the transcript of this interview in order to determine whether your answers were correctly transcribed. The transcript will thereafter remain in the committee's custody, and the committee also reserves the right to request your return for additional questions should the need arise.

The process for the interview is as follows, pretty simple. The minority will be given 45 minutes to ask you questions, Mr. Parscale, and the majority will be given 45 minutes to ask you questions. Immediately thereafter, we will take a 5-minute break if you desire, after which time the minority will be given 15 minutes to ask questions and the majority will then be given 15 minutes to ask questions. These 15-minute rounds will continue until the questioning has been completed.

Time will be kept for each portion and each round in the interview with warnings given at the 5- and 1-minute mark.

You are appearing today before us voluntarily and we greatly appreciate that, but we would remind you that it is unlawful to deliberately provide false

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

information to Members of Congress or staff. And since this interview will be conducted under oath, Mr. Parscale, would you raise your right hand to be sworn?

[Witness sworn.]

██████████ Thank you very much.

The record will reflect that the witness has been sworn and --

MR. ROONEY: Did you say minority, majority?

██████████ Yes.

MR. ROONEY: Minority first?

██████████ Minority first.

MR. ROONEY: He's switching it on us, throwing us for a loop.

██████████ Oh, it's their witness, so they go first.

MR. ROONEY: Are you yielding?

MR. HECK: If I yield does, that mean we lose our time?

MR. ROONEY: I will give it back to you.

██████████ Yeah. No, no.

MR. HECK: Look, we had internally assigned who would take the lead on this, and I am here principally on observer status. I have our prepared questions and I can go through them, but --

MR. ROONEY: I'll go first, but I'm not taking 45 minutes, and then I will just yield to you. Is that good?

██████████ That's fine.

MR. HECK: Talk slowly.

MR. ROONEY: So thank you for coming in. Is it Pascrell?

MR. ROONEY: Par-scale.

MR. PARSCALE: Par-scale, like golf and weigh yourself.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. ROONEY: Par-scale, okay.

I'm Tom Rooney. This is Mr. Heck. We're both members of the Intelligence Committee. We're here today, and for -- by and large, most of this committee's responsibility is charged with oversight of the Intelligence Community. We are not the Justice Department, we are not a criminal investigative body. This isn't a criminal proceeding. Our job is to, at the end of interviewing witnesses such as yourself, to write a report to the -- basically to the Intelligence Community to tell them what happened in 2016 with regard to the election, whether or not there was Russian interference, and how far did that go.

So as much as you can lend insight into that, we would appreciate your straightforwardness and assistance in writing that report. You might not have anything to add to it, in which case we're sorry for wasting your time. But we hope that you can and we hope that we'll be able to -- thank you -- we hope that we'll be able to learn more about what specifically Russia was trying to do during the last election cycle and how do we avoid them interfering in our future elections. And if you have any insight into that, we would appreciate hearing from you.

The majority and the minority leaders of this committee got together and they laid out four parameters with regard to where they wanted this investigation to go and where we thought our report would be helpful. So I'm going to go through the four parameters with you and ask you if you have any thoughts on them or comments, and then I'm going to ask you some specific questions. And then with any of this stuff, if it doesn't apply to you, just say you don't know if you don't know.

But before I do all that, can you just sort of give a background? We have a little bit of a background here with regard to what you did with regard to your role in the last campaign, but if you could just sort of enlighten the members briefly as

to who you were and what you were doing and that kind of thing.

MR. PARSCALE: Would you like that in a specific -- my role is different during different periods during the campaign.

MR. ROONEY: Yeah, I mean, I would just go back to --

MR. PARSCALE: To the beginning?

MR. ROONEY: -- to 2015 and tell us, you know, how you became part of the Trump campaign and what you did for them.

MR. PARSCALE: Prior to the campaign, I was the agency of record for several of Trump's commercial businesses. And my company was in San Antonio, Texas. And we provided real web markings that provides services to help commercial businesses grow.

In 2015, I received an email that asked me if I could make a splash page for Mr. Trump to form an exploratory community for the President of the United States.

MR. ROONEY: Had you ever worked on a political campaign before that?

MR. PARSCALE: I had made a website for the tax assessor of Bexar County.

MR. ROONEY: So I'm just curious as to why a person or a candidate like Donald Trump would reach out to somebody that didn't have background in politics to do this.

MR. PARSCALE: I don't that --

MR. ROONEY: Do you know?

MR. PARSCALE: No, I do not know.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry for interrupting.

MR. PARSCALE: Do you want me to continue?



MR. ROONEY: Yeah.

MR. PARSCALE: That website was a simple made web page. I understood his brand. And I made a simple web page for him for 1,500 bucks.

MR. ROONEY: Uh-huh. And then what?

MR. PARSCALE: Some time passed, and then I got a phone call asking me to make a website for him.

MR. ROONEY: Who did you coordinate with that to build it, like, on the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: The only name that I remember at that point was Amanda Miller.

MR. ROONEY: What kind of guidance did she give you?

MR. PARSCALE: Honestly, she asked me for my advice of how -- what would a site look like.

MR. ROONEY: Right.

MR. PARSCALE: And I gave my opinion. And they agreed with that and I made that site.

MR. ROONEY: But messaging and that kind of stuff --

MR. PARSCALE: There wasn't much messaging on that --

THE REPORTER: One at a time.

But messaging --

MR. ROONEY: Sorry.

MR. PARSCALE: That wasn't much messaging on the original site. It was his name, sign up to follow him. It was extremely simple. There was -- at this point, there was no political messaging on our website.

MR. ROONEY: Tell us how it --

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: Evolved?

MR. ROONEY: Evolved, yeah.

MR. PARSCALE: A few months go by, I meet Corey Lewandowski by phone. He calls me and he says: We need to put this on the site, we need to put this on the site, and we need to put this on the site. That's what I do.

Hello. It is getting full in here.

MR. ROONEY: We picked the wrong room.

MR. PARSCALE: So I completed making the website, and Corey Lewandowski had started frequently calling me as well as other people on the campaign at that point and started asking me to put things on the website, to do things. And that was pretty much my realm of things for the first few months.

MR. ROONEY: How much were -- how were you being compensated for --

MR. PARSCALE: Hourly. Just like any other contract I'd have with any other client.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. So as time progressed, did anything change or --

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. ROONEY: -- did you just basically do --

MR. PARSCALE: No, it changed.

I received a phone call from Jared Kushner in -- I don't know exactly when -- and he asked people within the campaign -- or within the company, he said: Brad's a great web marketer, you should really listen to what -- his thoughts on how to win the campaign and what to do.

MR. ROONEY: When was this?

MR. PARSCALE: This would have been a few months before the primaries started.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. ROONEY: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: So late 2015, I think it is.

MR. ROONEY: And then what happened?

MR. PARSCALE: I gave him my pitch. I explained how I thought Facebook would play a key role, how marketing has changed to emotional. I gave him my pitch of 20 years of advertising. And he agreed. And they gave me the contract to do all the web marketing for the primaries.

MR. ROONEY: And that was exclusively on Facebook?

MR. PARSCALE: No. It was -- the decision was there was a sales spot for Facebook, but did -- the budget ended up being more exclusively Facebook, though, during the primaries, at least the web portion.

MR. ROONEY: Right.

MR. PARSCALE: And at that point, I had no other relation to anything else happening in the campaign.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. Go on as far as what happened after that.

MR. PARSCALE: At this point, I still have never visited the campaign or never met anybody. I was still in San Antonio.

MR. ROONEY: Right. Everything is by phone call?

MR. PARSCALE: Everything is by phone or email. The primaries would go through and I don't know how much you want me to go into detail. I just -- I keep solving problems, coming up with ideas. And I come up with an idea of how to advertise on Facebook, and saying how we should push out Mr. Trump's message. Jared and I are talking on a daily basis, things like that. And we win the primaries.

MR. ROONEY: What kind of problems? You said, you know, were faced

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

with problems that you had to solve. Give us an example of something like that.

MR. PARSCALE: How do we get -- we're down in Wisconsin, how do we get -- how do we get more people, you know, things like that. How do we get more people to view this video? How -- Brad we need to get this message up. What's the best way to do that? You know. Very similar problems that a corporation would have in releasing a product.

MR. ROONEY: We've heard a lot in the news lately -- and without getting into what you've heard, but actually what you saw and did as part of the campaign -- with regard to Russia and their intent on using mediums like Facebook to influence not only our election, but we saw even in most recently with the NFL kneel down and things like that. Did you ever any interaction with the Russian Government while you were working on the Trump campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. ROONEY: Did they ever try to contact you or -- that you know of?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I know of.

MR. ROONEY: Did you work with anybody that you weren't sure was part of the campaign, the Trump campaign, to work on behalf of the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Can you --

MR. ROONEY: Like, was there a third party that you weren't sure was part of the Trump campaign that was working with you to assist the Trump campaign, somebody not like Jared Kushner, but --

MR. PARSCALE: There -- not --

MR. ROONEY: I'm sort of reaching here, but --

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah. Not that I'm aware of, but there were vendors that were obviously tied to the campaign that I did work with.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. ROONEY: Do you know if any of those people were paid for by the Russian Government?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. So go -- go on after so after -- after the primary and we get into the general. Is your role basically the same through the completion?

MR. PARSCALE: Pretty much. I thought that that was the end of my work. I thought I had done good. They would hire somebody else. You know? But I think they were all very happy with what I did. I got a call one day and said: We've all unanimously agreed to make you digital director for the campaign.

MR. ROONEY: And this is after the primary.

MR. PARSCALE: After the primary, before convention.

MR. ROONEY: And then how did your -- did your compensation ever change?

MR. PARSCALE: At this point, no. It's --

MR. ROONEY: Still hourly?

MR. PARSCALE: Still hourly. Plus, a small commission on the ad buys. At this point, it is just me by myself and a couple staff members from my company. I did almost all the primary from my laptop.

MR. ROONEY: Just briefly, did anything change after the primary?

MR. PARSCALE: Everything changed after the primary.

MR. ROONEY: Tell us about that.

MR. PARSCALE: Corey -- it didn't change until Corey got fired. When Corey got fired and Paul took over, I was pretty much told we need to start fundraising in a few days. We need to build out a team. You need to be ready --

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. QUIGLEY: Just to be sure, can we clarify who Paul was?

MR. PARSCALE: Paul Manafort. I apologize. I've said these names so many times. So Paul -- so they wanted me to get things going in a significant way.

MR. ROONEY: In fundraising.

MR. PARSCALE: Fundraising at the beginning. And so I had to build a team really fast.

MR. ROONEY: How did you do that?

MR. PARSCALE: Hired lots of vendors.

MR. ROONEY: How did you vet the vendors?

MR. PARSCALE: Vet -- how do you mean vet?

MR. ROONEY: Was there any kind of qualifications as to who you chose to use or was it basically just based on price? Or how did you know that the product that you were getting from these guys was, you know, good quality and that kind of thing?

MR. PARSCALE: So most of the vendors that I -- that I wanted to hire, I had them come to San Antonio and met them and had them pitch me on why they would be good.

MR. ROONEY: And then so what happened after that?

MR. PARSCALE: I continued on the campaign and eventually they asked me to come to New York. That was the first time I ever visited the campaign headquarters.

MR. ROONEY: Who did you meet with up there?

MR. PARSCALE: I think the first day I met -- I met a lot of people, but the only ones I remember for sure are Paul Manafort, Rick Gates, and Corey

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Lewandowski. He was still there the time I went the first time. And when I went back, Corey was no longer there and I was digital director.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. How did things continue to evolve from there?

Was that basically it after that --

MR. PARSCALE: No. After that, it changed more.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. PARSCALE: I slowly took over other portions of the campaign, things that needed to be done. Eventually took over all TV advertising, all TV ad production, the mail program, the RNC relationship mainly.

MR. ROONEY: So you basically did all the media and media consulting and that kind of thing for the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. ROONEY: Did you --

MR. PARSCALE: Under the leadership, obviously, of Jared Kushner?

MR. ROONEY: Yeah.

Did you stay in Texas or did you move to New York full-time at that point?

MR. PARSCALE: I moved full-time to New York in some period of time in that realm.

MR. ROONEY: How many people did you have working for you when you went up there?

MR. PARSCALE: In San Antonio?

MR. ROONEY: No, in New York.

MR. PARSCALE: I'd never really had a staff in New York, per se, the way I had in San Antonio. It was different in New York.

MR. ROONEY: So when you did -- you say you did all the TV and mail

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

and all that stuff --

MR. PARSCALE: The vendors.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. Continue on after you got that title.

MR. PARSCALE: Well, I never really got the title.

MR. ROONEY: You just did it.

MR. PARSCALE: I just did it. The campaign had really no functional system at all?

MR. ROONEY: Okay. I'm going to go through -- I just want -- is there anything else just on overview, background, that you did for the campaign, during the campaign that you want to share with the committee before I get into some specifics?

MR. PARSCALE: I think it's a very general question. My job was to do whatever from my 20 years of business experience to make sure that this thing worked.

MR. ROONEY: How did it end? After the election and all that, did you --

MR. PARSCALE: I went home?

MR. ROONEY: And that's it.

MR. PARSCALE: I didn't want to work in the government.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. So as I told you before -- were you offered a job?

MR. PARSCALE: Not really. I was told that if I wanted one, I could have one. I said I wanted to go home.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. I'm going to get into just some very specific questions. Again, as I told you at the beginning, if you don't know the answers to these questions, it's fine to say you don't know.

MR. PARSCALE: Sure.



MR. ROONEY: Because these are the parameters of our investigation, as agreed to by our chairman and the ranking member, to try to figure out how best to report out to the Intelligence Community what happened during the election cycle.

The first question is, what Russian cyber activity and other activity measures were directed against the United States and its allies. Do you have any input or comment on that?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. ROONEY: Did the Russia active measures include links between Russia and individuals associated with political campaigns or any other U.S. persons, including yourself?

MR. PARSCALE: Can you say that again slower?

MR. ROONEY: Did the Russian active measures include links between Russia and individuals associated with political campaigns or any other U.S. persons?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I'm aware of.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. What was the U.S. Government's response to these Russian active measures? And what do we need to do to protect ourselves and our allies in the future? Do you have any comment on that?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know anything about the response.

MR. ROONEY: What possible leaks of classified information took place related to the Intelligence Community assessment of these matters? Do you know anything about that?

MR. PARSCALE: [Nonverbal response.]

THE REPORTER: Your answer?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. ROONEY: Yeah, you have to say it.

Do you know in your time -- and this, I think, is most relevant, it's sort of repeating a question I already asked. Did you see, actually see, not read or hear, did you actually see any efforts by the Russian Government and/or the Trump campaign to collude with each other during the campaign in your role as digital director or whatever you --

MR. PARSCALE: Media whatever thing --

MR. ROONEY: Yeah

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. ROONEY: Did you see any kind of conspiracy by the Russian Government and/or the Trump campaign to work with each other?

MR. PARSCALE: No, not that I --

MR. ROONEY: Did you see any kind of coordination between the two, whether it be -- you know, you mentioned Paul Manafort, Corey Lewandowski, and Jared Kushner -- any of the principal actors that you worked with in the digital realm, whether it be through Facebook, advertisements, any of that stuff?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. ROONEY: I don't know -- [REDACTED] is gone -- what our time is. But --

[REDACTED] Yeah, we usually do 45, 45.

MR. ROONEY: No, I know, but I don't know where we were in that 45 minutes.

[REDACTED] I think you guys are probably good so just right after 3.

MR. ROONEY: Well, I think that -- I think that we've got -- Mr. Heck was kind enough to yield to us, so I am not going to, for the sake of just taking up time, I'll yield the balance to the minority, and then you can start your 45 minutes.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

██████████ Yeah.

MR. ROONEY: Yeah, restart the clock?

MR. HIMES: You can continue. It flips to us.

Thank you.

MR. HIMES: I'm Jim Himes from Connecticut. Nice to meet you.

MR. PARSCALE: Nice to meet you.

MR. HIMES: So I might ask you some duplicative questions.

MR. PARSCALE: It won't be the first time.

MR. HIMES: Let's start with some people.

When did you first find out that Donald Trump was considering a run for President?

MR. PARSCALE: The day? Do you want me to guess? I don't want to guess, but February 21st is when I believe, 2015?

MR. HIMES: February 21st. Okay. How did you find this out?

MR. PARSCALE: By email.

MR. HIMES: From whom?

MR. PARSCALE: Amanda Miller?

MR. HIMES: And what's your relationship with Amanda Miller?

MR. PARSCALE: She was, at Trump Org, was the head of PR, I believe. I don't know her title, but I believe that's what it is.

MR. HIMES: Had you had any contact or done any -- had you had any contact with Donald Trump himself prior to that date?

MR. PARSCALE: No. Himself personally?

MR. HIMES: Himself personally.

MR. PARSCALE: No.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. HIMES: But you'd done work for the organization.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. HIMES: Can you describe that work, when it started and what the nature of that work was?

MR. PARSCALE: It goes back several years. I worked on Trump real estate, website projects and marketing, Melania Trump's skin care line, Trump winery, Air Trump Foundation. There might be some other sort of things in that period, over like 5-year period.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And I think you testified earlier to Mr. Rooney's question that you started officially with the are Trump campaign the day after Corey Lewandowski was fired. Is that correct?

MR. PARSCALE: No. What I said was I became officially a titled member of campaign. I started working from February.

MR. HIMES: From your laptop.

MR. PARSCALE: From my laptop, right. He asked when I changed a larger title.

MR. HIMES: Who asked you to make that change to become an official member of the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: No one asked me to, they just told me.

MR. HIMES: Who told you?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't remember who gave me the call.

MR. HIMES: You don't recall it was Jared Kushner?

MR. PARSCALE: I do not recall if it was Jared Kushner who called. Someone called and said that I was.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Can you talk a little bit about your relationship with Jared Kushner? When did you first meet him? What was the nature of the relationship leading up to the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: I didn't know Jared Kushner before the campaign started.

MR. HIMES: Okay. When did you meet him?

MR. PARSCALE: I knew his wife

MR. HIMES: You knew his wife.

MR. PARSCALE: Ivanka.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: I wouldn't know when. I met him by phone.

MR. HIMES: And you knew Ivanka because of your work on how you were setting websites?

MR. PARSCALE: I met the Trump children over the years period before that.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And so, sorry, just to be clear here, when did you actually meet Jared Kushner?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't remember the date. It was by phone.

MR. HIMES: But it was in the context of the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. HIMES: Again, I know this is thoroughly duplicative.

MR. PARSCALE: It's all right.

MR. HIMES: But as of the official posting, how would you describe your responsibilities once it became official?

