

**Minutes from Bilateral and Trilateral US-PAL-ISR Sessions
Post Annapolis**

*Monday, 25th August 2008
West Jerusalem*

5h30PM – INBAL HOTEL

Attendees:

Palestinian

- Ahmed Querei (AA)
- Dr. Saeb Erekat (SE)
- Salah el-Alayan (SA)
- Zeinah Salahi (ZS)

United States

- Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice (CR)
- David Welch (DW)
- Elliott Abrams (EA)
- Jonathan Shwartz (JS)
- Jamal Hilal (JH)

Meeting Summary (*not verbatim*):

CR:

- I wanted to get a chance to hear from you to prepare for tomorrow's trilateral.

AA:

- Thank you for coming when there is so much going on.
- After Washington, we came to discuss the issues to see where we arrived. We met with TL one time – I understand [the difficulties she is having]. It was a good meeting. We talked about security.
- I don't know if it's an Israeli policy, or a political decision because of politics. There is still no talk about Jerusalem. If we don't start soon it will be a problem. Especially with the leaks that say that it will be postponed. It doesn't help us. We repeat our position on Jerusalem many times.
- That nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.
- No partial agreements.
- Also they leaked about territory. That came from Olmert – it doesn't help in that regard.
- Today they leaked [about a field visit in Ariel – she apologized but I said it's not against me, it's against you].
- Saeb met and the other committees met in regular meetings to see where we are, but we don't see progress.

- We talked about security – a lot. Hazem, Amos... we asked them to try to write but they didn't make progress.
- We need an independent state, with limited arms, a state that will take care of security, fight terror, with no Israeli military presence in the state. But we are ready for any kind of cooperation, bilateral and regional. For Israel, we are ready to accept a third party.
- [TL's position hasn't changed. She is also against a third party army. But a third party is not an army.] There is no good change to facts on the ground.

CR:

- I have my own sources. There are two checkpoints that were removed. My sources say that the impact is 20,000 people.

[Discussion of the checkpoints removed and if they have a significant impact. American team notes that one near Sheve Shimron, one near Hebron (Hal Hou) and one near Bir Nabala have been removed. AA responds that it is checkpoints like Howara that need to be removed. The checkpoint being referred to near Qalandia had only two soldiers. He also notes that the housing demolitions continue.]

AA:

- We will continue [negotiating] until the last moment.

SE:

- I think pursuant to what we agreed in your office to start drafting [CR: Security...] Territory, including settlements and Jerusalem, and we submitted on water.
- We are not going to play some silly blame game. Because our complexities are not less than theirs. The only thing that they were willing to talk about –

CR:

- Let's go issue by issue. All we have on territory is the denominator – the only thing that is disputed is the NML, without prejudice to the location of the borders the land is the land occupied in 1967.
- The practical work is to be about key settlement areas – Maale Adumim or Ariel. Whether it can be accommodated or not.
- On refugees – Jonathan is to stay behind and work on the mechanism.
- Jerusalem...

AA:

- We can't talk about the borders without Jerusalem.

[Discussion about whether or not Jerusalem is protected by the language on the "denominator" suggested by the Secretary.]

CR:

- They say that they never tried to discuss the Jordan Valley [re: sovereignty], just arrangements.
- There is an agreement that there will be swaps [but we don't know how much] and there will be a West Bank Gaza corridor.
- [A hard issue is looking at] how and if Maale Adumim and Ariel can be accommodated in a Palestinian state.
- On responsibility, I know that you are working on it but can't say...

[SE points out that UD noted in the last meeting that he has no authority to discuss the location of the border at this point.]

CR:

- On Jerusalem, we have the practical issues about life in an undivided city. We have the political issue about how it can be a capital for both. Something for the holy sites. On territory we have [the formula for the neighborhoods].

AA:

- [Let's put it this way – on Jerusalem there is two sides –] the territory, and the modalities of cooperation. On cooperation, there is 1. municipal cooperation, 2. holy places, 3. free movement of people, 4. security cooperation, 5. economic cooperation, 6. tourism cooperation...
- First, we need in a very clear way to know that East Jerusalem is Palestinian.

