

RELEASE IN FULL

From: Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>
Sent: Saturday, January 22, 2011 6:20 AM
To: H
Subject: Re: CoM Conference/CVE Session

I left it that if phil had not responded by 5pm to invite to facilitate that went to him yesterday, have Danny do.

But they all are losing forest for the trees - it is not about them; its about ambos.

Cdm

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

From: H <HDR22@clintonemail.com>
To: Mills, Cheryl D
Sent: Fri Jan 21 17:40:34 2011
Subject: Re: CoM Conference/CVE Session

He is good--but after reading, I think Dan has a point and maybe should be paired w Farah w Phil being more of a moderator.

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

From: Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>
To: H
Sent: Fri Jan 21 15:26:04 2011
Subject: FW: CoM Conference/CVE Session

FYI on why Steve is so good.

From: Mull, Stephen D
Sent: Friday, January 21, 2011 3:07 PM
To: Benjamin, Daniel S
Cc: Sullivan, Jacob J; Mills, Cheryl D
Subject: RE: CoM Conference/CVE Session

Hi Dan,

Thanks for laying all this out, and of course you're right that there's absolutely no question that S/CT is the Department's lead on CVE issues. Your e-mail beat me to the punch in laying out to you and the other Assistant Secretaries the Secretary's rationale for structuring the breakout sessions at the conference and explaining the role she'd like you to play - apologies for that.

One of the common complaints we've heard from past participants in regional chiefs of mission conferences is that they tend to be a one-way transmission of "the view from Washington" from a series of Department officials, with insufficient

opportunities for Ambassadors to provide input. The Secretary very much wanted to avoid that dynamic at this conference, so asked us to use these breakout sessions to maximize the opportunity for the Ambassadors to provide their insights – i.e. get them to do all the talking. To promote that dynamic, we largely (and purposely) selected facilitators for these sessions who are not the action office or substantive experts on the topic; otherwise there's a risk Ambassadors would tend to defer more to the facilitators instead of the other way around.

That said, the Secretary very much expects the relevant Assistant Secretary/equivalent to be in these sessions to hear the ideas from the field as a resource for their management of the policy question, and also to serve as a resource for any questions that may arise in the course of discussions. To that end, she hopes that you will attend the CVE sessions as the Department's CVE lead to play those roles. To make sure that things stay on track, we'll also strongly encourage the facilitators to be in touch with you and your team ahead of time to make sure that they will ask the right questions and manage the sessions in a way that will be most helpful to you.

I admit this is a break from past tradition on these things, and it may turn out not to work, in which case, I have every confidence we'll ask you to run the session the next time we do one of these (and there's no doubt that this will be an important issue at every such conference for the foreseeable future). I hope that this makes sense and that you can live with this approach.

Many thanks,

Steve

From: Benjamin, Daniel S
Sent: Friday, January 21, 2011 12:29 PM
To: Mull, Stephen D
Cc: Sullivan, Jacob J
Subject: CoM Conference/CVE Session

Steve—

I understand that plans are afoot to have EUR (Gordon) and SRMC (Pandith) lead the session on CVE at the Chiefs of Mission conference. We find this deeply problematic. S/CT has both the Department and interagency acknowledged lead on CVE. We have by far the most CVE activity going on at State, including a wide range of analytic and programmatic work. When it came to briefing the President on the Secretary's plan for Strategic Counterterrorism, a central component of which involves CVE, she asked me to do the presentation. We represent the Department regularly at the Tuesday WHSR meetings with the President, where we update him on, among other things, CVE; I am slated to be the deputy chair of the CSCC, which is perhaps the Department's foremost major CVE initiative this year.

S/CT has also spearheaded the effort to create a Department-wide CVE community of interest and convened the Administration's first interagency summit on the subject. In the context of our RSI meetings with posts in key regions, we have been working to motivate our ambassadors to innovate in this area. We have run three major international conferences in little more than a year on the subject. We are creating the Global Counterterrorism Forum, one of whose key working groups will be on CVE. Moreover, as I've discussed with both Cheryl and Jake, the transformation of S/CT from its current state to a full-fledged bureau, as envisioned in the QDDR, will center on the role we are developing in CVE and capacity building.

In short, I feel it essential that we lead this session. EUR is involved in putting CVE officers in some of its embassies, an initiative we have strongly supported in line with our goal of doing the same in all regional bureaus. Moreover, Farah's CVE role is a subordinate to her outreach activity, and her mandate specifies that she coordinate with us on CVE, on which, again, we have the lead. So the plan, as it exists now, does not make sense and would do real damage to what we are seeking to achieve in this area. I hope you understand and can rearrange accordingly.

Dan

Daniel Benjamin

Ambassador-at-Large

Coordinator for Counterterrorism

U.S Department of State

202-647-9892