MR. PARSCALE: It depends on a period of time. I have a have you fluid

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

job placement throughout the campaign. If you ask me a specific period, I could tell you what my roll was during that time.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Let's come back to that. So you described a variety of work that you've done for the Trump Organization.

Prior to that day when you were told that you would be officially on the campaign, had you done any political digital work prior?

MR. PARSCALE: I made a web page for the tax assessor of Bexar.

MR. ROONEY: B-e-x-a-r.

MR. HIMES: Sounds like an official thing?

MR. PARSCALE: No, I don't know. It was just some guy was running for tax assessor. He lost.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Okay. So that may answer this question. But had you ever worked on a political campaign or political advertising digital media before the committee?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. HIMES: Can you take us through the subcontractors that were hired through your firm to provide services to the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: I could list ones I remember.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: They might not be the complete list, though.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: Cambridge Analytica -- no, Cambridge Analytica was not a subcontractor of mine. Oh, yeah, they were, they were both. Cambridge Analytica. Prosper Group. Do you want vendors who we hired things through or vendors that provided staff or staff that --

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. HIMES: Both, yeah, both.

MR. PARSCALE: Whew.

MR. HIMES: What you can remember, obviously.

MR. PARSCALE: I mean, obviously, Facebook, Google, Twitter were all there. Those are also ad platforms, so you're asking two different things. I need to make sure what you're asking.

MR. HIMES: Yeah. No. I appreciate that. So I guess what I'm looking for is folks that were directly compensated by your organization as either subcontractors or as ad platforms.

MR. PARSCALE: Okay. So those would be -- there were -- the ad platforms would be great, you know. We also bought ads on Politico and all those. I mean, those would be significant, all those ads we bought direct as well. And then you have a couple other companies, I can't remember their names. So the list of the new contracts was less than a handful that had staff there.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So can we talk a little bit about Cambridge Analytica, which was the first organization mentioned? When was your first contact with Cambridge Analytica, either associated with the campaign or otherwise?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't remember when, but it was -- I don't remember when.

MR. HIMES: Did you have any preexisting contact with Cambridge Analytica before the campaign? Had you known them before?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So you got to know them as part and parcel of the campaign.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. HIMES: Can you describe your -- what was the nature of the working relationship between you and Cambridge Analytica?

MR. PARSCALE: I hired Cambridge Analytica for staff.

MR. HIMES: For staff. Can you elaborate on that?

MR. PARSCALE: I hired them because I needed people who had ever worked on a campaign before.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: And that was it.

MR. HIMES: So when you say for staff, are you -- you didn't hire them for their analytical capability. You just were looking for bodies?

MR. PARSCALE: No. I was looking for bodies that had worked on campaigns.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And how did that work? Did they actually come physically, be collocated with you?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. HIMES: Okay. How did you choose who was brought on board?

MR. PARSCALE: I met -- I had a dinner and I met a gentleman that I felt was well qualified. And I felt like I needed that expertise to help me in places where I didn't know anything about politics.

MR. HIMES: Do you remember that gentleman's name?

MR. PARSCALE: Matt Oczkowski.

MR. HIMES: Can you spell that?

MR. PARSCALE: I cannot spell it.

MR. HIMES: Matt Oczkowski?

MR. PARSCALE: Matt Oczkowski. He was the digital director under

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE



Walker.

MR. QUIGLEY: Sorry. So I get this right, is it Matt space --

MR. PARSCALE: Matt Oczkowski.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. Matt is his first name and --

MR. PARSCALE: They call him Oz.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. Oczkowski.

MR. HIMES: If you asked me to spell it, I would get it wrong 100 times.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So he was your -- he was your initial and lead contact with Cambridge Analytica?

MR. PARSCALE: No. He was not my initial contact. I can't remember who my initial contact, the guy's name was, but he came to one of the dinners.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: And then I met him, and then I decided I wanted to hire him.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And then --

MR. PARSCALE: But they came with him.

MR. HIMES: How many other people came --

MR. PARSCALE: No. I just mean I had to hire Cambridge because he was under a contract.

MR. HIMES: Under a contract with whom?

MR. PARSCALE: With Cambridge.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So he wasn't an employee of Cambridge, he was a subcontractor?

MR. PARSCALE: No. He was an employee, but his employee contract said he couldn't come work for me separately.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. HIMES: Oh, I see, I see. I got it. I got it. So how many other individuals came over from Cambridge Analytica?

MR. PARSCALE: Originally I think it was three other.

MR. HIMES: Three? So Matt Oczkowski, plus three others.

MR. PARSCALE: I believe an initial contract was four.

MR. HIMES: And can you describe what their job descriptions were within your organization?

MR. PARSCALE: At the beginning was to provide help to me to build out a team for fundraising.

MR. HIMES: Provide help to you to build? Can you be a little bit more detailed? When you say build out a team, their job was to hire others?

MR. PARSCALE: To help me come up with a plan how to do small dollar fundraising, because they had just gotten done working on the Cruz campaign and the Carson campaign, and I knew they had good experience in small dollar fundraising.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So were they, for example, charged with building the website --

MR. PARSCALE: No. Just more of a strategy, like I needed someone in the room who had experience.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And how would you describe -- so you just said they were not -- they weren't building sites. But when you say experience what are we talking about? Targeting?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, yeah. They were helping with audience building, strategies on, you know, how do you build a small dollar fundraising program. I wanted Matt's experience.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. HIMES: I guess I'm trying to get at we have four individuals, I'm trying to better understand exactly what they did day to day. They didn't build Web sites. You said they had experience.

MR. PARSCALE: Well, you would have them building out, talking to -- look, I had me, myself and I. So I didn't even have a deputy. So, you know, I needed people. You know, if I had a very busy day, Matt knew what he was doing, he would say: Hey, we need to build out, we need to get an email contract vendor. Let's figure out how we need to do that. We need to create emails. We need to create ads. We need to do all these things.

And I couldn't take from my company, otherwise my company would go out of business. So I had to build out an entire copy of my company in a week. If you're in small business, you'd under -- you know, that makes sense. Because if I take all my employees that work on a campaign that ends in 3 weeks, my company goes out of business, because then I don't have my company.

So I had to, like, build through vendors a copy of my company. Matt was talented, I needed someone that knew what they were doing. I didn't know Cambridge Analytica from Adam.

MR. HIMES: So the way you described these four individuals, it sort of sounds like they were -- I'll use the word "exclusively" -- exclusively tasked with building out a small dollar fundraising, including email --

MR. PARSCALE: Email, making ads. Getting us on -- you know into social media, doing the things necessary to get us ready, you know, to raise money.

MR. HIMES: Okay. You mentioned a group called Prosper. Can you tell us a little bit about --

MR. PARSCALE: They were the company I hired to do the -- to start our email program.

MR. HIMES: Outgoing emails?

MR. PARSCALE: Outgoing email program and our SMS program.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: Our SMS program, which was the text message program.

MR. PARSCALE: And were these texts and emails exclusively dedicated to fundraising?

MR. PARSCALE: At that point.

MR. HIMES: Okay. At some point --

MR. PARSCALE: At some point it transitioned into GOTV or other things.

MR. HIMES: And can you talk a little bit about how that happened, what --

MR. PARSCALE: Well, actually, both those things didn't work.

MR. HIMES: How so?

MR. PARSCALE: Well, eventually we weren't any good at that really, and we didn't have enough time to build it right. So I ended up just partnering with the RNC and let them do that.

MR. HIMES: Okay. We may come back to Cambridge Analytica, but let's talk a little bit about the ad platforms, Facebook, Google and Twitter.

MR. PARSCALE: Sure.

MR. HIMES: My understanding is that they had people embedded with you, with the campaign. Can you go through each of those three and talk about how many people and what those functions were?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah. Let me -- can ask you ask that one at a time or

something?

MR. HIMES: Yeah. Well, let's start with Facebook. So Facebook, how many people did Facebook detail to be physically with your operation?

MR. PARSCALE: They never gave me a number, but there was always a couple people there.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: But they didn't say: This is how many people you're getting.

MR. HIMES: So this was not contractual where there was a contract that said five people?

MR. PARSCALE: No. It was not contractual.

MR. HIMES: So it was informal? In other words --

MR. PARSCALE: It was informal --

THE REPORTER: One at a time.

MR. HIMES: It was informal?

MR. PARSCALE: To a sense, yes. You spend money on their platform, we send people to help you.

MR. HIMES: And what kind of help would they offer?

MR. PARSCALE: Suggestive help on how to use their platform to the best of our ability.

MR. HIMES: And would that include -- I don't want to lead questions, but are we talking about targeting as well as substantive ads?

MR. PARSCALE: No. We didn't -- during the general election we did not use Facebook targeting tools really.

MR. HIMES: You did not use Facebook targeting tools. Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: That's not absolute, but mostly.

MR. HIMES: What about Google?

MR. PARSCALE: Google, we had two separate deals with. We had a contractual deal with Double Click, which is one of their subsidiaries, as a managed provider. We had multiple managed providers on the campaign. And then Google sent representatives of their political division to also help us to work the landscape of Google.

MR. HIMES: And how many people would typically be from Google?

MR. PARSCALE: A couple as well.

MR. HIMES: Two.

MR. PARSCALE: A little less than Facebook, but just close.

MR. HIMES: Did you have contact with these individuals on a day-to-day basis?

MR. PARSCALE: Not day to day, but a lot. My staff maybe or the people that were in the office, like a Matt, those people would be there more. Remember I was in New York originally.

MR. HIMES: So when you say your staff, you described previously that it was Matt plus three others from Cambridge Analytica?

MR. PARSCALE: Well, it grew a lot. You asked me when I hired Cambridge. I was thinking those came before. I ended up having a lot more people there.

MR. HIMES: Yeah, okay.

Twitter, how many people from Twitter were detailed to this?

MR. PARSCALE: They only had two people I think working their entire political division. And they kind of came, barely. Like, they only have two guys I

know of that work in the Republican group. They are a really small company compared to Facebook.

MR. HIMES: Do you recall any conversations with people from any of these subcontractors or your staff -- so Cambridge Analytica, Facebook, Google, Twitter -- about the use of bots, automated retweeting mechanisms?

MR. PARSCALE: Can you ask that again?

MR. HIMES: Yeah. Do you recall any conversations with any of these people -- we've now talked about five different organizations -- about the use of bots, sock puppets, trolls.

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know what a sock puppet is but --

MR. HIMES: A fake account.

MR. PARSCALE: Oh. Yes.

MR. HIMES: What was the nature of those conversations?

MR. PARSCALE: I asked Twitter what were the bots, because I didn't know what they were at that point.

MR. HIMES: Okay. You'd never heard of bot prior to --

MR. PARSCALE: I'd heard the word bot. I never heard of what a Twitter bot was.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And what was the answer you got?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't remember actually. I just remember I asked them. I think they just kind of wrote it off.

MR. HIMES: Were bots, sock puppets -- which I understand to be sort of fake accounts, in other words the identity of the account is not the identity of the originator -- trolls, were those in any way a part of the campaign effort?

MR. PARSCALE: No. I don't think they work.

MR. ROONEY: Jim, is a bot a fake account too?

MR. HIMES: It is not a fake account, it is just an automated, you know -- you pick a universe and it retweets everything from that universe to a --

MR. PARSCALE: It can't do that officially, by the way.

MR. HIMES: It can't?

MR. PARSCALE: What you just said is not correct.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Help me then.

MR. PARSCALE: A bot can only retweet to its own followers. It can't choose a universe.

MR. HIMES: Got it.

MR. PARSCALE: That's only the Twitter advertising platform. That takes money.

MR. HIMES: Let me ask you a category of questions. We may come back to some of these, but let me ask you a category of questions to get to the heart of one of the four legs of the investigation that you sort of answered around or answered these questions, so forgive me if I'm being duplicative. But they all pertain to Russia, which of course is one of the four legs of our stool here.

Have you ever been to Russia?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. HIMES: Have you ever met anyone who may be connected to the Russian Government, anyone linked to Russian economic leaders, Russian banks, energy companies, scientists, nonprofit academics, think tanks? Have you met any Russians that would fall under those categories?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I know of.

MR. HIMES: Never met any Russians at all?



MR. PARSCALE: Not that I know of. I don't know. I don't ask people their country of origin.

MR. HIMES: Hold up their passport.

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah.

MR. HIMES: Have you ever done work for Russia or any Russia-linked entity?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I know of, but I believe I've made websites for people who have Russian divisions in America?

MR. HIMES: Okay. Can you be more detailed?

MR. PARSCALE: Just meaning that like -- I've made website for 20 years. Big U.S. companies have websites that you translate into every language and/or they have people all over the world, so you make websites. I have made them for country of the world, probably. But I've been making websites for 20 years.

MR. HIMES: Have you heard of the outfit called the Internet Research Agency?

MR. PARSCALE: Not before the news.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Not prior to the stories that have come out recently. At the time of the campaign, had you ever heard of them?

MR. PARSCALE: Never heard of them.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Today what do you know about that group?

MR. PARSCALE: Just what I read in the news.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So you learned about it just reading about it in the news recently, well subsequent the campaign.

This is a little bit of a restatement of a question I asked earlier. Were you during the campaign or are you now aware of any Russia bots or trolls following

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

the Trump campaign or RNC officials, affiliates, or anyone connected to the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: No. That was a long question.

MR. HIMES: Yeah.

MR. PARSCALE: Out of sight of what I read in the media, no.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So there was a -- I guess it was a Daily Beast article a couple days ago actually that had you -- I'll just read you the line here: "Three weeks before the election Brad" -- is it Parskell?

MR. PARSCALE: Par-scale.

MR. HIMES: "... Parscale, the Trump campaign's digital director, retweeted a separate post from @Tenn\_GOP." When you retweeted that, did you --

MR. PARSCALE: I thought it was the Tennessee GOP?

MR. HIMES: Okay. So you didn't at the time have any sense that --

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. HIMES: -- they why connected to the Internet Research Agency or any Russian entity?

MR. PARSCALE: No. No.

MR. HIMES: And was it your practice to retweet political Tweets like that?

MR. PARSCALE: I randomly retweet things to support my boss.

MR. HIMES: So at the time, you thought that was legitimately the Tennessee Republican --

MR. PARSCALE: It's not really a political message. I just really don't like the media in the United States and that tweet's about the media. I think the media, after what I've experienced for 2 years, I have this much faith in the U.S.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

media.

MR. HIMES: And I'm sorry, connect that to Tenn\_GOP for me.

MR. PARSCALE: Well, they had put some tweet about there about the bias in the media, so I retweeted a media bias. I don't think -- you'd have to read the tweet, but I have been on the other side now of the U.S. media and I have lost all faith.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So apart from the retweet, did you -- and I'm just going to use a bunch of words there, so, say, different media platforms here -- but did you share, follow, comment on, direct message or otherwise engage with @Tenn\_GOP?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know. I really don't know. Somebody else would have to go into my Twitter account to follow -- to see if I follow them or not.

MR. HIMES: Okay. But you don't have a recollection of --

MR. PARSCALE: No. I didn't know --

MR. HIMES: Of a conversation --

MR. PARSCALE: I didn't know even know about that --

THE REPORTER: You have to speak one at a time.

MR. PARSCALE: I didn't even know about that tweet until I saw the article also.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Have you ever interacted with other social media or online users that you suspected or have since found out are connected to Russia?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I know of.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Have you ever engaged with -- and by engaged with I mean followed, retweeted, tweeted to, direct message, messaged -- the individual known as Guccifer 2.0?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I -- no. Not that I remember.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Wikileaks?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I remember -- did I retweet Wikileaks?

MR. HIMES: Yeah, I'd used a pretty broad --

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know. I mean, in 7, 10 years, I don't know.

MR. HIMES: Okay. But you've never had any direct contact with Wikileaks --

MR. PARSCALE: I do not believe so.

MR. HIMES: -- or people associated therewith?

Same question for Julian Assange.

MR. PARSCALE: No. Not that I ever remember.

MR. HIMES: Okay. That's you personally. What about other accounts that you had access to or individuals who are working with you?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't believe so. I would not know what they all do.

MR. HIMES: Okay. I'm going to get into just a couple of these questions around the supposed Clinton emails. It won't take too long. And then I will turn it over to Ms. Speier.

How are we doing on time by the way.

MR. ROONEY: Jim, I think you started at 2:35, so you've got, like, 20 more minutes.

But I just want you to let you know, after that, if you need to use the bathroom or anything, just let us know.

Unless Frank has questions, Jim, we'll just let you keep going. 3:20.

MR. PARSCALE: I'm good.

MR. TODD: This young lady has to take everybody's statement down, so

just give her an opportunity to do that.

MR. PARSCALE: I'm trying to talk slower.

MR. HIMES: So there have been efforts over time by a number of individuals to find, authenticate, release, catalogue Hillary Clinton's so-called missing 33,000 emails. Some people believe that hackers accessed and stole data from Clinton's email server, a claim which has never been validated. Nonetheless, let me ask you a few questions related to that.

Did you ever meet a GOP operative by the name of Peter Smith.

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know who that is.

MR. HIMES: Have you ever met anyone who said they were interested in finding Hillary Clinton's 33,000 missing emails?

MR. PARSCALE: You're asking me if I ever met anybody that's interested in those emails?

MR. HIMES: Yeah. Well, interested in finding them, not just generally interested, but somebody who is --

MR. PARSCALE: I think everybody I know who is a Republican wanted to find them.

No, I don't know anybody like that actually has an ability to do it? No.

MR. HIMES: Or just somebody who was --

MR. PARSCALE: My father would love to find them, but that doesn't mean, like, you know --

MR. HIMES. No, I mean slightly more formal effort?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah. No, I don't know anybody.

MR. HIMES: Did you ever do any work with an individual interested in acquiring -- and by interested, I mean not just generally interested, but, you know,

who was actually working towards finding these 33,000 emails?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And then can I conclude that you or others connected to the Trump campaign, you're not aware of any effort that you were involved in or that the Trump campaign was involved in to find those so-called missing emails?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. HIMES: No? Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: They can find their own emails.

MR. HIMES: Why don't I -- Jackie, if you're ready. Thanks.

I'm going to pause here and just yield to Representative Speier.

MS. SPEIER: Good afternoon.

MR. PARSCALE: Hello.

MS. SPEIER: Let me first start off by asking you, if you would, we have received a letter from your attorney that basically took it upon itself to say that you aren't providing us with any emails, correspondence that you had with the campaign. And the reason was that we've already received it from the campaign.

We would like for you to provide us with any communication you have had with the campaign related to the issue areas that we are interested in. So will you comply with that request, please?

MR. TODD: May I just clarify something? If you've already received it --

MR. ROONEY: Did he state his name?

THE REPORTER: He did.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. Sorry.

MR. TODD: If you've already received these, you want them again?

MS. SPEIER: I want the communications -- I think the committee would like the communications that you have had with the Trump campaign.