CR:

- You'll get there but you're not going to get there in the next three weeks. While one side is running for elections.
- [Repeats the issues related to modalities.]
- Holy sites will have to be resolved sensitively or not resolved sensitively.
- The way forward is to refine what needs to be decided.
- On security, I'd like to spend the most time on this tomorrow. Refine the principles –
 - Appropriate roles and missions of the Palestinian security forces.
 - Security equipment and forces maintained must be appropriate for missions.
 - Bilaterally, the US is giving assistance to you with relation to the equipment, to Israel on how their security will be enhanced by a Palestinian state.
- [CR notes that the positive list versus negative list distinction is still open, and that a key is in creating a mechanism that will allow whichever list to be evaluated going forward with third party assistance. Also discussion on the idea of a full Israeli withdrawal.]
- I want to establish two other principles. I will introduce tomorrow the idea – the intention of Israel to withdraw, conditions permitting...

SE:

- [Notes that this is an Israeli argument.] I can hear this from TL!

CR:

- I want them to say it, because I don't think that you've heard it.
- [Notes third party issue.]
- We are trying to set it up without prejudging, so that when the [bilateral] work is completed, it [i.e. the way to bridge the gaps between the two sides] will be obvious.

SE:

- This is a dangerous approach. If Palestinians in Jordan are the threat...

CR:

- General Jones working towards a point where there is no Israeli military presence.
- We are doing it this way so that if you strip away the issues that would need them to be there, then [they have no reason left to stay unless] they just want to be there! But [I don't think that they want to be].
- I don't want to do this until the Jones mission is done.

SE:

- Fair enough.

CR:

- The third party –

AA:

- How do you see it?

CR:

- On the borders, like the 2005 agreement. Training and equipping. Some early warning functions for both sides.

AA:

- The Palestinian security forces inside and the third party to defend the border...

SE:

- Against the Islamists...

CR:

- The police do that with Canada.

AA:

- [GOI says everything is security. They don't want to give them an agreement.]

CR:

- [Refers to the AMA as a model, where the EU are monitors, but Palestinians perform the security functions, etc.]

AA:

- [Notes the threats coming from the East, including Iran.]

CR:

- Iran is missile or air, not land. I'm pretty confident that there is a good security chapter – it will just take a little more time to unfold.
- The work is not wasted, to keep narrowing differences.

AA:

- On security, we may do it with your help but we want something to be very clear to the Israelis...

CR:

- Do you allow for a transition period?

AA:

- We are not there yet. A withdrawal period, one year, but not [based on] testing the Palestinians... not as part of the agreement. [???

[Discussion on when the State of Palestine comes into existence, and the link of that to withdrawal of forces. CR notes that the Palestinian side will probably have to be more flexible on this point.]

CR:

- [Do you intend to cooperate with respect to threats? Share intelligence?]

AA:

- Of course.

SE:

- There will be a 24 hour operation center for all regional aspects of fighting terror.

CR:

- We like the concept – a good concept.

AA:

- They need to change their mindset from that of control to that of partnership.

CR:

- We need to get a little more work on the Jones front.

[Notes Jones coming on the 8th of September.]

CR:

- Ready on your side – the roles and missions and arms – to have that piece together ASAP.
- I'm sure that by Jones working on the Israeli side, with Israel to protect the "security equities"...

DW:

- [And this will help to] avoid the theological discussion of demilitarization, etc.

AA:

- [Notes the issue of the negative list versus the positive list.]

CR:

- I understand. We take a neutral position on it. [Notes that in the end, they are probably the same list.]
- The functions, the arms, the training...
- Over time, as threats change, you will have to change and review the list – [for example] every three years that will have to change. It must be a living document.
- [Continues along same lines.]
- AA threatens to have F-16's with no pilots!
- Tell Hazem that I need him to really sit with JR to flesh it out.

SE:

- AA is trying to avoid toothpaste [being prohibited] because it has something in it that is on the list, etc.

CR:

- It should take a week or ten days to figure it out.
- By the 8th, an intensive effort. By the 18th we expect with the Israelis to work on the security equities on withdrawal [notes Barak's team due to come to US].
- You [have to] make the change in mindset.

