

Agenda

- Introduction, focus and desired outcomes JF
- Summary KA
- Comments EH
- Q&A All
- . Summary and next steps JF

Kristian Anderson

Bob Garry - I have not been able to contact Bob. Please forward if you can.

Christian Drosten

Tony Fauci

Mike Ferguson

Ron Fouchier

Eddie Holmes

Marion Koopmans

Stefan Pohlmann

Andrew Rambaut

Paul Schreier

Patrick Vallance

Attachment 4 – Steven Quay Declaration

	Forwarded	maccaga	
_	rorwarded	message	

From: Jon Cohen < jcohen@ sass. org>

Date: Mon, Jul 27, 2020 at 3:02 PM

Subject: Re: The authors who wrote the paper saying that SARS-CoV-2 is not human engineered

first tried convincing Anthony Fauci of the opposite.

To: Kristian G. Andersen, Edward Holmes <edward holmes@sydney.edu.au>

From: Edward Holmes	(b) (6)		
Date: Saturday, 8 Februa	ary 2020 at 20:11		
To: Christian Drosten	(b) (6)		
Cc: Jeremy Farrar	(b) (6)		(b) (6)
			(b) (6)
	(b) (6), Francis Collins	(b) (6)	
	, Josie Gold	ing	(b) (6) ₁
Marion Koopmans	(b) (6) Mike F	erguson	
	(b) (6)		
Subject: Re: [ext] 2019 N	V-CoV		
Hi Christian,			
ni Christian,			
I don't know where this sto	ory came from, but it has nothing wha	atsoever to do the HIV	nonsense. Please
	nat. This is a broader story.		
	arted there have suggestions that the		
	dence of where the outbreak occurred		
	u that a lot of people there believe th		
	vhen Wuhan lab published the bat vir	And the second s	mpled in a
different province for which			

I believe the aim/question here is whether we, as scientists, should try to write something balanced on the science behind this? There are arguments for and against doing this.

Personally, with the pangolin virus possessing 6/6 key sites in the receptor binding domain, I am in favour of the natural evolution theory.

Best wishes,

Eddie

PROFESSOR EDWARD C. HOLMES FAA FRS

ARC Australian Laureate Fellow

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

Marie Bashir Institute for Infectious Diseases & Biosecurity,
School of Life & Environmental Sciences and School of Medical Sciences,
The University of Sydney | Sydney | NSW | 2006 | Australia

T

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

On Sat, Feb 8, 2020 at 12:38 PM Drosten, Christian (b) (6) wrote:
OK, I see. We should then introduce references to these informal sources in the beginning of the text.
Else it reads a bit funny.

Attachment 4 – Steven Quay Declaration

On 8 Feb 2020, at 22:15, Kristian G. Andersen (b) (6) > wrote:

A lot of good discussion here, so I just wanted to add a couple of things for context that I think are important - and why what we're considering is far from "another conspiracy theory", but rather is taking a valid scientific approach to a question that is increasingly being asked by the public, media, scientists, and politicians (e.g., I have been contacted by Science, NYT, and many other news outlets over the last couple of days about this exact question).

To Ron's question, passage of SARS-like CoVs have been ongoing for several years, and more specifically in Wuhan under BSL-2 conditions - see references 12-15 in the document for a few examples. The fact that Wuhan became the epicenter of the ongoing epidemic caused by nCoV is likely an unfortunate coincidence, but it raises questions that would be wrong to dismiss out of hand. Our main work over the last couple of weeks has been focused on trying to *disprove* any type of lab theory, but we are at a crossroad where the scientific evidence isn't conclusive enough to say that we have high confidence in any of the three main theories considered. Like Eddie - and I believe Bob, Andrew, and everybody on this email as well - I am very hopeful that the viruses from pangolins will help provide the missing pieces. For now, giving the lab theory serious consideration has been highly effective at countering many of the circulating conspiracy theories, including HIV recombinants, bioengineering, etc. - here's just one example: https://www.factcheck.org/2020/02/baseless-conspiracy-theories-claim-new-coronavirus-was-bioengineered/.

As to publishing this document in a journal, I am currently not in favor of doing so. I believe that publishing something that is open-ended could backfire at this stage. I think it's important that we try to gather additional evidence - including waiting on the pangolin virus sequences and further scrutinize the furin cleavage site and O-linked glycans - before publishing. That way we can (hopefully) come out with some strong conclusive statements that are based on the best data we have access to. I don't think we are there yet.

Best, Kristian

Attachment 4 – Steven Quay Declaration

On 9 Feb 2020, at 6:52 am, Drosten, Christian

(b) (6) wrote:

Dear All,

I am overloaded with nCoV patient-related work and will need a few days before I can work on this text.

Can someone help me with one question: didn't we congregate to challenge a certain theory, and if we could, drop it? This whole text reads as if the hypothesis was obvious, or was brought up by some external source, forcing us to respond. Is this the case? It does not seem as if this was linked to the HIV nonsense.

Who came up with this story in the beginning? Are we working on debunking our own conspiracy theory?

Christian

--

Professor Christian Drosten

Director, Institute of Virology Scientific Director, Charité Global Health

Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin

Campus Charité Mitte

Chariteplatz 1 D-10117 Berlin

Germany