MR. WEBSTER: We believe that's already been produced.

MS. SPEIER: Well, I don't know that it's been produced.

MR. TODD: Okay.

MS. SPEIER: All right.

All right. Let's go to -- the name Project Alamo, where did that come from?

MR. PARSCALE: I made it up.

MS. SPEIER: You made it up?

MR. PARSCALE: Uh-huh.

MS. SPEIER: It was not the name of Cambridge Analytica's system.

MR. PARSCALE: Nope.

MS. SPEIER: No. Okay.

Let's start with Cambridge. You mentioned that you got met with one Matt --

MR. PARSCALE: Oczkowski.

██████████ Page 21.

MS. SPEIER: And you wanted to hire him. Were you -- who directed you to talk to people at Cambridge Analytica.

MR. PARSCALE: Who directed me? I don't remember who sent me the initial introduction to them. They came and flew to San Antonio and had lunch with me -- or dinner.

MS. SPEIER: They just texted you or emailed you and said, "We'd like to come talk to you"?

MR. PARSCALE: I believe they emailed somebody in the campaign, and

they talked to a few people over time. And someone forwarded that to me and said: You should probably check them out.

MS. SPEIER: So it wasn't Steve Bannon or Robert Mercer? It could've been?

MR. PARSCALE: No, I didn't know them then.

MS. SPEIER: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: I had never met them then.

MS. SPEIER: Can you tell us a little bit about the nature of their work?

MR. PARSCALE: It changed --

MR. WEBSTER: For the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: For the campaign or work at the company or --

MS. SPEIER: As a company.

MR. PARSCALE: Oh, I took them when I met them as a company that it is a data science and marketing company, with political experience.

MS. SPEIER: So when you first hired persons from Cambridge Analytica, there were three or four.

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, it was a handful.

MS. SPEIER: Your company grew to over 100, at least in some of the --

MR. PARSCALE: That's reporters?

MS. SPEIER: Reporters. So how big was your company as the campaign got into full --

MR. PARSCALE: Well, people got -- sorry. I'll let you finish.

MS. SPEIER: As the campaign got into full-blown operation and you were now doing digital ads, TV.

MR. PARSCALE: My company itself was already 60, 70 people at the



time, so Giles-Parscale itself, but people get confused, and assorted of those employees were working on the campaign for different tasks as we needed them.

Then we opened another office and we brought all the vendors in and hired people to provide certain tasks that were politically related that my company couldn't perform. So those people, there was probably another 30 or 40 of those people.

So if you take that plus what was downtown, my company holistically, it was over 100. But in any given day were 100 different people working on the Trump campaign? No.

MS. SPEIER: So when you said you started out during the primary, it was you and your computer and maybe a couple of people.

MR. PARSCALE: Yep.

MS. SPEIER: When did it jump from 2 to 60.

MR. PARSCALE: No. Even when I was working on the campaign in the primary myself, I still had a company of 60 employees.

MS. SPEIER: Got it.

MR. PARSCALE: It's just they didn't have the skill set and I didn't probably trust for this kind of important project to be run by my employees, I did it all myself.

MS. SPEIER: So how many Cambridge employees did you have eventually?

MR. PARSCALE: A few more came. And I would say it peaked probably in the 10, dozen range maybe. I don't know exactly the number.

MS. SPEIER: Was there ever a point where the campaign asked you about having Cambridge come and work in toto with the campaign with your office?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know what is toto?

MS. SPEIER: In toto, t-o-t-o.

MR. PARSCALE: I think Toto, I think of Kansas. So I don't know what you mean by that.

MS. SPEIER: At one point was there ever a discussion of having the entire staff of Cambridge Analytica come and join you to work on the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I'm aware of.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. You said you were in communication with Jared Kushner on a regular basis, like, many times during the day.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: A couple times during the day?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: And you never had a conversation about that?

MR. PARSCALE: About Cambridge becoming, like, the entire company?

MS. SPEIER: Coming and working with you.

MR. PARSCALE: I don't remember that.

MS. SPEIER: You don't remember that.

Cambridge Analytica also has a parent company called SCL Group Ltd. Are you familiar with them?

MR. PARSCALE: I wasn't until after the campaign was over.

MS. SPEIER: So you never had any contact with them?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know.

MS. SPEIER: So did you know at the time who owned Cambridge?

MR. PARSCALE: No. I didn't learn till later.

MS. SPEIER: Later in the campaign?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: The very end.

MS. SPEIER: The end of the campaign? And who owns Cambridge?

MR. PARSCALE: Under my understanding, Rebecca Mercer and Steve Bannon and Alexander Nix.

MS. SPEIER: Did you have any conversations with Alexander Nix during the campaign.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: And what were those conversations about?

MR. PARSCALE: Contract negotiations.

MS. SPEIER: So there's a document here that I'd like to provide for the record. It's to Alexander Nix from a Peter Schweizer. Are you familiar with that?

MR. WEBSTER: The document or Mr. Schweizer?

MS. SPEIER: Mr. Schweizer, sorry.

MR. PARSCALE: I don't recall the name.

MS. SPEIER: So this particular document says: "I think that Peter has already amassed the key negative data on Hillary. However, I will task the team and assess the feasibility of expanding on his work and revert ASAP. FYI, 2 months ago Cambridge Analytica contacted Julian Assange directly to ask for him to share Hillary's hacked emails with us to disseminate. He said no, but it looks like he intends to do it himself. So maybe he will address the problem for us. A."

So this is Alexander Nix, CEO of Cambridge Analytica, in contact with a Peter Schweizer.

So you had no discussions with Jared Kushner, no discussions with anyone at CA regarding this?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: Regarding which part, this email?

MS. SPEIER: This email.

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MS. SPEIER: Julian Assange.

MR. PARSCALE: No. Not that I remember.

MS. SPEIER: Was there -- did Jared Kushner ever suggest to you that there were going to be releases of information by third parties that you might be able to somehow capitalize on?

MR. PARSCALE: No, not that I remember.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. Do you maintain a primary server for your company?

MR. PARSCALE: A primary server? Of what kind of data?

MS. SPEIER: Well, data on behalf of the campaign.

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MS. SPEIER: You do have servers?

MR. PARSCALE: We license servers for our web servers and websites we make for our clients.

MS. SPEIER: So, like, potentially Amazon or Microsoft?

MR. PARSCALE: AWS.

MS. SPEIER: What is it again?

MR. PARSCALE: Amazon service is called AWS.

MS. SPEIER: What kind of voter targeting data did you keep on your servers for ad targeting?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't think I could answer exactly what's in there. I mean, that's a very specific question.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MS. SPEIER: Did you ever make data available to third parties, individuals, groups, or party committees?

MR. PARSCALE: We would share data to the Republican National Committee.

MS. SPEIER: With Cambridge Analytica?

MR. PARSCALE: Cambridge would have had access also to Trump data.

MS. SPEIER: Anyone else?

MR. PARSCALE: It's possible, but I don't think so.

MS. SPEIER: Vendors.

MR. PARSCALE: I would imagine Prosper Group had access to it.

MS. SPEIER: Did you ever post voter data online?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MS. SPEIER: Did you post it on a private or public server online?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MS. SPEIER: Are you aware of reports that The Trump Organization maintained a data link with a Russian-based bank, Alfa Bank, during the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: I remember the news articles about it.

MS. SPEIER: Outside of the news articles, you had no knowledge?

MR. PARSCALE: Wait. I have knowledge of when the news said it and Trump people emailed me to tell me it's happening. Like, the news people are saying this crazy stuff over here. Like, that's all I remember.

MS. SPEIER: So the news broke that The Trump Organization had some arrangement with Alfa Bank?

MR. PARSCALE: No. I'm just saying they told me that there is a story

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

that people are accusing them about.

MS. SPEIER: And what did they say about the story?

MR. PARSCALE: They said -- they explained the craziness of how it all worked, like the DNS server and all the stuff. You know, it's like they explained the logic behind it and why they -- about Cendyn -- C-e-n-d-y-n, I think -- which was the company which was one the hosting companies of The Trump Org.

MS. SPEIER: And what is it again? C--

MR. PARSCALE: C-e-n-d-y-n? Cendyn. That was the company hosting that server I think you're talking about, which is, like, 10,000 people on that same server.

MS. SPEIER: So not -- there was -- no one conveyed to you there was a relationship between The Trump Organization --

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MS. SPEIER: -- and Alfa Bank?

MR. PARSCALE: No. I just knew about the media and the story.

MR. HIMES: Can I intercede here?

MS. SPEIER: Of course.

MR. HIMES: Can you just walk us through? You said that they explained the logic, was the word you used. Can you walk us through what that explanation was?

MR. PARSCALE: I only remember the basics of it, but pretty much was that their server happens to -- that they were -- they had bought some service --

MR. HIMES: I'm sorry, they is who?

MR. PARSCALE: Trump Org.

MR. HIMES: Trump Org.

MR. PARSCALE: Trump Org had done something on a server that for some service Cendyn was the provider of, I believe Trump.com's, some of their services or something. And this other organization also used the same company for something else and they just happened to have the same DNS entry, which is very common.

MR. HIMES: So when you say this other company, you're referring to Alfa.

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, whatever that bank was, yeah, you said. I forgot what the name was.

MR. HIMES: So just to make sure I understand, I don't actually know what a DNS server is.

MR. PARSCALE: So in the Internet when you have a domain name, multiple domain names can point to the same IP address. So it's possible that your website for your reelect could be on the same with a Russian server, Putin's, you would never know, completely possible. Why? Because you register a domain name to a server provider, that server provider shares that same IP address across multiple servers, that's what's called a router configuration, which then spreads the traffic.

So millions of domain names in the United States and around the world share the same IP addresses. Like Rackspace Cloud or Liquid Web Cloud, over 10 million websites in the United States share the same IP address, because we are running out of IP addresses because Congress hasn't passed and pushed IP6, so we're running out of IP4 addresses.

So what they have done is they have created load balancers which load single IP addresses across, because of the expense of how hard it's got for IP4. That makes a lot of sense, but if you don't understand how the IP system works,

which most Americans and most humans don't, you would immediately say these feedings (ph) point to the same server, they must know each other. That's not true. That would mean that 90 percent of the world's businesses in the United States are colluding with each other because they use rack space.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So the explanation, just if I can summarize, the explanation you received was this third party, Alfa, is also occupying space in this server --

MR. PARSCALE: No, not even the same server. They are -- I'm sorry.

MR. TODD: Let him finish.

MR. PARSCALE: I'll let him finish.

MS. SPEIER: And speak slower because I do think she is having a hard time.

MR. PARSCALE: Sorry. And it's very technical talk and I have been doing it a long time.

MR. HIMES: So it is not a physical server. It is a question of IP addresses.

MR. PARSCALE: Load balancers, which is what distribute traffic to web servers. So if you think about it, it would be very similar to the Y and I-5 in California and all those lanes going into one highway. The balancer makes sure that all the cars don't run into each other.

MR. TODD: Slow down.

MR. ROONEY: Yeah, I didn't get any of that.

MR. HIMES: We don't have time to get into the details of the technology, but it sounds -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- it sounds like the explanation from The Trump Organization was that there is no link between them and Alfa, there



were just technical reasons why they had similar addresses. Is that --

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. What it sounded like to me, that they were sharing the domain name server load balancer.

MR. HIMES: Okay, okay.

Sorry, Jackie.

MR. PARSCALE: Sorry to, like, go crazy technical on you. But, like, to explain that, you had to, like --

MS. SPEIER: Did you focus your digital media efforts on particular States or localities?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: Could you tell us which ones?

MR. PARSCALE: Let me ask you specifically, which part of my digital media efforts, because I had multiple?

MS. SPEIER: Well, let's start with email.

MR. PARSCALE: Email was not targeted by State, that was targeted for fundraising. I mean, we would have emails that were targeted for events.

MS. SPEIER: Your ads?

MR. PARSCALE: Ads were broken into multiple groups. So you would have fundraising, you would have GOTV, you would have persuasion. So fundraising was not broken down by State, but GOTV was.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. So let's talk about GOTV.

MR. PARSCALE: Okay.

MS. SPEIER: So what States did you target?

MR. PARSCALE: It would be hard for me to remember everything in order in which it was done, but it was key swing States would have with been things like

Pennsylvania, at the end Wisconsin, Michigan, North Carolina, Florida. Did some in New Mexico, Colorado, Iowa, Nevada. I know I'm missing something here. I'd have to look at a map.

MS. SPEIER: And so you wrote off California.

MR. PARSCALE: Not California -- not California, zero. I'll be honest with you. If I saw a map, I could go and -- it just -- it's like --

MS. SPEIER: Okay. Did you target White men?

MR. PARSCALE: I did not target by race specifically in GOTV and/or persuasion efforts.

MS. SPEIER: Did you target them at all.

MR. PARSCALE: White men, they were probably in our targets.

MS. SPEIER: No, but I mean did you ever target them on one platform or another?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MS. SPEIER: Had about African Americans?

MR. PARSCALE: On digital? No.

MS. SPEIER: And LGBTQ?

MR. PARSCALE: No. I don't know if that's possible.

MS. SPEIER: You don't think it's possible?

MR. PARSCALE: Well, I don't know if there's -- I guess you could do it in theory, maybe.

MS. SPEIER: Did you --

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know if there's a database of that.

MS. SPEIER: Did you acquire databases from the RNC?

MR. PARSCALE: The RNC did most of our targeting.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MS. SPEIER: So the RNC could have targeted them?

MR. PARSCALE: They could possibly.

MS. SPEIER: But you never requested --

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MS. SPEIER: -- a particular universe.

MR. PARSCALE: I never did things by race. Language, but not race.

MS. SPEIER: So you did it by language?

MR. PARSCALE: Spanish, because some people can't read English.

MS. SPEIER: Right. Any other language?

MR. PARSCALE: No, just Spanish.

MS. SPEIER: There are -- there was an article that appeared that talked about an individual who -- let me find it here -- a Columbia University technology expert earlier this month wrote an article on the website Medium (ph) pointing out that a data scientist intern named Michael Phillips, who apparently was actually their chief data scientist and was active in the Leave.eu campaign was hired by Cambridge Analytica during the time of the Trump campaign left source code scripts on the developer sharing site Github for nearly a year.

This included essentially private log-in information for Cambridge's Twitter data, which could have been accessed by anyone who viewed the public post. That is, an American or foreign actor could have viewed the information, logged into Cambridge's Twitter account, and used that to drive their own Twitter content through the shared API key.

Are you aware of that story.

MR. PARSCALE: I'm aware of the story.

MS. SPEIER: Do you have any personal knowledge of the information

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

discussed in the post?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MS. SPEIER: Did you know or ever meet Michael Phillips?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I -- I don't think so.

MS. SPEIER: So he never worked on the campaign from your vantage point?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I -- I don't believe so.

MS. SPEIER: Do you think it's possible that Cambridge left their Twitter API key available for other use in order to make the data accessible to other entities?

MR. PARSCALE: You're asking me if it's possible?

MS. SPEIER: Do you think it's -- well, maybe I should ask this question. Do you think it's negligent to leave that kind of data available to --

MR. PARSCALE: I'm not pertinent to what data was actually in there.

MS. SPEIER: How about voter suppression, did you engage in any advertising or --

MR. PARSCALE: What do you mean by voter suppression?

MS. SPEIER: Discouraging certain groups of people from engaging in the voting process.

MR. PARSCALE: I don't believe so.

MS. SPEIER: So you did not ever use dark posts.

MR. PARSCALE: Dark posts are Facebook ads, the same thing.

MS. SPEIER: Okay, Facebook ads.

MR. PARSCALE: That's the -- every name outside of political, people call them dark ads?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MS. SPEIER: Can you explain what these dark ads are then?

MR. PARSCALE: A Facebook advertisement and a Twitter advertisement are identical, and if they are dark to the users, the person who owns profiles page main timeline, that in the commercial world means dark post, because it's dark, not because it's evil, but it's dark because you can't see it.

What that means is you run an advertising from your name, it says Donald Trump on it and whoever your might be, I'm sure all your campaigns do this also, and that means you run a Facebook advertisement, that's called a dark post, which is the exact same thing as a Facebook advertisement. They're identical. The media likes to call it dark posts because it gives it an evil connotation and makes it sound worse.

MS. SPEIER: So where did the term come from?

MR. PARSCALE: That's the term it has been for years in the consumer world.

MS. SPEIER: So it's not like the media created it.

MR. PARSCALE: No, they --

MS. SPEIER: It's just a term that's been used by Facebook and others?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. I feel like, though, they like to spin it as an evil thing. Sorry, I'll leave out my opinion of the media?

MS. SPEIER: So in those settings it is an advertisement that is sent to someone and you don't necessarily know who is the sender?

MR. PARSCALE: No, you do. It has their picture and their name.

MS. SPEIER: It does.

MR. PARSCALE: Yep.

MS. SPEIER: Their picture or ---

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: Donald Trump's picture. If I did a Donald Trump dark post or a Facebook ad, it has his picture, his name, and it says it comes from him.

MS. SPEIER: What if you were doing one that was critical of Hillary Clinton?

MR. PARSCALE: It would say it was still from him.

MS. SPEIER: It would still identify?

MR. PARSCALE: Donald Trump.

MS. SPEIER: Him.

Did you ever use other posts and repost them and change them in any way?

MR. PARSCALE: You would have to clarify that question. Could you give me an example?

MS. SPEIER: You took one -- you took a tweet from Tenn\_GOP and retweeted it. Did you ever see an ad or a comment where you -- or an ad in particular where you reposted it?

MR. PARSCALE: Somebody else's post and ran it as an advertisement?

MS. SPEIER: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: Other than Trump's? I don't recall. Highly likely we'd do, like, a Pence tweet or somebody else's from the campaign or Sheriff Clarke. I would imagine yes, but I would have to see every post.

MS. SPEIER: So this was one that was initially put up by a neo-Nazi message board. Are you familiar with this one?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, that wasn't an ad.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. What was it then?

MR. PARSCALE: That was a social media post.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MS. SPEIER: Okay. It was a social media post. And then it was reposted and then taken down and changed.

MR. PARSCALE: Can I make sure? Can you like --

MS. SPEIER: Yeah. Why don't I pass that to your?

MR. PARSCALE: I can see it through the back --

MS. SPEIER: It was initially posted with a star and then subsequently taken down and a circle created. Was that something that your operation --

MR. PARSCALE: I only did the circle. I fixed it. Somebody else made it. Dan Scavino made the -- or posted the original ad. I just fixed it at breakfast with the circle.

MS. SPEIER: At breakfast?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, I was at breakfast, so I did it on my phone?

MS. SPEIER: Okay. Now, that seems to suggest that it actually came up on a Trump site with the star and then was subsequently taken down and changed.