[AA raises the issue of water. AA and ZS explain in detail the problem of approach (creating new water first, versus deciding equitable allocation first) and the Jordan River Basin. CR notes that she knows nothing about water and doesn't anticipate getting involved on the issue.]

AA:

- Let's work on refugees together on responsibility and the right of return. You keep working on the mechanism.

CR:

- On refugees, the question is who is going to make the first move!?

AA:

- They are going to recognize responsibility.

CR:

- We need to think of the UNGA.

SE:

- What are the dates?

DW:

- The 21st is the UNGA.

CR:

- The 26th is the Quartet meeting.
- If you are there, what would you say?

AA:

- Whatever you want us to.

DW:

- The professor has some ideas...

CR:

- If you attend the Quartet meeting? What will you say? I think it will reassure the international community. I get reassured [when I see you together].
- I need to know what you think. I think we can do this by the end of the year.

AA:

- We are working hard. We need our partner to be convinced.

CR:

- I agree that issues can't be left aside.

AA:

- I want the agreement to work – something implementable.

CR:

- Once you figure out the [core issues]...

AA:

- Once you have, the writing is not hard.

CR:

- Writing the agreement is not hard. Writing the implementation agreement will be hard.

- What is your view of the NML?

AA:

- The NML is really Palestinian. Israel annexed it after 1967.

[Discussion on NML and how Palestinian proposal to include it in the swaps was meant to preserve the interests of both sides.]

Tuesday, 26th August 2008
West Jerusalem

10H35AM – INBAL HOTEL

Attendees:

Palestinian

- Ahmed Querei (AA)
- Dr. Saeb Erekat (SE)
- Salah el-Alayan (SA)
- Zeinah Salahi (ZS)

United States

- Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice (CR)
- David Welch (DW)
- Elliott Abrams (EA)
- Jonathan Shwartz (JS)

Israeli

- FM Tzipi Livni (TL)
- Tal Becker (TB)
- Udi Dekel (UD)

Meeting Summary (*not verbatim*):

[TL notes that in the press conference with CR she noted that settlements were not helpful and that the GoI will continue to work according to Annapolis. Israeli government policy is not to increase settlements.]

CR:

- What I'd like to do is hear from you what has happened since July 30th. I know it's complicated. [In the time left, I would like to see where we can reach with TL and AA before September.] I'd like to reiterate [some of the statements I made last time]. Then security.
- Opening comments?

AA:

- In general, after our last meeting in Washington, we left with much hope that we will accelerate our work, but I understand.
- In our last meeting, we focused on security. I don't want to say that there are differences, because we still don't have an agreement.
- Our assumptions are independent state, sovereignty, law and order, and a security force that will enforce the rule of law. When we are talking about a permanent

agreement, that there will be no occupation, cooperation will be better, so the Palestinian security forces will be more effective.

- Today I'm not convinced that it's 100% because of incursions, killings, etc. But the situation today is not the same as in the day after.
- I don't want to see an Israeli army in a Palestinian state. If Israel is not convinced, we can accept a third party in a period and mandate to be agreed upon.
- We are ready for a very wide cooperation on a bilateral basis, and even wider on a regional basis.
- General Jones' work is a good basis in this regard.
- On territory – 1967 basis, the West Bank including Jerusalem, NML, the Dead Sea, Gaza Strip, the WBGS passage... [Swaps] equal in quality and quantity. No modifications that affect natural resources, real territorial contiguity – not roads or tunnels or bridges – and will not divide territory – north, middle, south – real viable Palestinian state – not as a word but on the ground.
- On territory, no new progress.
- Olmert offered 7.3%, with compensation of 5%. Of course, it is not a matter of how much, it is a matter of where it is. Annexation that would isolate Jerusalem, or affect water sources, we cannot accept.
- It doesn't need negotiation – it needs a real decision.
- All the committees and experts talked about the water. In water I see a problem – we have a real problem.

TL:

- This year will be a difficult year in water.

