

RELEASE IN PART
B5, B6

From: H <hrod17@clintonemail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2010 7:31 AM
To: 'JilotyLC@state.gov'
Subject: Fw: A few items

Pls print.

----- Original Message -----

From: Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>
To: H
Sent: Thu Jun 17 19:37:04 2010
Subject: A few items

1. Indonesia

Are you notionally comfortable with hosting the first round of the binational commission with Indonesia in the fall, in advance of the POTUS trip? If so, I'll work with Huma and Lona on scheduling.

2. Voluntary Principles,

B6

Here is Mike's argument – what are your thoughts?:

I have asked my friend who is also close to the Secretary, if he would be willing to help us in our efforts to upgrade the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (VPs). This is a 10-year-old initiative to establish principles for companies in the extractive industries who are operating in areas where armed conflicts are taking place. We are chairing the VPs this year and trying to build a stronger governance structure and accountability mechanisms. It is a heavy lift and one that will require expert negotiating skills to find agreement with the 17 major oil and mining companies, 7 governments and 9 human rights and other NGOs that are part of the VPs process.

I suggested to that it would be especially helpful if he could serve as representative/designate of the Secretary to the VPs. If we could announce that the Secretary has asked him to serve as her person working on this process, it would give us great momentum.

To spur our reform agenda, we are having a VPs meeting in Washington on June 30-July 1 and ideally would like to announce his participation at that time. Can you help us get an invite to to be a representative of S to the VPs? This doesn't have to be long—there's some draft language below to give you an idea.

3.

B5

As you know, the Cubans are in town for the migration talks.

4.

B6

5. Korea Expo

Would like to discuss with you at some point.

6. July 2011

B5

Below are the formulations from around the President's speech – we're looking for more recent White House statements:

POTUS West Point speech 12/1/09:

"But taken together, these additional American and international troops will allow us to accelerate handing over responsibility to Afghan forces, and allow us to begin the transfer of our forces out of Afghanistan in July of 2011. Just as we have done in Iraq, we will execute this transition responsibly, taking into account conditions on the ground."

12/1/09 – briefing by senior administration officials on West Point Speech:

“Well, remember what July 2011 represents. It represents the beginning of a process which will be conditions-based.”

12/2/09 – Gibbs press briefing: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/briefing-white-house-press-secretary-robert-gibbs-12209>

“The policy is -- let me be clear, let me be clear, because the President was clear -- our forces, in July of 2011, will transition out of Afghanistan. Again, understand what he said: This is a conditions-based drawdown, decisions made by the Commander-in-Chief, but that's -- understand where we're talking about. ... A conditions-based drawdown will begin in July 2011.”

12/3/09 – Here is what the White House put out after all of the confusion:

July 2011 is fixed: That is going to be the inflection point. That is going to be the date on which we begin to transfer authority and responsibility to Afghan security forces. But the pace, size of the drawdown, and areas to be handed over will be predicated on the situation on the ground. If things are going very well, a larger number of forces could come out of more areas. If not, the size and speed of the drawdown will be adjusted accordingly. This could be a long, gradual drawdown. So it's not contradictory to set a date-certain, yet be conditions-based. We have a high degree of confidence that the addition of 30,000 troops will change the dynamics in some parts of the country by mid-2011. And roughly 60 percent of the country is uncontested now. This policy is about balancing competing interests: On the one hand, we need to signal resolve, and tell the Afghan people and government we'll be their partner and friend -- and let our enemies now we are going to stand with Afghanistan for the long term. At the time, we want to send a signal that the heavy military presence is not permanent, and light a fire under the Afghans to do for themselves what we know they're capable of doing.