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, I think it was on a Facebook post or something. I don't remember which post it was on. It was a general timeline post.

MS. SPEIER: Okay.

MR. ROONEY: Jackie, does Adam want to move to the other room?

██████████ I think it's possible.

MS. SPEIER: Should we take a break?

██████████ It might be a little less cozy.

MS. SPEIER: Let's take a break.

[Recess.]

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[3:45 p.m.]

MR. HIMES: We've covered a lot of ground. We feel like we don't have a very specific picture of 04, the data operations work. And to try to get at that -- I'll try not to be repetitive here, but to try to get at that we thought we might go to the way you described the phases, phase 1.0, 2.0, and phase 3.0. I guess in a Google conversation, you looked at that. We're almost looking for org charts, personnel, who paid, that kind of thing. So it's really kind of mechanical, in terms of painting a picture of how it worked.

So, if you don't mind, let's start with what you called phase 1.0. In the beginning, you described your role as a consultant working out of your living room on a laptop during this phase. And then we'll do the same thing for 2.0 and 3.0, again, kind of the way you divided it up. How do you define the timeframe for phase 1.0?

MR. PARSCALE: I would put 1.0 until the day he won the primary and became the, you know, the candidate, the general election, going into the convention. The convention is 2.0, really. It's really more for me, 1.0 is Corey; 2.0 is Paul Manafort; 3 is the rest. Like, if you take it by who's running the campaign, okay.

MR. HIMES: And --

MR. PARSCALE: That kind of matches up the same timeline.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And so let's stick with 1.0. Tell us again the functions, the nature of the work during 1.0.

MR. PARSCALE: The data work specifically or my work?

MR. HIMES: How are those two things different?

MR. PARSCALE: Well, I did more things than just data throughout the



campaign.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Describe your work in the 1.0.

MR. PARSCALE: 1.0, my job was mainly to manage the web assets, which would be the website and any types of things around the website, which is very -- not to get into specifics there, but like just general stuff, like hosting, things like that. And then that then went to running kind of a State-by-State advertising campaign on social media when we went into new primary States.

MR. HIMES: This is still in phase 1.0?

MR. PARSCALE: This is only 1.0.

MR. HIMES: So in the case -- you mentioned both the website and the ads. Where are you getting content for both website and ads?

MR. PARSCALE: Website content is different. That content comes mainly from the campaign trickle down to me, saying, hey, can you put up this position paper, can you put up these news articles, whatever that might be. Those would be emailed to me, website content.

Graphics on the website my company would make. So those would just be photos, little message over, very basic.

Ads were produced in two main ways for the -- during the phase 1.0. Slow down, sorry.

1.0 portion -- sorry, campaign ads for the 1.0 section, we had some made by us, but the majority were actually Trump to camera. So we had a cameraman come into Trump Tower and Trump would talk to the camera, and we'd split that into little -- myself and Jared really felt like Trump talking straight to the people was actually more important than little ads. And then we put those on social media, and we did very simple targeting on Facebook to advertise those.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. HIMES: Was there a formal approval process for content? You testified that content for the website would come via email to you. If you created an ad or changed the website, was there a formal approval process?

MR. PARSCALE: In 1.0?

MR. HIMES: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: In version 1, most everything would go to Corey or Hope or those people. They would approve it. At that point, I'm pretty disconnected. You know, I'm sending it to them, would you like me to put up? They're saying, yes. They send it back.

MR. HIMES: Okay. You testified before that phase 1.0 was just you. Any other --

MR. PARSCALE: Well, I mean, I had a couple staff members who would help me make -- you know, cut some videos, make some graphics, do stuff. But for the majority, it was just me doing all the work.

MR. HIMES: And staff members of your company.

MR. PARSCALE: Company, Giles-Parscale, yes.

MR. HIMES: And I think you testified that at this point, phase 1.0, you were not being compensated. Is that correct?

MR. PARSCALE: No. I was being compensated. Just hourly, I said.

MR. HIMES: Hourly, okay.

MR. PARSCALE: I didn't have a formal like contract with a retainer or other things like that.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And you mentioned Hicks, Corey, and Kushner. Were they your main contacts at the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: During phase 1?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. HIMES: Were there other campaign --

MR. PARSCALE: Michael Glassner was also another one. Michael Glassner. He was the deputy under Corey during phase 1.

MR. HIMES: During phase one, did you have a formal reporting relationship with anybody, somebody who was your boss?

MR. PARSCALE: That's a matter of -- I would say my boss for a while was Corey, and then it became Jared.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Can you give us a sense of timeframe there, when that occurred?

MR. PARSCALE: The day it changed, I can tell you what the day of the event was. I couldn't tell you what the date was. It happened in Trump's fundraiser in San Antonio. I couldn't tell you when that was. It was early, like somewhere during the -- after pretty much he won the primary, Jared kind of became my boss. During the primary itself, Corey was more my boss.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Before we leave phase 1.0 behind, you referred earlier to targeting. Who did that targeting and what was --

MR. PARSCALE: I did during phase 1 myself.

MR. HIMES: You exclusively?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. And during the primary, targeting was extremely simple. Say, we're going into Wisconsin for the primary, I would choose in Facebook toolset Wisconsin, Republicans. It was a -- what they call in the consumer world a shotgun approach, which was Trump's voice was so big, he was getting so much shares, no microtargeting I felt was needed during phase 1. And we didn't have the money and the infrastructure to do it anyway.

So we went for the large-splash approach, which was drive the CPM, which

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

is the cost per thousand ads, as low as possible and try to just get as much exposure across the Republican base.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Was there any interaction with the RNC during phase 1.0?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, towards the end, but no real engagement. It was like we just started having meetings after Trump became the candidate.

MR. HIMES: So during 1.0, what was the nature of the interaction with you, what was the substance --

MR. PARSCALE: Of the RNC?

MR. HIMES: -- of the RNC interactions?

MR. PARSCALE: Very, very, very little at the end. Just a couple meetings before Corey left.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So before we leave phase 1.0 behind, you described up front that the work consisted primarily of the website and advertising. Were there other elements of your work in phase 1.0?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. I did a lot of random things. I provided background checks online of new employees, like I would search people's social media profile, see if they were never Trump style people. I was -- I would do anything that they sent me to as a technical help on the internet that I could provide assistance of.

MR. HIMES: Background checks has a fairly specific meaning. It sounds like you were doing research on --

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, I was doing research on new staff members.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: If they were hired in New York, I would get on Pin

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Verified. I would search their Twitter accounts. I would search, you know, Way Back Machine to see if they had deleted texts and tweets and things or -- not texts, but tweets and Facebook posts and things that might have looked negative, but now they're getting on the -- and they want to be supportive, but maybe they had a bad history and weren't really pro-Trump supporters.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So let's move now to what you called phase 2.0, which I think you said was --

MR. PARSCALE: It's the shortest period.

MR. HIMES: -- GOP Convention until August 21st, in which you said in the analysis your services were needed the least and which during the RNC took the lead in fundraising. So let's go through that for phase 2.0.

Did I get the timeframe right in terms of how --

MR. PARSCALE: If I gave that date before. I maybe have given that. I have might have looked and knew that date. Yeah, that sounds approximately, though, right.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So let's go through then during phase 2.0, what were the actual functions? We talked about website, advertising, and some background checks in phase 1.0. What were the changes in terms of your tasking in phase 2.0?

MR. PARSCALE: In phase 2, I still kept the website and the other portions, obviously. I never really lost anything I had to do; I only gained things I needed to do.

Phase 2 is when Paul Manafort really kind of took over and Rick Gates became his deputy. And my engagement with the campaign dramatically increased. I was getting more phone calls from the leadership, like Paul and Rick

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

and people like that, about things. I was tasked with building a small dollar fundraising program. I was tasked with growing the visual and data department, start making decisions. I really call it the growth phase, where I had to build a team for what ended up being 3.0.

I didn't -- during the convention I was -- you know, I tweeted and posted and did things and -- you know, little things, but we really didn't have much of an ad program at that point, because we didn't have any money.

MR. HIMES: Help me understand. You were quoted as saying you were needed the least at this time, and yet you just testified that you were getting lots of calls from senior people in the campaign and you were building out an effort. Those seem a little inconsistent.

MR. PARSCALE: What I mean is I wasn't needed as much for creating advertising. What I -- that -- I think what you're talking about, that convention was about Google advertising and social media advertising. I would say my importance to the advertising program was the least in phase 2, but, however, my need internally for growing was starting to grow.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So in phase 1.0, you testified that you had a couple of your own employees, your own company on a fairly informal and ad hoc basis. Let's talk about staff during phase 2.0. Who were they and where did they come from?

MR. PARSCALE: Phase 2, mostly outside vendors.

MR. HIMES: Mostly outside vendors. Is this what we were talking about before?

MR. PARSCALE: Before, yes.

MR. HIMES: Is this the point in time when the Facebook, Twitter, and

Google people --

MR. PARSCALE: They start showing up. The Prosper Group shows up. Cambridge Analytica people show up. All those people start showing up during this phase.

MR. HIMES: Now, is there a formal org chart that would sort of make this a little more understandable to us?

MR. PARSCALE: I wish.

MR. HIMES: Okay. But we talked about this. This was the number of people who were --

MR. PARSCALE: Pretty much, I was copying my company with vendors.

MR. HIMES: And did all of these vendors report directly to you and were they tasked by you?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. Yeah. I mean, I'm trying to think if anyone else had talked to anyone else. But no, they were mainly talking to me.

MR. HIMES: Now, what about your interaction? You testified that you were now getting more calls from people like Paul Manafort. It sounds like the nature of your communication with the campaign changed in this phase. So can you elaborate on that a little bit?

MR. PARSCALE: That's more planning. So during the Corey phase, it was very reactive. You need to go do this, we got to have it done yesterday. Where the Corey/Paul stage comes is -- I'm sorry, let me rephrase. I messed up. The Rick/Paul stage says, now let's plan forward.

So when you think about that is, yeah, I was more needed during phase 1.0 like because I'm always trying to fix things. Phase 2.0, it's more like, okay, we want you part of the strategy as we move forward. So a lot of those phone calls

are, what do you think we should do? How are we going to build this? Who are we going to hire? How are we moving forward?

MR. HIMES: Now, the vendors that we've been talking about today, Cambridge, the three advertising platforms, were all of their services provided pursuant to contracts signed with you?

MR. PARSCALE: Cambridge's contract was directly with the campaign.

MR. HIMES: With the campaign.

MR. PARSCALE: Later, they had a small contract with my company as well to provide some services, but they weren't related to what the other people were doing.

MR. HIMES: And were the three platforms, were the individuals --

MR. PARSCALE: Those were all with Giles-Parscale.

MR. HIMES: And were they formally contracted?

MR. PARSCALE: They have a formal credit -- they have a formal credit agreement, but you don't sign a formal agreement. It's a credit agreement to pay them.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: They have a terms and conditions I think is how it works.

MR. HIMES: So when we get into the advertising platforms, we talked a little bit about approval of content and source of content in phase 1.0. In phase 2.0, where now you have advertising platforms, who's producing content for those ads?

MR. PARSCALE: Giles-Parscale is during that phase still.

MR. HIMES: You're producing. Okay. You said still, but in 1.0 you were



saying it was coming from the campaign.

MR. PARSCALE: Let me -- let me break that out again. In 1.0 -- you asked me two separate questions. You asked me website content and advertising. Website content was coming from the campaign, so political messaging, what they want to do. Giles-Parscale then would take things that they have in political messaging, make those into ads, send them back for approval. So content versus an ad for me is two separate things.

MR. HIMES: So during 2.0, does content for the website continue to be provided to you by the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, but there's not a lot of ads at that period of time.

MR. HIMES: Well, we're just talking about website now, not about ads.

MR. PARSCALE: Website, yes. Throughout the entire campaign, all website content was provided to us by the campaign.

MR. HIMES: Okay, that's helpful. Now, in terms of -- and you said there wasn't a lot of advertising going on right now, but these ad platforms are presumably running ads, correct?

MR. PARSCALE: No, they're showing up to try to -- at this point, they know we've won and they see a big budget in the future. And so they're there trying to get us -- they're there in the process of trying to sell us, to say -- Facebook's there saying, spend \$100 million with us. Google is there, spend \$100 million with us. Twitter is there, spend \$100 million with us.

MR. HIMES: But they're not at this point --

MR. TODD: As a courtesy to the court reporter.

MR. PARSCALE: Am I speaking fast still? I'll try to slow down.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So back to the -- so they're not actually running ads

during phase 2.0?

MR. PARSCALE: We start running ads at phase 2.0 for fundraising, but very little. I don't know if you're ask -- let me ask you. Are you asking me in comparison to 1 versus 2 its volume, or are you asking me whether it happened at all?

MR. HIMES: I'm asking you whether it happened at all, and if it happened what the source of the content was.

MR. PARSCALE: Okay. So content source means political messaging. Whatever the strategy was always came from the campaign. So that would be -- like from New York. So that would either be Donald Trump directly to message, which was easy to find, his Twitter account, or there was a political team that would write, there was a communications team that would write and would provide us with those talking points and what that is.

All of the advertising during phase 1 and phase 2, not on digital, and during phase 3 for digital were always made by Giles-Parscale. However, Giles-Parscale never made our own political messaging.

Does that answer your question?

MR. HIMES: I think it does. So if I understand you correctly, you're saying that you did the production?

MR. PARSCALE: The production of the ad, but what -- the guts of what is being said, the build the wall, end trade reform, you know, fix trade reform, whatever that might be is a message that's coming down to us. And we're taking that and making it look within brand, make it look pretty, make it targetable, those kinds of things.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So last question with respect to phase 2.0.

Interaction with the RNC. We covered this in 1.0. Does the nature of the interaction with the RNC change during 2.0?

MR. PARSCALE: It starts to grow, because I think in 1.0 there was none, I mean not with me. 2.0, I have a couple meetings where we try to be friendly.

MR. HIMES: Can you be more specific? Was there an agenda in these meetings?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah. I mean, at the time when I showed up at the first meeting, I thought they hated us. I didn't think they would talk to me.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Let's jump then to what you characterize as phase 3.0. This is -- if I understand correctly, you used the phrase you became a media engine and media conquest with a staff of over 100 and a budget of 90 million. Let's take those one at a time.

MR. PARSCALE: Okay.

MR. HIMES: Staff. Can you sort of list for us -- is 100 roughly the right number, in terms of --

MR. PARSCALE: That was a general number that's always been given. If you take the downtown office plus the north side plus some people that were in New York --

MR. HIMES: I'm sorry, can you be more specific?

MR. PARSCALE: So we have a downtown office, which was Giles-Parscale's headquarters. You know, it would have 50, 60, 65 employees at this time. I can't remember the exact number during that period. It was a 2-year period, so it was growing.

MR. HIMES: This is downtown New York?

MR. PARSCALE: Downtown San Antonio.

MR. HIMES: Okay, thank you.

MR. PARSCALE: And then we opened a north side office. To the rest of the world, it would actually still be downtown, but in San Antonio it's called north side, by the airport. And we opened another office, and that's where all these vendors came in. And they would show up, you know, five, six employees, or whatever, ten, you know. You collect all them together, Facebook staff. And then the RNC shows up, which in the relationship with 3.0 there's a whole bunch of RNC staff members that all show up, and they were kind of considered my staff. In the relationship with the partnership of our joint fundraising committee, Team MAGAC, which is the Make America Great Again Committee. All those people are there.

And if you take all that number, on a given day, maybe you have 50, 60 people; and downtown you have 50 or 60. You start, as a rough marketing number, saying about 100 people are working on this.

MR. HIMES: And we talked earlier about the number of people from the platforms. Can you estimate those three platforms, Twitter, Facebook, and Google?

MR. PARSCALE: Just repeat again?

MR. HIMES: Well, yes, if that number didn't change, but --

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah. I mean, there was -- Facebook probably had the most with, you know, two to four people, given there on any given day. Google would have been right underneath that, two to three there. Well, let me rephrase this.

Google probably had more, because Google had two separate companies Google owns there. So Google actually owns another company called Double

Click, which was actually in our office also. Double Click had staff members there. If you take Google's two subsidiaries together, they had more staff there than Facebook. But half their staff was not there to help sell Google; they were a managed service provider of a company they sell which helps you learn how to use Google search better. This is getting like Google and Facebook own the world. So like, I don't know. Like, there's a lot of them in there.

MR. HIMES: Okay. RNC. At this point, has the RNC detailed staff to that --

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, in 3.0. Their numbers went up and down a lot. I mean, at least 10 to 15 I would think would be down there at any given time. It made huge fluctuations, depending on holidays and weeks and back and forth.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Now I know this is painful, because we've done it twice, but website, advertising, all the other functions, background checks, walk us through the actual --

MR. PARSCALE: Phase 3?

MR. HIMES: -- tasks that were included in phase 3 undertaken by all of these people.

MR. PARSCALE: Everybody?

MR. HIMES: Well, just what the task were of the digital operation.

MR. PARSCALE: Oh, the digital operation?

MR. HIMES: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: The main feature of San Antonio was to create a holistic brand, which was all the branding material of all the advertising that was put on the web. Create all the store products and manage the store, like what things we sold, which drove a lot of our early money, which was selling hats and t-shirts and

stuff.

MR. HIMES: So you had responsibility for the merchandising operation as well?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: I didn't have to make the stuff. I just had -- I had to invent the stuff. Does that make sense?

MR. HIMES: By --

MR. PARSCALE: Somebody else in Louisiana made it.

MR. HIMES: No, I understand you didn't actually manufacture it. So it was part of your role to --

MR. PARSCALE: I made all the store, yeah.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Can you talk about that a little bit? When you say you made all the store, what does that mean?

MR. PARSCALE: I built the website. Our company built the website, which is the shop.donaldjtrump. The first merchandise that was made was actually made by a company in Louisiana, and I was not very happy about how out of brand it was. So we came back, Giles-Parscale, and redesigned it all to be more in brand with Trump. And then we relaunched shop.donaldjtrump.com with all that new gear. And then from that moment on until today, we've managed the shop.

MR. HIMES: Okay. So I interrupted you as you were listing. Brand and merchandising.

MR. PARSCALE: Merchandising. Pretty much had all the polling research for tracking polling out of San Antonio, which was we ran a multitiered

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

polling system, which I think was different than other people had done. I did it much more like what I was used to in the commercial world, the polling. And so we ran --

MR. HIMES: I'm sorry, are you saying polling?

MR. PARSCALE: Polling.

MR. HIMES: What we would think of as research?

MR. PARSCALE: No. Polling is what you would think as pollsters, like the -- yeah, I mean research. I don't know what you guys call it on your side. But like polling is what I mean is like asking 2,500 people who do you want to vote for, blah blah blah, and figuring out where people are.