AA:

- How to enhance water needs real cooperation between us. There is 650mcm in the WBGS. We are allowed to use now 100mcm. Settlements use most of the water.
- There are two sources – 1) the aquifers and 2) the surface waters.
- The water, up to now we are unable to use it.
- If we have extra we can sell it.
- The other problem is the Jordan River. All others take their share. We are the only side that doesn't take any shares.
- It is against international law and the interim agreements – where Israel recognized Palestinian water rights.
- We are ready to cooperate without limits to increase water sources.
- Refugees – the international mechanism. The US will work on it. And the other main issues – the responsibility and the right of return – are important for Israelis and Palestinians. Now is the time to talk very seriously about these issues.
- I don't want to complain but we are suffering with the issue of settlement expansion.
- I don't see why Israel can't take real steps to stop settlement expansion.
- The other thing I want to say is about the leak of information in a way that hurts the Palestinians.

CR:

- I don't think that the leaks helped anyone.

TL:

- The last leak didn't come from these negotiations. It was not about our negotiations.
- At the end of the day it led me to a better understanding that leaks work against both sides. [Notes the cycle of leak, counter-leak, and the resulting caution in the negotiations themselves. Clear that information can't be leaked prematurely without hurting the process. Otherwise it empowers spoilers.] It is better to get everything on the table, then people can say yes or no, because otherwise people can torpedo the agreement itself. It also led to something – I don't know if this is what led to a situation – [notes MS leak in Le Monde] where both of us are more worried about putting something on the table that will be leaked afterwards. Like the last security meeting, where it was a step backwards.
- Since our meeting in Washington, there were meetings on security – we will discuss later.
- On borders, I want to say something. I was glad to hear your positions on what is important for us – protect contiguity and natural resources – for us it is to take more Israelis, no Palestinians, part of the blocs – the Palestinians hate this word – AA refers to adjustments – small. But this doesn't give an answer to most of the settlements.
- On the Palestinian side I also didn't see a change in what was presented.
- We understand the need that the borders not affect the continuity [stresses this contiguity] of the West Bank. Complicated borders. But we are not going to cut the West Bank, and only connect with roads. The other is natural resources.

AA:

- And Jerusalem.

TL:

- I will refer to that.
- On natural resources, according to the law, there is a connection between what is upstairs and what is under the surface. We need to disconnect. [i.e. Ariel is not going to impact automatically the water aquifers – let's assume that if you agree that Ariel is part of the border – you won't but if we do you can be assured that we will agree something on the aquifer.] We have no idea of cutting Jerusalem from Palestine. We need Maale Adumim as part of Israel. There is going to be a connection. Maale Adumim is just one part of the [perimeter] of Jerusalem, and it doesn't take all of it.
- Another thing we agreed to address three things together – borders, security, and refugees. The US is working on the international mechanism and on other issues Tal and Saeb are trying to reach something but...

- On water I don't want to refer to the numbers because our experts' numbers are different. We need to address it because I understand that the status quo is not good for you.

[AA notes that he was involved in the multilateral tracks on water in the past.]

[TL notes also the issue of the water expert committee.]

TL:

- All sources will be addressed. If other people involved we need to figure out how to deal with it. [Reference to World Water Week in Sweden and the discussion on the multilateral talks that was raised there.]

SE:

- Day to day issues are handled by Shaddad. The long term issues are in our negotiations.

TL:

- On security, we decided to have a list of arms of what was needed to protect, etc.
- In the last meeting it was raised that Palestinians need an army.

AA:

- What? Is that shameful?

SE:

- That's not fair – this morning he said a strong police force [with a third party whose mandate is to be agreed with you. How can that be an army?]

TL:

- [Missing]

AA:

- Water – is it possible to discuss a serious discussion on what is there, what is needed, how to go forward?
- Regarding security – I don't want to go into details but I hope that Hazem and Amos will continue discussing.
- [Palestine will] not be a basis for terror against Israel. [We will not discuss the] arms needed, but what arms we cannot have.
- On territory, we can accept modifications on the borders, but not inside the territory. Ariel, whether we like it or not, it will divide the West Bank. What will we need around Maale Adumim to protect it? There will be friction. The same with Har Homa. Let's start in a rational way and go forward. [In the last days, let's be realistic. Palestinians need a real agreement. We will cooperate with Israel more than with the neighbors!]

