

RELEASE IN PART B5,B6

From: Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 10:52 PM
To: H
Subject: Re: For meetings with Amb. Rehman..

It's Tom D who put the kibosh on it. I will explore with Denis but am not optimistic.

From: H [mailto:HDR22@clintonemail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 10:27 PM
To: Sullivan, Jacob J
Subject: Re: For meetings with Amb. Rehman..

From: Sullivan, Jacob J [mailto:SullivanJJ@state.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 12:13 PM
To: H
Subject: FW: For meetings with Amb. Rehman..

FYI for your meeting with Rehman this week.

From: Feldman, Daniel F
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 9:35 AM
To: Sullivan, Jacob J; Fuchs, Michael H
Subject: FW: For meetings with Amb. Rehman..

Robin Raphel's intel for Sherry's first week in DC...

From: Robin L Raphel [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2012 11:29 PM
To: Feldman, Daniel F; Lenderking, Timothy A; Grossman, Marc I
Subject: For meetings with Amb.Rehman..

What I am hearing:

--The S call to AZ went down quite well on their side, better than any of the others. It made them think there is "something to work with".

--Civ -mil relations remain very sensitive. Her bosses do not want US civilians meeting with senior military officials unless the MFA (Salman) is present. (This should be okay with us as we are the ones who are trying to keep all elements of gov't together on both sides...)

--the Pak-Mil report on 26 November is due to come out on Friday. It will be "different" from ours. The lack of a US apology for the 24 dead still rankles very deeply. An apology could help soften the tendencies of the Parliament to be strident in the recommendations to the government on bilateral relations.

--CT cooperation "redlines" are in danger of colliding. It is worth trying to find operational fixes, but the whole "redlines" narrative is not helpful.

--the Pakistan side is looking for progress/gestures in other areas to help deflect hardline positions on the sensitive areas like CT cooperation. Something positive on the Enterprise Fund (like moving forward with a model that does not require legislation), or energy projects, would be useful. But it is important to avoid more empty promises like ROZs.

It occurs to me that we could be in danger of talking past each other, us demanding satisfaction on our CT redlines and them wanting an apology, enterprise fund, energy projects, etc. Best to be aware.

Thanks.