MR. HIMES: So you were actually doing polling?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah. I managed all the polling for the campaign.

MR. HIMES: Including the creation of the --

MR. PARSCALE: No, not the creation of the questions. I managed -- we had three different polling systems going on, which was Kellyanne's company and Tony Fabrizio and all them. Then I had the RNC through target point and the voter scoring system. And then I had my own polling system for all tracking polling. And I migrated those all into a centralized system with which I could track the overall opportunity to win per State.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Great. So brand merchandising, polling.

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah. Because I could do it for \$70,000 a week, and the pollsters in D.C. do it for \$400,000 a month -- a week. And I was like, why am I paying \$330,000 more? I couldn't figure that out.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Now, you haven't mentioned website. Presumably, you're --

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: Remember, anything I do I never really lose.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. PARSCALE: So I hope that you can just --

MR. HIMES: So branding, merchandising, and polling are the new tasks associated with phase 3.0? You want more? I'm looking for -- so what I just heard you say is that website, advertising, and background checks, which were part of phase 1.0 and 2.0 --

MR. PARSCALE: I did stop doing background checks later, though. I have to admit that. After he became a candidate, that really got tasked to the Secret Service, I think.

MR. HIMES: In 3.0, in addition to those functions, minus the background checks, we have branding and merchandising, polling. What else?

MR. PARSCALE: Oh, TV. I started -- I got in charge of all the TV advertisement production, all the TV buying, the mail program, the mail creative. Somewhat, I got involved in the door-knocking program for a while.

MR. HIMES: Just so we're clear on this, mail, TV, door knocking, are the actual functions there subcontracted?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. Different parts of them are different ways. So like the TV -- when I say majority of TV, I went and found we were using one vendor for making all the TV commercials. I went and hired three. We were using a different company I didn't feel was very professional buying TV, and I changed over to another -- I went out and rebid it and then took over all the TV buying and placement.

MR. HIMES: And where were -- I want to cover this for TV, for mail, and for online, because I wasn't aware that you were doing TV and mail as well. But



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

the content for all of that advertising, did you develop it or did it come from the campaign or others?

MR. PARSCALE: Well, TV advertisement is mainly driven by talking points and strategy. No, I didn't ever make a talking point for the entire period of time. However, those were provided every day to me by email from the Republican National Committee, the Trump campaign, and our communications directors. So --

MR. HIMES: Did you have creative decision-making power? In other words, did you say, this ad runs?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Is that true of mail as well?

MR. PARSCALE: I wasn't solo on that decision, though. I was the first tier. Then it would go on to say to Jared or -- I would actually -- with TV, I sat with Mr. Trump, and he would go line by line with every TV commercial, pressing the arrow key one at a time, and he would choose what was in the TV commercials.

MR. HIMES: What about mail?

MR. PARSCALE: Mail was mainly approved by David Bossie. So I was in charge of the plumbing.

MR. HIMES: Online advertising, can you describe that effort as part of phase 3.0?

MR. PARSCALE: Well, the majority from phase 2 to phase 3 as it grew was prospecting. Are you familiar with that term?

MR. HIMES: Be more specific.

MR. PARSCALE: Prospecting is the idea and the art of growing your list so that you can find more donors. So that means finding needles in a haystack

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

so you can add them to your email list or to other types of methods so you can turn them into a long-term donor.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And were you personally doing the prospecting?

MR. PARSCALE: Me like by myself?

MR. HIMES: You and your operation, or was that subcontracted?

MR. PARSCALE: No. That was mainly a relationship between Giles-Parscale and the Republican National Committee, with Giles-Parscale making the ads and the Republican National Committee helping place the ads online, the targeting of those ads. And then based off if they were an email or an SMS or based off what method we prospected, different people had different roles in the usage of that.

MR. HIMES: Now, I think you testified earlier that -- correct me if I'm wrong -- but that the SMS and email effort failed. Is that correct?

MR. PARSCALE: No. You asked me the first company I hired about it. I said the first go where I tried to build it failed, the email program and the kind of basics of the prospecting. And that's when we went and made a deal with the Republican National Committee to do it as a joint deal, because their infrastructure was already built out.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And with respect to targeting of both the online ads, which you were saying has a lot to do with prospecting, who was making those targeting decisions, in terms of geography? We talked a little bit about demographics and ethnicity.

MR. PARSCALE: It depends on what type of ad you're talking about.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Can you walk us through different kinds of ads and the decision-making process for each?

MR. PARSCALE: In phase 3?

MR. HIMES: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: So I was -- there's a lot of people that kind of -- this is kind of a contention of who said who chose what States in the campaign.

I ultimately had kind of the control over which States the digital and TV budget went into. However, I sat in the room with people saying, we should do this, we should do this. But eventually, I was the one that had to push the button or email somebody and say, this is the States we're going to, here is the budget.

The targeting for GOTV efforts, through the end of the campaign, those audiences were all built by the Republican National Committee. Fundraising audiences were built from a group of people. So you had the RNC and Cambridge that made audiences for fundraising through portions of phase 3, for fundraising. Then you had mail universes and all that stuff. Or you just want digital universes, right?

MR. HIMES: I must admit I didn't know that mail was under your purview before, so I guess yeah, let's continue through it.

MR. PARSCALE: Mail universes were all RNC. The entire mail program, other than creative, was really run by the RNC.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And what about television targeting decisions? Geography.

MR. PARSCALE: I chose those.

MR. HIMES: You did?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. HIMES: Okay. And you said, if I heard you correctly, Cambridge was -- let me ask you the question -- targeting of online ads, prospecting, and

persuasion, all online, who was involved in that?

MR. PARSCALE: I'm not exactly sure what you just asked me. I apologize.

MR. HIMES: Okay. Online advertisement.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. HIMES: Who was making the targeting decisions as to where they would run?

MR. PARSCALE: I feel like I just answered that, but I don't -- is there some specific portion of it you don't think I answered?

MR. HIMES: You mentioned Cambridge Analytica, and you mentioned another entity that --

MR. PARSCALE: The Republican National Committee.

MR. HIMES: It was Cambridge Analytica and the Republican National Committee?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. Those are the only two people I used for audience building, in phase 3.

MR. HIMES: In phase 3. Okay. I'm going to pause and yield here.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you.

Mr. Parscale, I'm Adam Schiff. I apologize if some of this is repetitive.

MR. PARSCALE: That's okay.

MR. SCHIFF: I want to understand, if you would, the interrelationship between your firm and Cambridge Analytica. So you helped develop what the ads looked like and make sure they're on brand.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And you said, I think, that in terms of broadest form of

targeting, what States, you would make that decision, in consultation with others.

MR. PARSCALE: In the broad sense of targeting, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: What was Cambridge Analytica's role then? What information were they providing you and how were they providing it to you?

MR. PARSCALE: It depends on when, but there became a moment in the campaign with about I don't know exactly how much left when I had a meeting and I made the decision that we weren't going to use Cambridge's data anymore, we were just going to use the RNC's.

MR. SCHIFF: So during the time that they were involved in the campaign. What --

MR. PARSCALE: Well, they were involved to the end. We just stopped using their audiences.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. Well, up until that point then, what kind of information were they giving you and how did that process work?

MR. PARSCALE: So Cambridge for a portion of the time provided us -- and we really need to explain what provided means, because that word means something different in technical terms. They produced audiences that which then were shared into the platform that we would then target ads to for donations.

MR. SCHIFF: So the data that Cambridge Analytica would give you would be information on people that they believed would be responsive to your advertising for the purposes of raising money for the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. There was a small period of time after that when we transitioned to RNC that we were running general ads as well. Like, you know, vote for Trump -- not vote for Trump, but more like, you know, what Trump's

policy positions were. There was a period of time in there.

MR. SCHIFF: Then the data that you got from Cambridge Analytica was used initially for prospecting?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And then later used for both prospecting and persuasion?

MR. PARSCALE: For a period of time, yes. Because I -- go ahead.

MR. SCHIFF: So during the first phase where you're getting the data for prospecting, are you aware of how that data is put together in the sense of who they're targeting or why they've decided to target who they're targeting?

MR. PARSCALE: Can you ask again, because I want to be very specific how you're asking that?

MR. SCHIFF: Yeah. As I understand it -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- in the early part of the interaction you had with Cambridge Analytica, they would give you targeting information, based on their data analytics. That was designed to be people who would be receptive to a fundraising appeal.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And do you know how they identified what audience would be receptive to a fundraising appeal?

MR. PARSCALE: No. I am not specific of their machine learning code and how they do it, no.

MR. SCHIFF: And at some later point, in addition to them giving you, sort of, audiences for fundraising, they would also give you audiences for persuasion?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, how did it work with those audiences in terms of persuasion to mesh the content with the audience you're trying to persuade?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: I would be provided with a list of audiences. I don't know if it was -- if they were emailed or I don't remember how. But we would receive an Excel spreadsheet I usually think, and it would have audiences and it would have tags of what that audience is.

MR. SCHIFF: So they would be tagged, this is the right audience for a build the wall message and this is --

MR. PARSCALE: It would be less specific than that. Immigration, tax reform, you know, trade, whatever -- jobs. It would be much more general than that.

MR. SCHIFF: And you wouldn't necessarily know where these individuals were, and they might be scattered out throughout the country?

MR. PARSCALE: For donation, yes. Persuasion would have been GO to a State.

MR. SCHIFF: And you would have gotten the GO tag information with the package from Cambridge Analytica?

MR. PARSCALE: Most likely we used -- I don't know. I don't know if that -- I would have to -- I don't know exactly where we got the GO from.

MR. SCHIFF: You know, at some point the Republican party started giving you the same target data that Cambridge Analytica was?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: Both for persuasion and for raising money?

MR. PARSCALE: They were more persuasion and GOTV, because when that time period ended, we were already towards the end. So GOTV became more important.

MR. SCHIFF: And when you were making use of the Cambridge Analytica

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

data and you were designing the ads and targeting them pursuant to what you got from Cambridge Analytica, did you know where those ads were going?

MR. PARSCALE: Specifically, each ad?

MR. SCHIFF: Well, did you understand how Cambridge Analytica was targeting? For example, were they targeting by swing State, were they targeting by swing precincts, or were they targeting by --

MR. PARSCALE: I would have known the basics. I would have known States, goal, but not every single audience. There were thousands.

MR. SCHIFF: And who would be communicating with Cambridge Analytica so that they would be informed of what audiences they should be providing you --

MR. PARSCALE: Well, they were in the office.

MR. SCHIFF: I'm sorry?

MR. PARSCALE: Matt Oczkowski, the lead for Cambridge, would have been -- I talked to him every day. He sat next to me in San Antonio.

MR. SCHIFF: But somebody would have been giving Cambridge Analytica the information about where they felt the campaign ought to focus its energy.

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah. I told Cambridge, here are the swing States we're focusing on. But donor data doesn't work that way. Donors, I'm not giving them any information.

MR. SCHIFF: And who were the point people in terms of Cambridge Analytica that you worked with?

MR. PARSCALE: I only really worked with one.

MR. SCHIFF: And you probably mentioned to my colleagues.

MR. PARSCALE: Matt Oczkowski.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. SCHIFF: And in terms of the RNC, when it came to the targeting of data analytics, who would the point person be there?

MR. PARSCALE: I had a few points there, but my main point of contact was Katie Walsh.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. I just want to make sure that I'm understanding the process correctly. So, in terms of the persuasion, not the fundraising, you would get the basic content of the message from the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, the political message.

MR. SCHIFF: The political message, the talking points or whatnot. You would create ads that were on brand that were --

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And I'm talking about the designed to persuade.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: You would receive the targeting information from Cambridge Analytica or from the RNC.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: The targeting information, you don't know how it was derived, in the terms of their psychoanalytical data gathering process?

MR. PARSCALE: That's asking something different.

MR. SCHIFF: Oh, okay. So you do know how that was derived?

MR. PARSCALE: No. Deriving an audience and psychographics are two different things.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. Well, what's your understanding of how they develop their audience?

MR. PARSCALE: Deriving their audiences were definitely based off of the

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

polling and research, and then machine learning back across a larger database.

MR. SCHIFF: And the machine learning is the --

MR. PARSCALE: That's their -- that's their -- both their sciences and how they do it, and neither of those would divulge that to me.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. So you get the information then from Cambridge Analytica. And did the Republican party have basically their own version of what Cambridge Analytica did --

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: -- in terms of data analytics?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. So you get the targeting information from them?

MR. PARSCALE: Yep.

MR. SCHIFF: And your job is to then make the ad purchases with Facebook, Google, et cetera, on the different platforms?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. They would actually put the audiences directly into the platforms.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. And how involved were the social media companies in the process, or were they --

MR. PARSCALE: You're asking my opinion?

MR. SCHIFF: Well, specifically, did they have any role other than taking your money, taking your content, and taking your audience and basically put --

MR. PARSCALE: Education.

MR. SCHIFF: They also educated you?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: About how the platforms worked?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, and best practices.

MR. SCHIFF: And did they -- at a certain point, were they basically full time in your office, because you were a big enough customer that it made sense for them?

MR. PARSCALE: They got close, I would say. If you're asking my opinion?

MR. SCHIFF: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: I'd say they got close, a couple of them did, being there more than I was.

MR. SCHIFF: And who were the key point people at each of the social media companies?

MR. PARSCALE: Do you want names?

MR. SCHIFF: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: Do you want to name each company specifically and I can go through them or what do you feel like?

MR. SCHIFF: Sure. Facebook.

MR. PARSCALE: We had three key people that I remember, which is Annie Lewis, James Barn and Mike Senich.

MR. SCHIFF: Google.

MR. PARSCALE: Google would have been -- I'm going to butcher her last name so I apologize to her. It's Ali J. Asselstine. I don't really know. I never said her last name because of this problem. Curt Black (ph). Those were two main people from Google. There were others. I just don't remember their names.

MR. SCHIFF: And Twitter?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: Twitter was -- oh, I just blanked out. Hold on. I literally just said it 5 minutes ago. You have to give me a minute, or I could look at my phone.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. You've already answered it. You've told my colleagues.

MR. PARSCALE: I told your colleagues the answer. I apologize, his name blanked out on me.

MR. SCHIFF: And what other platforms did you use for your persuasion?

MR. PARSCALE: We used Snapchat some, and the guy's name was Rob. I can't remember Rob's last name.

MR. SCHIFF: Any other social media platforms that you used?

MR. PARSCALE: Social media? No. We used other ad platforms from AOL, Yahoo, Politico, I mean, like any other campaign where we bought a lot of, you know, you know, stuff.

MR. SCHIFF: All right. And do you have any knowledge of whether Cambridge Analytica shared their information with any other parties apart from your --

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SCHIFF: -- your business?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SCHIFF: And are you aware of whether they made that publicly available?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. Let me turn to my colleagues.

MR. CONAWAY: Can we swap, guys? We've got a vote here coming up.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

We've got a couple questions.

MS. SPEIER: Sure.

MR. GOWDY: Is it Parscale?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, perfect.

MR. GOWDY: My name is Trey Gowdy. I'm from South Carolina. I've just got one quick question.

One of my colleagues had mused on television that he was -- and this will be as close to a quote as I can get it -- very interested in finding out whether there was Russian funding or support for the Trump campaign's data analytics operation or Russian assistance in any way with gathering data that was then used by the campaign. And given my colleague's interest in that, I thought I would go ahead and ask you.

How did the Russians help you with -- we'll start at the very first -- funding?

MR. PARSCALE: They didn't.

MR. GOWDY: How about support?

MR. PARSCALE: They didn't.

MR. GOWDY: I'm not sure what data analytics operation is, but I'm hoping you know what that is.

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah. They didn't.

MR. GOWDY: Okay. We'll keep going through the litany here.

Assistance in any way. That's broad, but he modified it a little bit. Gathering data.

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I know of.

MR. GOWDY: Those then used by the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I know of.

MR. GOWDY: So if we were to create a list, any money from any Russian sources?

MR. PARSCALE: I mean, I can't answer for every FEC thing, but not that I know of.

MR. GOWDY: Instructions on who to target, how to do it?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. GOWDY: Suggestions?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. GOWDY: Provide any workforce for you?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. GOWDY: I'm running out of synonyms for assistance and aid. If I missed any, you fill in the blanks for me, okay? I've asked every synonym I can think for Russian assistance. The answer is no to all of them?

MR. PARSCALE: No. And I think every dollar that we received is on the FEC website.

MR. GOWDY: All right. Thank you.

MR. SCHIFF: Just to follow up before my colleague, of course, if the Russians were getting data from the same place you were, Cambridge Analytica, you might not be aware of that. Is that right?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, that's true.

MR. SCHIFF: So if they were assisting through Cambridge Analytica, you wouldn't be in a position to answer my colleague's questions?

MR. PARSCALE: That is correct.

MR. SCHIFF: Ms. Speier.

MS. SPEIER: Thank you.

The communication team from which you received your marching orders, so to speak, who was on that communications team in New York?

MR. PARSCALE: It depends on the phase. Were you talking about the last phase?

MS. SPEIER: Yes, phase 3.

MR. PARSCALE: That would have been several people from -- you want me to name names I --

MS. SPEIER: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: It wouldn't be holistic, but it would be a lot. That could be Bannon, Steve Bannon, Kellyanne Conway, Jared Kushner, Donald Trump, Jason Miller, Hope Hicks, Stephen Miller. Those would probably be the main names.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. Let me ask you kind of a general question. Do you think the Russians intervened in the election?

MR. PARSCALE: I wouldn't know that.

MS. SPEIER: Well, let's go back to a document that you provided to us. It was a monthly security report from Rackspace Managed Security.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: They work for you, right?

MR. PARSCALE: That was a company that we hired to provide security.

MS. SPEIER: So from July 24th through August 21st, 2016, they talked about the Giles-Parscale threat landscape.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: And they specifically reference investigations into a Russian cyber attack that targeted Democratic politicians and reached the private email

accounts of more than 100 party officials and groups points to several possible cyber threats: Actors Fancy Bear and Cozy Bear. While Fancy Bear activity on the victims' network was identified in April 2016, the Cozy Bear adversary is believed to have maintained access since at least summer of 2015.

The two state-sponsored Russian adversaries leveraged multiple implants and tools to maintain persistence, including Fancy Bear's X-tunnel network tunnelling tool, the open source remcom remote execution tool, and Cozy Bear's C daddy back door. The adversaries were additionally observed conducting postexploitation reconnaissance and targeting of DNC user data, including email communications.

So you were aware of this back in July and August of 2016. Clearly, the Russians were messing with the Democrats. So how can you, with that knowledge, not presume that they attempted to intervene in the election process?

MR. PARSCALE: I mean, Rackspace, the media. I mean, you asked if I knew. I don't know.

