

RELEASE IN PART B6

Re: update re personnel

From: Nancy Bekavac [redacted]

B6

To: hdr22@clintonemail.com; cmills [redacted]

B6

Subject: Re: update re personnel

Dear Madame Secretary and Cheryl -

We repeat our urging you to hire [redacted] or someone else senior for the personnel function, lodging it in White House Liaison for now. We believe that doing personnel correctly from the outset was important enough to have someone senior doing it. That's why we're doing it.

B6

On the intake, it helps: senior people (Lee Hamilton, Strobe Talbot) whom we know meet with us at a moment's notice and give us their personal reactions openly; younger folks will meet with us because they think we are credible; we know things about who knows who/dislikes, was divorced from whom. We know who is related.

On the evaluation side, a senior person like [redacted] can make decent judgments and save you and HRC lots of time by eliminating people you will not want to deal with. A person like [redacted] can deliver bad news to important people who are not selected in a way a junior person cannot -- and you should never be giving the bad news.

B6

B6

On the process side, an experienced person like [redacted] can make the [redacted] function for you by making things easy for [redacted], being knowledgeable and charming and generally getting you better treatment than those "represented" to the office by junior grade nice folks who are clueless. [redacted] will be able to write the forwarding letter in a way designed to please and encourage the [redacted] to expedite folks. [redacted] can set up a process in the office that will work into the future.

B6

B6

B6

B6j

The whole personnel process, particularly at State where it is complicated by FSO considerations, is complex, time-consuming and filled with possible derailments and detours -- you need someone senior to ramrod it, certainly in the first six months.

If you don't get the people right in the Department -- and right away -- you are going to lose precious time and political capital you can't get back. We STRONGLY urge a senior person to get this started the right way right away.

[redacted] shouldn't do it forever -- [redacted] should do it for six months or so and then move on to one of the positions held by a career person or something else that suits [redacted]. But if you go with a junior person now, you will be paying for it for at least a year or more, and probably for all four years. The comparative advantage of someone knowledgeable for State versus what appears to be a [redacted] is huge -- you should not give that away!

B6
B6
B6

Yours,

Nancy

>>> "Cheryl Mills" 02/10/09 5:15 AM >>>

I will ask her re your rec of pairing.

As of yesterday - she was also considering [redacted]

B6

I will not meet with her on personnel again until wed so pls do whatever diligence is nec to decide if this pairing is something you rec so we can discuss it and the best fit for [redacted]

B6

Hrc has resv about [redacted]
[redacted]

B6
B6

I can meet on weds or fri - I will send tomes when I am in the office.

Cdm

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

From: Jan Piercy

To: Cheryl Mills

CC: Nancy Bekavac

Sent: Mon Feb 09 22:24:32 2009

Subject: update

Glad you and [] are talking tomorrow.

B6

When could we have our weekly with you?

[] A combination of [] comes up as an intriguing [] (they know each other well and there's much mutual respect). Unsolicited, [] keeps being recommended from a surprising array of sources as a choice for [] that could hit lots of bases; could work well Congressionally, internationally, inside the Agency and across USG. []? who did [] transition with [] as you know? likewise is often mentioned as a strong #2, or #1. []

B6

B6

B6

B6

I know you earlier decided against [] it would be helpful if you could give us some indication of whether HRC could be receptive to this [] pairing. We're doing more due diligence but we don't want to float anything she has already ruled out.

B6

B6

Thanks,

Jan