CR:

- Let's go back over the issues, then security.
- I do think you've been working seriously, but in a month or so you need to start closing issues. See where we are ready, and where we can make ourselves ready.
- I think you are closer than you've ever been. I've read the materials from Camp David, etc.
- You are not going to have a framework agreement with all the I's dotted and the T's crossed.
- Don't be daunted that not every issue will be resolved by the end of the year.
- Without prejudice to the location of the borders, the land being discussed is the land occupied in 1967. There is disagreement over the NML 52km² – the denominator is the same territory. The only piece that is disputed is the NML. [The denominator includes the] Jordan Valley, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, Jerusalem, the Dead Sea.

TL:

- This is being discussed. We need to discuss what parts will be part of Israel.

CR:

- But you are talking about the same thing. The only thing that you don't agree is up for discussion is the NML. You'll find a way to discuss it.
- Swaps, there is no agreement on value, but an understanding that there will be a WBSG corridor.
- There are some key population centers. The US view is that population centers need to be taken into consideration. Some hurt contiguity and resources. We heard from TL that she is willing to look at that.
- Think soon about developing a map that starts from 1.9% and 7.3%, understanding that the difference is between 1.9% and 2.3% because Israel included 5% [swap].
- US point of view is that population centers will need to be accommodated somehow.
- I don't think that there is even a process [to resolve the issues relating to territory]!

TL:

- AA says 1967 line – not even 1.9%.

CR:

- But we all know what the denominator is. I could have gone to the Olympics...

TL:

- This time I think that you missing the Beijing Olympics is not from us!

CR:

- But I can blame you.

- Saeb, Tal and Jonathan – you work together to figure out how to do a joint map. So I can see it next time.
- On refugees, Saeb and Tal are closing the gaps, [to isolate what will need] a political decision.
- I will restate what I think. Resolving the status of Jerusalem is integral to a final agreement. For now, [we need to refine the list of positions to be negotiated on how Jerusalem will be administered]. The life of the city’s population and administration. If it will be “undivided”.

AA:

- My position is that it is an open city.

CR:

- Let me leave it without prejudice – it is undivided or open. But nonetheless, it will have to have an administration that allows it to be the capital or two states, [deal with] sewage, garbage. [TL mumbles something about it being the capital of two states.] The political issue as a capital of one or both states.

TL:

- We don’t need the last line.

CR:

- I’m just trying to catalogue the issues to be resolved.

AA:

- “Undivided” is an Israeli position that they use to say to annex the city. One city – east and west – to be an open city. Capital of both sides.

TL:

- It’s too early to say if it’s open or not.

TB:

- There are political, functional and religious aspects of the issue.

CR:

- Practical, political – one of these is the resolution of the capitol issue, and the holy sites.

SE:

- [How can you discuss territory without Jerusalem?]

CR:

- The denominator includes Jerusalem. So when you work off a map, it will have Jerusalem in it.

- On other aspects – it's not that you will postpone indefinitely, it's just moving at a slower pace. Not territory, but the others. TL agreed that Jerusalem must be part of a comprehensive agreement.

TL:

- I agreed at Annapolis.

SE:

- [I am just saying that you can't have an agreement without Jerusalem. When it comes to maps, this is the issue!]

CR:

- First of all, I hope that you don't mean the holy sites.

SE:

- Yes! They are part of Jerusalem!

CR:

- If you do it now, I might as well try to go see the rest of the Beijing Olympics.
- It's not timely.

SE:

- Why not?

CR:

- It's not timely for you or them. The Temple Mount and the Haram are on the same place, so that if you have to decide sovereignty...

TL:

- The problem of the Temple Mount and the Haram will not go away.

CR:

- We had an understanding about this! It's what we agreed!

[Argument ensues. CR notes that we all agreed that she would repeat what we agreed to happen in the last trilateral. The problem is that you are all trying to change that now. CR then tries to calm the situation and notes that she cannot help on Jerusalem *today*.]

SE:

- We agreed that all is agreed, or nothing is agreed. We can't keep something out.

TL:

- Agreement is the consent of both sides.
- We agreed in Annapolis that all is on the table. Everything is agenda, nothing agreed until everything agreed, nothing in the discussions is revealed.

- CR's position is what the US thinks needs to be discussed, but I cannot agree to anything. I can't say yes. The US can say what they want.
- We held negotiations on territory, so we could move on security first.