MS. SPEIER: Well, this is a form you rely on for security, and they are basically saying that --

MR. PARSCALE: They're giving me their opinion. I don't know. You asked me if I knew. I don't know. I'm not an expert. You could ask Rackspace.

MS. SPEIER: So you had this independent of the Intelligence Community back in July and August, and that didn't kind of jump out of the page and you didn't share that with the communications team?

MR. PARSCALE: I wouldn't probably share Rackspace's opinion back. I don't know. And I don't remember actually reading that now.

MS. SPEIER: So in terms of targeting, that decision was made by the



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

RNC and Cambridge Analytica, along with the communication team?

MR. PARSCALE: It depends what you mean by the choice of targeting.

MS. SPEIER: Well, you ran advertisements that were targeted at people.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: Who made those determinations?

MR. PARSCALE: Well, there are thousands of choices being made.

Different people made different choices.

MS. SPEIER: Well, what choices did you make?

MR. PARSCALE: Very -- probably what States -- in connection with other people in the campaign, what States we were going to go into. Maybe different issues that I felt were -- the ones in the polling data were showing us the best opportunity. The RNC and Cambridge actually made the audiences, from what our suggestions of where we needed to go.

MS. SPEIER: So in the 60-minute interview you did, you said you were making between 50,000 and 60,000 ads a day.

MR. PARSCALE: I said variations.

MS. SPEIER: Well, okay, variations of ads.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: Were you doing that?

MR. PARSCALE: No, we were doing that programmatic --

MS. SPEIER: Was your staff doing it?

MR. PARSCALE: We were doing that programmatically.

MS. SPEIER: What does that mean?

MR. PARSCALE: It means a computer was generating them, with versions. So maybe 10,000 ads of a different color.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MS. SPEIER: So I asked you this before and I'm still kind of perplexed by it. You didn't run any ads targeted based on race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or immigration status?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I'm aware of.

MS. SPEIER: What do you mean, not that you're aware of? Did Cambridge Analytica provide you any?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't believe so. I mean, no.

MS. SPEIER: All right. I'll yield back.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[4:35 p.m.]

MR. SWALWELL: Good afternoon, my name is Eric Swalwell of California.

Thank you for being here with us today.

MR. PARSCALE: You're welcome.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you sign a nondisclosure agreement with the campaign with respect to your work for it?

MR. PARSCALE: I did not personally sign a nondisclosure.

MR. SWALWELL: Did anyone who worked for Giles-Parscale sign a nondisclosure agreement?

MR. SPEIER: The company?

MR. PARSCALE: I believe the company's agreement has a nondisclosure clause in it.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. So in your contract with, your company's contract with the Trump campaign -- you company's contract with the Trump campaign includes a nondisclosure?

MR. PARSCALE: I believe so. I don't have it in front of me, though.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you recall which counsel on the Trump side negotiated that?

MR. PARSCALE: Negotiated the contract or the NDA?

MR. SWALWELL: The NDA.

MR. PARSCALE: No idea. The contract was provided to me.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you remember who counsel was on the Trump campaign side?

MR. PARSCALE: Don McGhan?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. SWALWELL: Is there anything about your testimony today that's limited because of what you perceive as being a violation of the NDA?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Have you spoken to Special Counsel, Bob Mueller, or anyone on his team with respect to the work you did in the 2016 election?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you been asked to?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: And just following up a little bit on my colleague's questions about security, did you ever see through the course of the campaign any data that the campaign owned, leaked out in another -- through another platform because it was stolen from you? Do you understand the question?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. I do not believe so that our cedes were ever show positive. Do you understand what that means?

MR. SWALWELL: No. Can you explain?

MR. PARSCALE: You cede data with fake stuff, like fake email addresses that are yours, they are not real supporters, they are yours. You make 50 of them, you cede it and if anyone ever steals it and uses it, you would know because you don't use those accounts for anything else.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever see any -- and I guess to just put a finer point on it, did you ever see any data that was proprietary to the campaign, was not part of messaging that public would see but for internal use, did you ever see that stolen and then disseminated in another form?

MR. PARSCALE: Other than communications from leaked stories, you

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

know, from the political people in New York, nothing from the data department.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. So of these different attacks that Ms. Speier was referencing where Cloud Flare was being used --

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: -- to assess, you never saw anything that occurred with those attacks and information disseminated broadly, is that -- kind of a clumsy way of saying it.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you see --

MR. PARSCALE: These are the Web sites, this isn't Trump data.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. So to your knowledge, data was never taken.

MR. PARSCALE: I -- don't believe so.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. So would you agree that regardless of who's responsible for taking it, the DNC was hacked?

MR. PARSCALE: From what I read?

MR. SWALWELL: Sure.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: The information was taken --

MR. PARSCALE: If the media is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: And then disseminated for the public to read.

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, if the media is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: Sure. And you're saying that to your knowledge nothing like that occurred to your --

MR. PARSCALE: Not to our data, not that I know of.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever see an attempt?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: Do you think -- do I think I ever saw an attempt for anyone to take our data?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah.

MR. PARSCALE: I do think the reports that I saw people made attempts -- I don't know if they were trying to steal it, but they definitely didn't have good intentions.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Nevertheless, they weren't successful?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't believe they were.

MR. SWALWELL: Are you aware of any individual third party or any Facebook advertisers using your custom audiences in ads that they created?

MR. PARSCALE: Can you ask that again?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah. Are you aware of any -- and is it Parscale?

MR. PARSCALE: It's par like golf, scale like weigh yourself. Parscale.

MR. SWALWELL: Parscale.

Are you aware of any non Giles-Parscale group, individual, third party advertiser using your custom audiences in ads that they created?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I'm aware of.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you target any look alike accounts targeting pages that have been identified in the press as having been run by Russians?

MR. PARSCALE: Not -- no.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you share material or media that has been identified in the press as having been created by Russians?

MR. PARSCALE: No, but I'm not aware of everything that's ever put in the media.

MR. SWALWELL: Sure. From what's in --

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: What I know, now.

MR. SWALWELL: And what's in press reporting, some of the ads that --

MR. PARSCALE: It's a lot of press, I mean, yes. Everything I've seen,  
no.

MR. SWALWELL: And if we were to provide you with a list of those pages,  
would you be willing to provide the committee with information as to whether or not  
they were something that --

MR. PARSCALE: I would help any way I could.

MR. SWALWELL: Thank you.

Did you mirror or mimic an ad seen on Facebook that you did not create?

MR. PARSCALE: Did I ever mirror?

MR. SWALWELL: Like you see an interesting ad that was used and you  
basically lift it and put it out in your own --

MR. PARSCALE: Not lift it. I would say, though, there's ads I've seen  
even iPod ads that I saw that were -- would generate ideas on how to make  
another ad. It's not like -- that's kind of how ads kind of work.

MR. SWALWELL: Did -- to your knowledge, did the campaign ever employ  
bots to push messages and make messaging trends.

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Were you aware of any third party bots or bot nets that  
amplify campaign messages during the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Am I aware other than the media?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah. Or what you just saw --

MR. PARSCALE: I -- no. I mean honestly, no.

MR. SWALWELL: Could you tell the difference? Can you tell the

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

difference between a bot and something that is --

MR. PARSCALE: I think Twitter can actually really do that. I mean I think there are signs of what a fake account looks like. That's my opinion.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you seen some of the Russian produced ads that --

MR. PARSCALE: I have not seen anything. I've been waiting diligently for you guys to release them.

MR. SWALWELL: Well, I guess -- I mean just the ones that have been in the press or reported.

MR. PARSCALE: I think I saw a couple, right?

MR. SWALWELL: The black matters ads.

MR. PARSCALE: There were a couple I think that came out that I saw. But I've been waiting more for the -- when you guys release them all. I'm curious to what they look like.

MR. SWALWELL: Did the campaign ever purchase followers?

MR. PARSCALE: No. For Twitter or Facebook?

MR. SWALWELL: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever repurpose content created by other entities for the Trump campaign? For example, something you may have seen from Russian Today or Sputnik or?

MR. PARSCALE: You're asking me specifically?

MR. SWALWELL: Or your company.

MR. PARSCALE: Or my company? No.

MR. SWALWELL: Employees at your company?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE



MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Are you familiar with the Star of David, Hilary Clinton image?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: And would you agree that that was --

MR. PARSCALE: You're asking me my opinion?

MR. SWALWELL: Well, did you ever repurpose anything like that that you saw a third party use?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't think I did.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay.

You're familiar with the Internet Research Agency?

MR. PARSCALE: From the media now.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. You'd never heard of them independent from this campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I could remember when I saw it.

MR. SWALWELL: How would you just generally assess the Russian, as a subject matter expert in --

MR. PARSCALE: You're asking my opinion of what I think --

MR. TODD: Slow down.

MR. PARSCALE: Go ahead, sorry.

MR. SWALWELL: We -- you and I could probably agree that you are a subject matter expert in computer software.

MR. PARSCALE: And social media?

MR. SWALWELL: And social media.

MR. PARSCALE: Oh, yeah.

MR. SWALWELL: How would you assess the Russian's capabilities in social media and persuasion?

MR. PARSCALE: What do I think they can do or what do I think how they did it?

MR. SWALWELL: No. What do you think they can do?

MR. PARSCALE: Well, I mean they put a man in space, I'm sure they could figure out social media.

MR. SWALWELL: From what you observed, like, Russia Today or Sputnik.

MR. PARSCALE: I think it's novice.

MR. SWALWELL: Why do you say that?

MR. PARSCALE: I think a true social media campaign would need a large scale amount of money.

MR. SWALWELL: During the course of the campaign, did you ever review anything that was posted on RT, otherwise known as Russia Today.

MR. PARSCALE: Honestly, I didn't even know that that channel existed before I saw media lately. I'm not a media TV expert.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you read the intelligence community assessment?

MR. PARSCALE: No, actually.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. We can give it to you. It is interesting that in many -- throughout the campaign RT had admit -- would it surprise you that RT's content oftentimes had more views than CNN, or MSNBC, or Fox News some of the videos they were putting out around the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: I am never surprised when polarizing content gets more abuse.

MR. SWALWELL: But did you ever review that polarizing content to inform what you would do to help the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: No, I don't think so. That was mainly lead by Donald Trump, I mean, his views.

MR. SWALWELL: Were you aware as to whether Donald Trump was being provided with content from RT or Sputnik?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Did he ever cite RT or Sputnik work to you as something that should be amplified?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I know of.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever create content for your digital campaign for the Trump campaign that you knew to be false?

MR. PARSCALE: Not that I'm aware of.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever share content personally or through Project Alamo that you knew to be false?

MR. PARSCALE: The question doesn't make sense for what Project Alamo is.

MR. SWALWELL: I'm sorry?

MR. PARSCALE: That question actually doesn't make sense. I apologize.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Let me back up. Are you familiar with the Pizzagate scandal, Michael Kellinger reposted a Pizzagate story.

MR. PARSCALE: The basics of it, yes. It was a while ago.

MR. SWALWELL: And that was proved to be false.

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever share content or did you assist the campaign in sharing content that you knew to be false?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't believe so.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever create content for the digital campaign that you knew to have been stolen?

MR. PARSCALE: No. I don't think so.

MR. SWALWELL: And by stolen, I mean, you know, I think we all agree regardless of who stole it that the Podesta emails were stolen.

MR. PARSCALE: That -- you want me to -- can you ask that very specifically?

MR. SWALWELL: Did you agree that John Podesta's emails were hacked?

MR. PARSCALE: Like on the media, yeah, it sounds like it. Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever repurpose or publish anything from those hacked emails to advance Donald Trump's campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't think so. I would have to see every ad. I don't believe so.

MR. SWALWELL: And we said earlier that you agreed that the DNC emails were also hacked. Did you ever use any of the content from the hacked DNC emails that were in the open source to create your own narrative?

MR. PARSCALE: We might have. I do not know.

MR. SWALWELL: How often did you speak with Donald Trump throughout the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't think it was a routine, but I would say enough. To know his phase.

MR. SWALWELL: Sure. There's three, right?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah. Phase one is zero, you know. Phase two, a couple times. And phase three every week.

MR. SWALWELL: And were they in person conversations or over the phone?

MR. PARSCALE: Mostly in person, a couple phone?

MR. SWALWELL: So in phase two, more than five or fewer than five?

MR. PARSCALE: Like total?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah.

MR. PARSCALE: It depends if conversations or just like being next to him.

MR. SWALWELL: No conversations. The two of you --

MR. PARSCALE: Less than five probably.

MR. SWALWELL: Phase three, more than five or fewer than five?

MR. PARSCALE: More than five.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. More than 20 or fewer than 20?

MR. PARSCALE: It would be hard to count. It had been a lot.

MR. SWALWELL: So between five and 20?

MR. PARSCALE: It might have been more than 20. I mean, I communicate with him often.

MR. SWALWELL: And when you --

MR. PARSCALE: Four or five times a day on certain days.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever talk to him by phone?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Would you ever pass along a communication to him by email that you knew would be passed to him?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: I probably emailed Hope something? Yeah.

MR. SWALWELL: How about Rhona Graff?

MR. PARSCALE: Probably. But I don't -- you know, photos of him.

MR. SWALWELL: So when you spoke to Donald Trump in both phases two and three, did -- I mean, what kind of convers -- were these specific as to what you were doing or was it just general narratives of the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: Oh, that's all over the place. We spoke on campaign strategies, TV advertising, data polling results, he was very engaged with all those things.

MR. SWALWELL: So you would describe him as being very engaged on a surface level?

MR. PARSCALE: When it comes -- when it comes -- when it comes to polling data in TV advertisement, extremely engaged.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever talk to him about D -- the hacked DNC emails?

MR. PARSCALE: No, that wasn't -- that's not my wheelhouse.

MR. SWALWELL: Did he -- did it ever come up in conversation about the John Podesta emails?

MR. PARSCALE: To me?

MR. SWALWELL: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: When you talked to Donald Trump, did the missing 33,000 Hillary Clinton emails ever come up?

MR. PARSCALE: In the conversation to me?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: I don't believe so.

MR. SWALWELL: Did Donald Trump ever bring up Russia when you talked to him?

MR. PARSCALE: When?

MR. SWALWELL: Phases two and three?

MR. PARSCALE: No, I don't believe so.

MR. SWALWELL: Recently?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: What did he say?

MR. PARSCALE: He said he liked on 60 Minutes when I said it was a joke.

MR. SWALWELL: When was that?

MR. PARSCALE: The night of 60 Minutes.

MR. SWALWELL: He called you?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah.

MR. SWALWELL: Did he say anything about our investigation?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Why do you think it was a joke?

MR. PARSCALE: I just thought my role in it was.

MR. SWALWELL: I'm sorry?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't think this is a joke, I just thought my role in it was because I know who I am.

MR. SWALWELL: And the President was referring to you saying that your joke -- your role in it was a joke.

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, what I did. He was being supportive of me.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. SWALWELL: Has he expressed an opinion about the assessment that Russia interfered in the election.

MR. PARSCALE: Ask that again?

MR. SWALWELL: Has he expressed to you an opinion about whether or not Russia interfered in the election?

MR. PARSCALE: No. He has not talked about that with me.

MR. SWALWELL: Does it bother you that it's been suggested that Russian interference, particularly through data, somehow influenced the election?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah.

MR. SWALWELL: Why?

MR. PARSCALE: Because I wouldn't want anybody to mess with our election process.

MR. SWALWELL: Are you familiar with who has access to -- who at Cambridge Analytica has access to U.S. voter data or is that outside of your knowledge?

MR. PARSCALE: Who has U.S. voter data?

MR. SWALWELL: So Cambridge Analytica holds U.S. voter data.

MR. PARSCALE: History?

MR. SWALWELL: U.S. voter data information.

MR. PARSCALE: History, like just voting history?

MR. SWALWELL: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know over there has.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you ever met Michael Flynn?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: How many times?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: Ever in his presence or -- met him is a weird word. If I met him once, then I knew him.

MR. SWALWELL: Well, after today if someone said have you ever met Brad Parscale, I'd say, yeah, I met him. Until today I would say, no.

MR. PARSCALE: I met him -- yeah. But didn't meet him again. I have seen him again and talked to him again. I'm just trying to be specific to your question.

MR. SWALWELL: Sure. So you've met him.

MR. PARSCALE: I've met him.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you ever had a meeting with him?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. How many times?

MR. PARSCALE: A couple.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. More than five?

MR. PARSCALE: No, two. I meant literally a couple.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Were you familiar in the meetings or interactions of Michael Flynn with his prior relationship with Russia, particularly RT?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: What would you talk about with Michael Flynn?

MR. PARSCALE: I mainly listened, but it was about technology.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you know the name Peter Smith?

MR. PARSCALE: That's a very common name. I don't know, maybe.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever hear General Flynn bring up the name Peter Smith?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: I don't remember.

MR. SWALWELL: Did Michael Flynn ever direct you to generate a message in your role with the campaign, that would be disseminated to --

MR. PARSCALE: Did Michael Flynn ever suggest to the data department or digital department to make a message?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah. Does that make sense?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know that I'm taking it the same way you are.

MR. SWALWELL: I mean, so in your interaction with him, did he ever say you guys should be --

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: -- talking more about this?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. He would -- he had an opinion.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. And what were they? Can you characterize what those opinions were about?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't remember. A lot of people had opinions.

MR. SWALWELL: Hillary's emails?

MR. PARSCALE: Man, I -- that's -- I can't remember that specific. I apologize.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you remember when the President said in the summer of it 2016, Russia if you're listening, you would be rewarded if you hacked Hillary's emails?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah.

MR. SWALWELL: What did you make of that?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know if I made -- I don't know what you mean --

MR. SWALWELL: Did you have a reaction when he said that?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: I think I laughed.

MR. SWALWELL: Were you familiar with any effort on the Trump campaign or anyone associated with the Trump campaign to try and get ahold of those emails?

MR. PARSCALE: No, not that I know.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever meet Roger Stone?

MR. PARSCALE: Never.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever meet Carter Page?

MR. PARSCALE: I didn't know who he is.

MR. SWALWELL: How about Dmitry Firtash?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know that name.

MR. SWALWELL: Vincent Tchenguiz?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Oleg Deripaska?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Are you familiar with Alfa Bank?

MR. PARSCALE: I'm familiar through news stories. We discussed this earlier. I don't know if you were in here. No, it's okay. I just want to make sure.

MR. SWALWELL: Nigel Farage?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes, I have met him.

MR. SWALWELL: You have?

MR. PARSCALE: Post campaign.

MR. SWALWELL: Any follow ups since?

MR. PARSCALE: No. We met. We were both speakers at the same conference and shook hands.

MR. SWALWELL: Thank you, Mr. Parscale.

MR. PARSCALE: Thank you.

[4:55 p.m.]

MR. SCHIFF: I just want to go over a couple things just to make sure I understand completely. I think you were asked earlier about an email exchange involving Peter Schweizer and Lisa Fleischmann.

MR. PARSCALE: Do I have that? Oh, is that this one you gave me? Yeah. Okay.

MR. SCHIFF: This was a suggestion that she was making that the stolen Clinton emails be posted online through Cambridge Analytica, who she noted could handle big data. This is Lisa Fleischmann. She wrote in the document Bates stamped CA6078, "I sent this idea to Steve," who I presume would be Steve Bannon, "and he connected me to his digital guy."

MR. PARSCALE: Where are you at? Oh, here.

MR. SCHIFF: "And he connected me to his digital guy. But campaigns are often so much in the day-to-day world that a more strategic move like this often has to take place outside the campaign."

Did Ms. Fleischmann connect with you, as she indicated in this email?

MR. PARSCALE: Steve had a couple digital guys, like, outside the campaign, but I don't remember her contacting me.

MR. SCHIFF: Did anyone contact you about having Cambridge Analytica using its big data capability to house the stolen Clinton emails?

MR. PARSCALE: I do not remember anyone bringing up Cambridge to do that.

MR. SCHIFF: Are you aware of any contact between Cambridge Analytica and Julian Assange?

MR. PARSCALE: Before this email?

MR. SCHIFF: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: Except I just read it right there.

MR. SCHIFF: Quite separate and apart from this email, have you had any discussions with anyone regarding whether Cambridge Analytica was in touch with Julian Assange?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. SCHIFF: I think that my colleague asked you, but I just want to broaden the question, whether your operation had used bots, and I think you said no. Did you use any of the other related mechanisms like --

MR. PARSCALE: The ones that he was all saying?

MR. SCHIFF: -- sock puppets and --

MR. PARSCALE: I had never actually heard of that before. The only things we used in Twitter -- maybe it's easier to explain what I did do.

MR. SCHIFF: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: We bought paid advertising, paid hashtags, and tweeted from Donald Trump's account, Mike Pence's account, and that's about it. We spent very little money on Twitter.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, I think one of the Twitter users that you retweeted I think you were asked about, turned out to be an IRA, a Russian troll, Tenn\_GOP, Tennessee GOP, which turned out to be Tennessee in Russia, if there is such a thing. Is that something you tweeted personally or you tweeted through the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: I tweeted personally.

MR. SCHIFF: And how much tweeting did you do personally through the campaign?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: A couple every once in a while.

MR. SCHIFF: And what attracted you to be retweeting this particular tweet?

MR. PARSCALE: I think because it was talking about how bad the media bias was.

MR. SCHIFF: So you were retweeting a Russian troll complaining about the U.S. media?

MR. PARSCALE: I thought it was a Tennessee GOP. It had a State seal. I can't see on the other side.

MR. SCHIFF: So even someone sophisticated in social media like yourself couldn't see that this was --

MR. PARSCALE: Unless Twitter puts up a sticker that says this is Russia, there is no way I would know.

MR. SCHIFF: So I take it then you never knowingly pushed any Russian-generated content or Russian-generated user either through your own social media or the campaign's social media?

MR. PARSCALE: Of course not.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you know of a company Tiptop?

MR. PARSCALE: I have not heard of that company.

MR. SCHIFF: Are you aware of any effort through unpaid staff to push anti-Hillary content without identifying a connection to the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't believe so, no.

MR. SCHIFF: And did you ever use a custom audience that you or your firm did not create or was not created for you by Cambridge Analytica or the Republican Party?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: We did use Facebook's own audience builder during phase one. So you have to add them to that. So Facebook audiences, RNC audiences, Cambridge audiences.

MR. SCHIFF: And that would be the full extent?

MR. PARSCALE: That would be the full extent --

MR. SCHIFF: -- for you to get your targeting information or your audience information?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: Project Alamo developed its own voter database in addition to what you got from RNC and Cambridge Analytica.

MR. PARSCALE: That's incorrect.

MR. SCHIFF: That's not correct? Okay. So that was --

MR. PARSCALE: Project Alamo was not a voter database.

MR. SCHIFF: Did your -- and maybe -- I don't know --

MR. PARSCALE: The media has misconstrued that.

MR. SCHIFF: Did your company create its own voter database in addition to what you got from RNC and Cambridge Analytica?

MR. PARSCALE: No, it did not.

MR. SCHIFF: So that was just misreported?

MR. PARSCALE: Misreported about what Alamo is.

MR. SCHIFF: But regardless what Alamo is, your company didn't do that, didn't create its own database?

MR. PARSCALE: Like create its own, like, what the RNC and Cambridge had?

MR. SCHIFF: Yes, or --

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: No. The only thing we stored was Trump signups, Trump supporters.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you know whether Cambridge Analytica's parent company, SCL Group, Ltd., based in London, had access to the data analytics it was providing to your campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: I was unaware of SCL Group until after the campaign, so no.

MR. SCHIFF: And did you share Cambridge Analytica or RNC voter databases or targeting information with anyone outside your campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: No. Can you ask that again?

MR. SCHIFF: Yeah. Did you share Cambridge Analytica or RNC voter data analytics or data period with anyone outside the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: The campaign?

MR. SCHIFF: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, no.

MR. SCHIFF: Cambridge Analytica, in addition to playing a role in the Trump campaign, reportedly played a significant role in Brexit as well. Do you know of their work on Brexit?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. CONAWAY: Adam, are you going to be able to finish in order to vote?

MR. SCHIFF: I am almost done with mine, but my colleagues have questions.

MR. CONAWAY: Let's let that be the get it done timeframe.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you ever use dark posts or any social media platform or capability to push voter suppression messages?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: What do you define voter suppression?

MR. SCHIFF: Something designed to suppress voter turnout among target populations.

MR. PARSCALE: I never tried to keep people from turning out.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Castro.

MR. CASTRO: In an interview didn't you talk about voter suppression techniques?

MR. PARSCALE: As in? Give me an example.

MR. CASTRO: You gave an interview to Wired or one of those magazines --

MR. PARSCALE: Talking about the Bloomberg article? That was not my quote.

MR. CASTRO: Talked about voter suppression.

MR. PARSCALE: That wasn't my quote.

MR. CASTRO: What was your quote?

MR. PARSCALE: No, that wasn't my quote. That was an unnamed source in the campaign said that.

MR. CASTRO: Who is Theresa Wong?

MR. PARSCALE: She was an employee of Giles-Parscale.

MR. CASTRO: Are you aware she gave an interview and tour to BBC regarding Project Alamo?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, which is just funny.

MR. CASTRO: What was her role in Giles-Parscale?

MR. PARSCALE: She was a copywriter.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. I am going to ask a series of basic information

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

questions.

MR. PARSCALE: Sure.

MR. CASTRO: The period here will be from January 2015 to the present time for these questions. All email addresses that you have used during that period.

MR. PARSCALE: You want me to list all the email addresses I used?

MR. CASTRO: During that period.

MR. PARSCALE: [REDACTED],

[REDACTED]. Do you want incoming email addresses or you want ones that I can send from?

MR. CASTRO: Anything that you have used to send or receive.

MR. PARSCALE: That's different. I can receive from a lot of email addresses but I can only send from a couple.

MR. CASTRO: All of them.

MR. PARSCALE: Oh, my God. I would have to provide a list.

MR. CASTRO: Counsel, will you stipulate that you will provide the list?

MR. TODD: The answer is we will certainly attempt to do that. Apparently it is a very large list.

MR. PARSCALE: For incoming.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. We have asked the same question of just about every other witness, and every other witness has complied with it somehow, either by providing the list or by naming --

MR. PARSCALE: Just to be honest with you, they don't own an advertising agency that is a digital company, which --

MR. CASTRO: Most people don't use 50 email addresses, though.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: All the group emails that I am part of. Every one of my clients gets a group email that then I am cc'd on automatically.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. It is our position that we would like to see a list of all of those where you can send or receive emails.

MR. TODD: Just to clarify, you want those --

MR. CASTRO: Yes. Phone numbers, cell phones. How many cell phones did you use during that period of time?

MR. PARSCALE: Just one, I believe. Yeah. I had another one for a while that I did not end up using. We were going to get a New York phone number, and I just didn't end up using it.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. What were the providers on those phones?

MR. PARSCALE: AT&T.

MR. CASTRO: For both?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes.

MR. CASTRO: Did you ever use a burner phone or purchase a burner phone?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. CASTRO: All right. Social media accounts where you received or sent messages. Facebook?

MR. PARSCALE: And Twitter.

MR. CASTRO: Twitter. Instagram?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't use Instagram.

MR. CASTRO: Any messaging apps where you sent or received messages. What'sApp?

MR. PARSCALE: During that period of time?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. CASTRO: Yes.

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. CASTRO: Signal?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. CASTRO: Proton?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. CASTRO: Any other messaging apps?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. CASTRO: Any other messaging apps or accounts where you sent or received messages?

MR. PARSCALE: Just iMessage and text message, which is the same kind of thing.

MR. CASTRO: Did you engage in direct messaging on Twitter?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. Some.

MR. CASTRO: You sold your company recently, at least part of it.

MR. PARSCALE: Merged.

MR. CASTRO: You got \$9 million --

MR. PARSCALE: Nine million stock.

MR. CASTRO: Who did you sell it to?

MR. PARSCALE: Cloud Commerce.

MR. CASTRO: What was that?

MR. PARSCALE: Cloud Commerce.

MR. CASTRO: And who partook in the profits of that?

MR. PARSCALE: I got the stock.

MR. CASTRO: And Mr. Giles?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: Ms. Giles? She did not in that deal. I had bought her out previous to the merger.

MR. CASTRO: All right.

Did you export the names of voters into Facebook to do your targeting?

MR. PARSCALE: Did I or my company?

MR. CASTRO: Or your company.

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. CASTRO: The operation.

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. CASTRO: So you didn't export any voters' names when you were doing your targeting on Facebook?

MR. PARSCALE: The audiences were built by other people, not us.

MR. CASTRO: Do you know how they went about -- let me ask you this. Do you know how Cambridge Analytica went about building its audience? Did you ever cover that stuff?

MR. PARSCALE: Yeah, I mean I understand it in basic -- more than basic, but I understand the basics of it.

MR. CASTRO: What was your understanding?

MR. PARSCALE: You want me to walk you through how voter modeling works?

MR. CASTRO: No, no. I want your understanding of how Cambridge Analytica did it based on your conversations with folks from Cambridge Analytica. Who was your main contact over there?

MR. PARSCALE: You want me to -- so you want me to describe what I believe Cambridge Analytica did to create --

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. CASTRO: Yeah. Where did they get their voter lists? How did they create them? How did they get them?

MR. PARSCALE: So most companies, including the RNC, Data Trust, DNC, all that, will -- and Cambridge -- buy from L3, different companies, or buy from the States, buy voter records.

MR. CASTRO: No, I understand that. But what is your understanding specifically of how Cambridge Analytica got their voter lists? Not theoretically how somebody does it, but how they did it.

MR. PARSCALE: I mean, that's the only way -- I mean, I don't know then.

MR. CASTRO: So you are saying you don't know how they got their lists?

MR. PARSCALE: Yes. I don't know. I thought you wanted me to explain how they do it. If you want me to ask you and specifically if I know how Cambridge bought something, I do not.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. Were you asked to forward your ads to anyone else or allow access to any database that you were in possession of?

MR. PARSCALE: Restate that.

MR. CASTRO: Were you asked to forward your ads to anyone else? Anybody outside of the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: What do you mean forward them?

MR. CASTRO: Just forward them. Send them the ads by email or over social media.

MR. PARSCALE: Did I ever send one of my ads to somebody else?

MR. CASTRO: No, no. Were you asked to forward your ads? For example, during campaigns somebody may say: Hey, can you send that ad on property taxes to such and such person? Can you email them the ad?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know. I don't remember. I don't know. Probably. Who knows?

MR. PARSCALE: You are not aware of who may have asked you to send them or who you sent them to.

MR. PARSCALE: If you gave me a specific case I maybe know. I don't know. Yeah, I mean -- I don't know. It's a very, very broad question. Did I send something I worked on to somebody over a 2-year period?

MR. CASTRO: The databases that you were in possession of, did you allow anybody outside of the campaign to access those?

MR. PARSCALE: The databases which we had -- are you including the vendors that we contracted with under contract as part of the campaign?

MR. CASTRO: Sure.

MR. PARSCALE: No, then everybody was within the campaign.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. As part of the production did you all provide a list of all the employees who worked for your company during the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: He is asking if we produced a list of all my employees that worked during the campaign.

MR. WEBSTER: I don't think we were asked for that.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. I don't know who is representing your side, but we would like to see a list of who you employed, basically, during that time. Their side.

MR. PARSCALE: Their side. This is my side.

MR. CASTRO: You said you had three offices in San Antonio -- two offices in San Antonio. Where were they located?

MR. PARSCALE: Downtown, 321 Sixth Street, and the other one I can't



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

remember the address, it was at 410 across from the airport, 410 and Harry Wuerzbach right there. You are the only here that knows that.

MR. CASTRO: Who were the Internet service providers there?

MR. PARSCALE: I imagine it was Cox. I don't know. Right?

MR. CASTRO: I don't think Cox does business in San Antonio.

MR. PARSCALE: It is Cox Cable then, right? Not Cox. It was -- I don't know. I don't remember. Time Warner, I guess.

MR. CASTRO: Who was the landlord over there at the northside building?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't remember his name. He passed away.

MR. CASTRO: You don't recall who you guys were renting space from?

MR. PARSCALE: No.

MR. CASTRO: Did you have any employees who were Russian or Eastern European?

MR. PARSCALE: No. Not that I know of.

MR. CASTRO: Do you know an Alana Nieder (ph)?

MR. PARSCALE: Oh, she is -- I don't know where she is from.

MR. CASTRO: Is she from Moldova?

MR. PARSCALE: Possibly. She was an intern employee.

MR. CASTRO: What role did she perform at the company or on the campaign?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't think she worked on the campaign. I don't believe so. She was an intern from Trinity University who worked there for a while, and then I think she's left the company since.

MR. CASTRO: Have you done any work for a foreign government?

MR. PARSCALE: Have I ever worked for a foreign government? I do not

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

believe so. In 20 years or during the 2 years?

MR. CASTRO: Say the last 5 years.

MR. PARSCALE: I do not believe so.

MR. CASTRO: Why the hesitation?

MR. PARSCALE: Because I am trying to think of 700 clients and everything we have ever worked for. I am just making sure that I recall my memory.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. We would just ask if there is any foreign company that you may have worked for.

MR. PARSCALE: Foreign company or country?

MR. CASTRO: I'm sorry, foreign country.

MR. PARSCALE: Like the actual government? No.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. And if you come across one that you would just forward that to us.

MR. PARSCALE: I thought you said foreign company.

MR. CASTRO: Or foreign company. Have you worked for a foreign company?

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know the ownership of every company. That's why I'd have to -- that's why it was a confusing question to me.

MR. CASTRO: I guess let me narrow the question then. Any Russian company?

MR. PARSCALE: No. Not that I know of.

MR. CASTRO: Any Ukrainian company?

MR. PARSCALE: Company now? You are going back to company?

MR. CASTRO: Company.

MR. PARSCALE: I don't know. I don't believe so.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. Now, we would just ask that you guys follow up if you discover that you did. That's all.

MR. PARSCALE: Yep.

MR. CASTRO: All right. I think that's all I have. They have got some more questions. I am going to go vote.

#### EXAMINATION

BY [REDACTED]

Q Mr. Parscale, my name is [REDACTED] I am a staffer for the majority. And I just wanted to follow up on one thing that was asked earlier. And not sure exactly what the connection is here to Russia, but just since it was brought up one and two, to follow up.

Are you familiar with a, I believe it's a Bloomberg story entitled "Inside the Trump Bunker With Days To Go"?

A Yes, I am familiar with it.

Q And you were interviewed for that story?

A Yes, I was.

Q Now, there is a quote attributed to a senior official saying that we have three major voter suppression operations underway. Were you the senior official quoted there?

A No, I was not.

Q And the three voter suppression operations were, and this is a quote, "aimed at three groups Clinton needs to win overwhelmingly: idealistic White liberals, young women, and African Americans."

Now, previously in response to questions from Ms. Speier, I believe you

said you didn't target on the basis of race or gender, if I recall correctly.

A No, gender, she didn't ask that. She just said on race and/or gay rights and things like that. She didn't say gender.

Q If I recall correctly, initially she asked about race and LGBTQ, but there was a longer list that may have included gender. Did the campaign target on the basis of gender?

A Gender, female versus male?

Q Yes.

A Yeah. I would think there would probably have been some targeting that was based off male and female. I apologize. I did not hear that before.

Q And identification as male or female, that is something that is generally listed in publicly available voter data. Is that correct?

A Yeah. Yeah.

Q Thank you for clearing that up. But with the exception of gender, if in fact she asked about that, the other identity categories, you testified earlier that you did not target on the basis of those. Is that correct? To include race?

A Can you remind me what those were? Like race, no.

Q The ones I specifically recall are race and sexual orientation.

A No.

Q Okay. So with respect to this quote here, did you participate in a voter suppression operation targeted at idealistic White liberals?

A No.

Q Did you participate in a voter suppression operation targeted at young women?

A No.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Did you participate in a voter suppression operation targeting African Americans?

A No.

Q Are you aware of a Trump campaign voter suppression operation targeted at idealistic White liberals?

A I am not aware of any.

Q Are you aware of a Trump campaign voter suppression operation targeted at young women?

A I am not aware.

Q Are you aware of a Trump campaign voter suppression operation targeted at African Americans?

A Not aware.

Q Any idea who might have provided this quote or what they were referring to?

A I don't know exactly who provided that quote. I can only -- I can only make assumptions of what I think they did it for.

██████████ That's all I have.

BY ██████████

Q Hi, Mr. Parscale. My name is ██████████ I work on the minority. I may go through a few questions hopefully fairly quickly. Hopefully, I am going to not go over anything that has already been asked. But we will move fairly quickly through them.

At the beginning of your testimony we talked about how you came to first know Cambridge Analytica. You said they flew, somebody flew to San Antonio and you had dinner with them, and that was how they came to work with the

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

campaign?

A That's how I think it worked. I probably learned about them by email first.

Q Okay. So before they came to San Antonio, who do you recall put the idea in your mind, talking about them?

A I don't remember.

Q And were you ever told at any point who in the campaign wanted you to work with Cambridge Analytica or wanted Cambridge Analytica embedded with your company?

A I don't believe anyone ever told me to do it. I don't think that happened. I mean, I think there were people that suggested them, but I don't remember them telling --

Q Jared Kushner, Steve Bannon, Rebecca Mercer, or you don't know?

A I didn't know them then. They weren't there at the campaign at the time I hired Cambridge.

Q Okay. So who, at the time that you hired Cambridge, who on the campaign were you communicating with?

A About them? That would have been Paul Manafort, Rick Gates, Jared Kushner.

Q Okay. When was Giles-Parscale first compensated for your work on the campaign? So I know you said you began work in February of 2015.

A I don't know when the first check came. It came from the exploratory committee, but the campaign came later. I can't remember which check was -- when the separation between exploratory committee and campaign occurred.

Q Okay. With respect to the funding, was the campaign's digital operation set up so that phase one, two, and three, most of the funding went through Giles-Parscale or were your subcontractors and vendors paid separately from the campaign?

A Can you ask that again?

Q Does that make sense?

A No.

Q So you said there were a number of vendors and subcontractors that you employed to do the many elements of work that it sounds like you took on throughout the three phases. When those vendors and subcontractors were compensated, was that separate from your company or were they -- did the money transfer through Giles-Parscale then to the vendors? So were you sort of an overarching --

A On some of them. Most of them. Not all of them. I mean you would have to go one by one. Some of them were not, some were.

Q Was there any kind of rhyme or reason of how those determinations were made or --

A Most if I was managing them.

Q And what did it mean for you to be managing a vendor?

A I oversaw their staff, their process, why we hired them. Those kind of things.

Q Were most of those folks embedded with you physically?

A In San Antonio, yeah. Not all of them, but possibly some. We had a few that were never on location.

Q And Facebook, Twitter, and Google you said were physically

embedded?

A Yeah.

Q I want to go through, because some of these are checked off and some of these I need to go through.

Switching gears, have you read the declassified Intelligence Community report that came out on January 6th, 2016, called "Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent U.S. Elections"?

A I have not read the whole thing.

Q Okay. You are familiar with the report?

A In basic terms.

Q What did you -- what were your thoughts after learning about it, reading about it, reading --

A I have always said the same thing, you know: I hope that no one meddles in our elections.

Q Do you think Russia did meddle in our elections in 2016?

A I have no idea.

Q Have you ever discussed that report with anybody on the Trump campaign?

A That report came out after the campaign. Do you mean --

Q I'm sorry, in the Trump administration?

A No.

Q Or folks that were connected to the campaign?

A No, I don't believe so.

Q As far as you are aware, were any of the subcontractors or vendors that you worked with or employed on the campaign connected to any foreign



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

entity, either a foreign government, did they have foreign subsidiaries, did they have foreign relationships?

A Do some companies I have have foreign -- as in any country in the world?

Q Well, let's start with Russia.

A Not that I know of.

Q Ukraine.

A Not that I know of.

Q No?

When you were looking at hiring vendors, what kind of due diligence would you do on looking at whether they had connections to foreign governments or foreign entities?

A That never crossed my mind.

Q Okay. So there wasn't like a business due diligence sort of element --

A You asked me something different. You asked me if I cleared if they worked with foreign entities. If I cared about if they were good at their job, yeah, there was due diligence.

Q Sorry. So with respect to whether they were connected to any foreign entity, was that part of your due diligence?

A No.

Q Okay. And then maybe then my quick followup would be, so what kind of were the things on your list that mattered in terms of due diligence?

A How they were good at their job, talking with them, technical skills, references, stuff people do to hire businesses.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q So in your production you provided a number of kind of I guess emails that you received from people via Monster.com and some other work --

A Yeah.

Q -- business like that. Were those provided simply because those individuals seemed to be connected to Russia? I wasn't really sure what to make of how they ended up in the production.

A My company puts up job applications, and people -- I am cc'd on all the job applications that come in.

Q So we received anybody who --

A Anyone that ever applied for my company that had the word in there.

Q Okay. As far as you know, did you ever hire or employ those people?

A Not that I know of. No one I saw in that, I don't believe. I didn't recognize any of their names.

Q At any point have you ever publicly or privately sought to obscure any subcontractors or vendors that worked for you, misrepresent who those individuals might be, or vendors?

A Say that again?

Q Have you ever attempted to misrepresent or obscure the names of vendors that worked for you?

A I don't know what you mean by that. How would I -- you mean like not --

Q Misrepresent, not be kind of open about them, misrepresent their background. Anything like that.

A I apologize. I don't really understand how you are -- I don't know

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

how to answer the question. I don't know what you're asking. Like how would I -- can you give me an example of how I would misrepresent a vendor?

Q So let's take the foreign entity example. Did you ever not report if a company was linked to a foreign entity?

A No, I have never not -- you are asking if I have lied about that?

Q I guess that's one way to look at it.

A No, I have not lied about that.

Q Did you ever post your voter data or your targeting data online publicly --

A No that I'm aware of.

Q -- purposefully leave it available online?

A Never purposely.

Q Were your data files password protected?

A Were our data files password protected?

Q So, like, presumably you had admin authority over RNC data?

A Yeah, everything was secured. Yeah.

Q And then who else on the campaign -- were there several people in your company --

A That had access?

Q -- or on the campaign that would have access?

A No, just a couple.

Q Like within Giles-Parscale?

A Giles-Parscale would just be my -- a couple, literally two.

Q And then folks in New York?

A Then you would have people in New York that are on the campaign.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

That's RNC data, not Cambridge data. None of us had access to Cambridge data. And then RNC data, we would have access to some.

Q Okay. So you said I think earlier that you kind of knew how Cambridge worked, but they would never -- I am not going to quote you exactly correctly, but I think you said something along the lines of they would never even tell you.

A They wouldn't tell you the secret sauce.

Q The secret sauce.

A Yeah. Neither would the RNC. But I understand the basics of what it means to create -- what they're doing. So it's like I understand how the engine is made, but I don't know how Ferrari's engine is made different than General Motors's engine.

Q So when they were embedded with you, you weren't sort of standing over their shoulder understanding how they were collecting their data, but you would get the package?

A That's a different question.

Q Okay.

A Do I understand the basics of what you said? You just asked me the basics. Yes. Do I understand the specifics of the technology in which they write their machine learning code? No.

Q Okay.

A That's two different questions.

Q I am not versed --

A I understand --

Q -- on the finer points of the data analytics.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A I know. But you said basics, so I just want to make sure. Yes, I understood the basics. I wouldn't have hired them if I didn't understand the basics. But that's like --

Q Sure. The secret sauce that you would not --

A That's like saying if you go buy a Ferrari, do you need to understand exactly how the Ferrari engine is built to understand it's fast? Most consumers would say no. But do you understand the Ferrari's better than a General Motors car? But you don't know the technology why.

Q I see. Just again, I am not kind of smart on the tech side.

A I get it.

Q So the source code is this type of thing that is the secret -- would be the secret sauce sort of thing?

A It's not just the source code. It's also -- it's more than that. It's strategy and how they think.

Q Okay. And you said nobody on your team would have had admin access to Cambridge Analytica's kind of internal programs?

A No.

Q So you talked about RNC data that you used, Cambridge data that you used. You did not have your own separate database I think was what you just testified. You said that was misinterpreted?

A Alamo? I did have a database. He said did I have a voter database like a voter file. I did not. Language --

Q Which is different from what you did have. Can you just kind of explain to me what --

A You want me to explain what Alamo is?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Yeah.

MR. TODD: May I ask both of you to pause? The court reporter cannot take both of you simultaneously.

MR. PARSCALE: Understood.

MR. TODD: If you would just wait until the question is finished?

██████████ Forgive me. I am trying to understand data analytics as we speak.

MR. PARSCALE: I understand.

MR. TODD: You are both doing it again. So one of you needs to wait until the other is finished so the court reporter can get a correct record.

██████████ Thank you.

BY ██████████

Q Why don't I read for you my question.

A Okay.

Q And if I am not asking it the correct way, you can help me interpret.

Did you create a database of information, whether it was voter data or other types of data, different from the RNC data and the Cambridge Analytica data?

A Yes.

Q And can you explain to me how that's different and where that --

A That data -- we created a database called Alamo. And Alamo meant the end point. And that was -- meaning if you think about the story of the Alamo, it's where everyone ended. You know, it's like meet you at the Alamo, like everyone goes.

It was the end point of all the APIs of anything that is happening with Trump data, not voter data, not publicly consumed data. So that would be report

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

analysis on ad performance, that would be if you signed up for a Trump email, you signed up for a Trump SMS or whatever data point, it was the end point where all of those things go.

So it was never other people's data coming in. It was our data end point. That's much different than what you look at from RNC and Cambridge, who create and buy databases to do data modeling.

Q So this is, for example, would be people who engaged with your Facebook pages or --

A Possibly, yes. The performance metrics. Basically doesn't give you their details.

Q Or Twitter?

A Think of it like as a CRM for what is happening. You know what CRM is?

Q Yes.

A So like I am sure you guys have one for what you are doing. It's like when you engage with people you keep track of what is happening. It was our CRM, because they don't make a CRM for politics. So we just kind of had to make our own.

Q So this was not something that you could have bought from the social media?

A No. This is all -- if you think about it, it's like a history book of what happened with our stuff. So that I could always go back and say: Hey, are we doing better this week than last week? If something gets deleted somewhere we have -- it's just a master record.

Q So that would include like people engaging with your content online?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A It would be the numbers, not who. So if 10,000 people do it, I would search -- I would have saved 10,000 people this ad. I wouldn't know who the 10,000 people are.

Q But that would help you presumably say: Okay, of these five ads, this one is the best because everybody loves this one. These ones suck because nobody likes these ones. Is that accurate use of --

A That's the official term, yes.

Q So you said you were creating -- I believe either you said it publicly or I read it somewhere, maybe you said it today -- like thousands, tens of thousands of ads?

A Yeah.

Q Like lots and lots of adds?

A Programmatically.

Q So were you personally in charge of reviewing each of those?

A No. Wait. Programmatically ads or what I call the base of that are called root narrative ads?

Q Uh-huh.

A So a root narrative can then have tens of thousands of versions of it, or thousands, or hundreds, or five. I was in charge of kind of the base approval process of root narratives.

Now, based off the root narrative approval process, I would either approve it myself or send it up if I felt like I didn't know the answer to whether this could be approved.

So, like, if it was a message that -- Build the Wall, it's very obvious I could approve Build the Wall. However, if it had some other political message that I



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

didn't know where Trump stood or what our campaign was, that ad would be sent on, other people would approve it, it would come back to me, now I could approve that root narrative moving forward.

Q And then the folks who were working for you would determine if it should be an orange background or a green background?

A Programmatically do that, yes. We would programmatically do that. That's computers doing that.

Q Okay. And that is --

A And then that data would flood back into Alamo.

Q Feed into your --

A There you go.

Q Correct. Okay.

A You are ready for a job in the industry now.

Q Are you familiar with a company called Sprinkler?

A Yep.

Q Given my limited knowledge about social media modeling and things like that, can you kind of give me the 10-second view of what they do?

A What they are? I mean, they are a programmatic ad buyer for social media platforms, mainly Facebook. That's my understanding of them.

Q So what would that -- let me ask you this actually first. Did you ever use, work with Sprinkler during the campaign?

MR. TODD: Could I have just a moment?

██████████ Sure.

MR. TODD: In fact, could we take a brief break?

██████████ Sure. Break from 5:35 to 5:41.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[Recess.]

BY [REDACTED]

Q Okay. I think we have just a couple more quick questions, and then we will get you out of here.

Going back to I think the very beginning of your testimony, I am not sure that it was ever made clear, how did you come to work with the Trump organization in the first place? I know you said you worked with the winery and Eric Trump and Melania. Kind of how did that relationship begin?

A Which part do you want to know about? I'm fine with -- that's 5 or 6 years.

Q Sure. So what was your first work that you ever did with the Trump Organization?

A The very first contract I had was with Trump International Real Estate.

Q And how did that contract come about? You saw it online and you bid for it or you knew somebody?

A No, no, no. This is a random story.

The way I heard it is a guy on an airplane was flying next to a lady named Kathy Kay. Now, I heard that third hand, third-party, so I don't know for sure. And she found out about me because she was asking somebody like: I need a good real estate web developer, do you know anybody good? And he was like: I know this guy in Texas.

She didn't work for Trump yet. This is like a year before that. She I guess ended up -- she called me on the phone and I talked to her for like an hour. And we were friendly.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

And she later ended up -- I didn't know she was the head of Sotheby's International Real Estate. She took the job at Trump International Realty, who was a new company, which is his real estate company. And I guess in a meeting she told everybody: We should get a bid from this guy that I met.

Q That's pretty lucky.

A Yeah, better lucky than good.

Q I mean, did you know the guy who she was talking to?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

A He was a guy out of San Francisco, I can't remember his name now. And I don't really know how the pieces all come together, that part. It's been a long time now. And I remember people talking about it. But it was random luck. I got a chance to bid.

Q So had you done work for that guy previously?

A There was other guys, yeah. Like different people I had done work. I had done other work in the New York real estate market, San Francisco market. I had been in business a long time. And she just heard -- the truth to that answer is, the specifics I know is, second hand information she got to hear about me, which then she goes: We should get a bid out of New York from this guy. And I got an email -- or it was a submission on my web form. And it said: This is Kathy from Trump, please call me.

Q And sorry, just so I am clear, so the guy who first suggested on the airplane to Kathy Kay --

A I don't know that that's -- this is like a story to me, it's almost like a myth within the camp. I am giving you a very vague knowledge of what I think

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

happened.

Q Sure.

A She heard from somebody that had worked for me -- it was a reference, in theory, right? And that reference ended up she ended up calling me.

Q So this person, the guy, had like been employed by you or --

A No, he was --

Q -- you had done work for him.

A Work for him. And she didn't work for Trump then. She later goes to work for Trump, then tells the family about me, and says: Hey, I really met this guy, he was really smart, I like him. We never hired him, but we should get a bid from him. That's the story I heard from the family over time. And then I bid for a project.

Q And you were essentially, like, invited by this woman to bid for the project?

A And Eric Trump and Ivanka Trump.

Q Okay.

Totally separate question. Was most of your communication with the campaign, during the campaign, with respect to your work for the campaign, on your [REDACTED] email address or --

A I would [REDACTED] for like 1.0 and then it's 2.0 and 3.0 it's [REDACTED] -- I don't know when I got my Donald Trump email address. I didn't always have it.

So all of my email that I communicate people with is either [REDACTED] during this period or [REDACTED] you know. I do think I have

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

a mobile media address and like some of that crap Apple makes you sign up for to, like, you know, to do stuff.

But, like, those are the two email addresses I used to communicate with the world.

Q And were you also using things like Slack or sending people messages on --

A Yeah, Slack. Slack, yeah, yeah.

Q Okay.

A Ask the question. Sorry.

Q So were you using Slack to do your work with other folks that you were --

A Slack, yes.

Q Okay. And then separately, were you sending messages on WhatsApp, Signal, Telegram?

A None of those.

Q Okay. So what about standard SMS text messages?

A Which iMessage.

Q iMessage.

A -- all mixed together, yes.

Q As a significant part of your business work? Or just --

A No. I just thought you asked me if I was just generally using it.

Q Well, two questions. One, I guess, were you generally using them? Two, were you using them to do your work?

A I mean, there was probably some communication that went through MMS because it's easy, or through iMessage. I would say the majority of things

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

were either -- were mostly done through email. It depends on what group you're talking about. If you're talking about leadership, email. All email almost. If you're talking about employees of Giles-Parscale, it's a lot on Slack. You have different people doing different duties, and Slack's easier to be, like, visual and, like, look at the ads, and email is easier to communicate with people in New York.

Q But not a lot of, like, iMessages, text messages --

A There were some.

Q -- with people in New York?

A Yeah. There were some. But I would think that the problem with that kind of communication when you are trying to be as organized as I am, it's hard to -- I hate doing that because you can't remember what's unopened, you can't mark things, and things get lost. So email was a much more efficient way to communicate.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] can I just ask one final question?

[REDACTED] Yeah.

BY [REDACTED]

Q If I may, I just wanted to direct your attention back to Bates number CA000077, which we discussed earlier.

A This thing?

Q Yes. Do you recall -- it's an email chain -- do you recall us talking about this earlier?

A Yeah.

Q And just for the record, are you on any of the emails contained in this document?

A No, I'm not.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Had you seen this document or these emails prior to being showed it today?

A No, I was not.

Q And prior to reading it in here, were you aware that Cambridge Analytica had purportedly contacted Julian Assange directly to ask him -- ask for him to share Hillary's hacked emails?

A No, I was not.

Q And do you have any direct knowledge of whether in fact that claim is true?

A No, I do not.

Q And the person who made that claim, Alexander Nix, I know you have previously discussed at length your relationship with Cambridge Analytica, but can you just describe briefly what, if any, relationship or interaction you had with Mr. Nix as part of your --

A We did not have a positive relationship.

Q What do you mean by that?

A We just didn't get along.

Q But you were or were not in contact with him as part of the --

A I talked to him a couple times.

Q Okay. And were those email communications?

A There were some emails. Basic. It's all about the contract negotiation.

Q But he was not among your sort of day-to-day or regular contacts at --

A He was not an active member in any way in our digital operation.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

██████████ Okay. Thank you.

██████████ Mr. Parscale, my name is ██████████ I am the ██████████

██████████ I just want to wrap it up with just a final statement.

First, a thank you. I know it has been a long afternoon.

MR. PARSCALE: Thank you.

██████████ So thank you very much for coming and for answering all our questions.

I also wanted to note that we are going to have an open hearing on November 1st, which you may be aware of, with three of the social media companies, Facebook, Google, Twitter.

MR. PARSCALE: I didn't know it was open. I apologize.

██████████ So it's going to be public. And you had mentioned your interest in seeing the ads that are released so that you have a sense of what they are like.

I think -- I can only speak for the minority on the committee -- but I think there is great public interest and there is also interest on the committee to better understand what Russia did through what they call active measures, so covert activity online, either in generating content, trying to amplify content, with a political or a socially divisive message.

I think, based on what the forensic examinations of these companies has shed light on so far, there is likely to be more that comes out, and we may see an ecosystem that developed across various platforms. And there may be connections made ultimately with -- or at least an alignment in terms of messaging or other content that may have aligned with work that you did on behalf of the campaign, or your company did on behalf of the campaign.



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

I stress this just because I think our interest, and it's the first prong of our investigation, is to understand what Russia's active measures were, setting aside the question of collusion, witting collusion. And in that respect, it may be the case that we may need to come back to you -- I think as -- if the opening statement was read -- we may need to come back to you for questions about documentation that may be relevant, or even to ask you further questions.

But I wanted to thank you again for coming.

MR. PARSCALE: Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 5:52 p.m., the interview was concluded.]

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