CR:

- [Anyway, Jerusalem is on the map.]

AA:

- 2% or 5%, Jerusalem is there?

CR:

- [Returns to the map issue – is it helpful? SE and TB to discuss if it is helpful or not.]

AA:

- In principle, there is no problem but as SE said – nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. On the framework – it must be everything.

CR:

- I didn't mean that it would be incomplete...
- On security – there are two principles. Two important values that could be in conflict, if they are not dealt with. 1) A Palestinian state must not diminish Israel's security. And 2) a Palestinian state must be sovereign.
- Through General Jones' mechanism, in parallel with the work on the Palestinian side with Hazem. Roles and missions and the arms needed, enforcing the rule of law, counter terrorism, protecting the Palestinian state from infiltration and smuggling...
- Israel's view is a prescribed list. Palestinians a proscribed list. The US is neutral now. We will ask Col. JR Wraight when he comes out on the 8th of September to sit –

SE:

- [Clarifies what the Jones' paper is on – the roles and responsibilities of the Palestinian security forces -- and not something else.]

CR:

- On the other side, certain requirements that would need to be fulfilled in a Palestinian state without hurting sovereignty.
- Barak said that their conversations are going well. On the 18th of September the Israeli team will go to the US to discuss those questions.
- Those together will make the security chapter.
- [The only gap is the role of the third party to make sure security package as a whole would work. Not an interpositional force. On passages and borders, regional, counterterrorism (the center – US has one in South-East Asia).]

SE:

- No limits on cooperating on fighting terror.

TL:

- These are words, but according to our experience when it comes to choosing between intelligence and something perceived as collaborating with the enemy, Palestinians, the moderates, our friends, made the choice of not cooperating. [Notes also the Siniora in 1701 example.] The words are good, I know you mean them, but at the end of the day don't say something that you can't guarantee.

AA:

- First, I hope that Israel will distinguish between today and the situation after a peace agreement.
- Lebanon -

TL:

- It's just an example. [Noting the problem of a difference of will and the ability to implement.]

AA:

- [Notes that this is the difference between occupation and peace. Palestine is the core of the conflict. Peace here will change the entire regional dynamic.]

CR:

- AA and SE make an important point. The situation of occupation is different, and there will be gaps in capabilities and political holdouts so you both have a point. Jones is trying to bridge some. The phase 1 of the Roadmap is a bridge. Transitional periods and phasing is a bridge. It is harder to bridge in the abstract, but I accept your idea AA [about the change post-occupation].

SE:

- [Refers to Gaza point.]

CR:

- We have to recognize that 20 years post state has less problems for this than 20 months post agreement.
- I'm not making a comment on your will, but there may be a gap in capabilities.
- Israel [needs to feel] more secure post-statehood. Palestine [needs to be] sovereign.

TL:

- If we take our forces out. I don't want to be in a situation where I am forced or tempted to go back in. It is crucial for both of us. [The first few months will be the most difficult.]

SE:

- Gradual withdrawal, and joint arrangements for the withdrawal.

CR:

- [Like you did on refugees] which is why agreeing some of the principles is important – to work backwards.

UD:

- You want us to have indirect discussions with your people?

CR:

- No! Palestinians can't make proposals on their own. They need technical help.

UD:

- In the last meeting, we went backwards. [Discussing the] roles and missions.

AA:

- We are not going to take lessons from you!

CR:

- They want to know you are not going to be a Palestinian state. You want to know that they have the capabilities.

TL:

- Sovereignty, independence, etc. Palestinian state will be demilitarized, they said limited arms, list of arms, law and order, counter terrorism. In the Jordan Valley – what will be between Palestine and Jordan. EWS.

UD:

- Airspace, EMS.

TL:

- In terms of Israeli soldiers. When we say demilitarized it means basically that there will be no arms there. [Notes sequencing of the issues.] We can start with a big “P” and a big “I”. The P is that there will be no Israeli soldiers, etc. the I is that we will have something on the crossings, borders, etc.

AA:

- CR made it very clear – sovereignty for Palestinians, security for Israel, a third party to help [TL: I don't know. CR: it could be] but why did I say to UD – our friends in the security think they will have involvement for the next 50 years. But I don't want you to define the missions. We have many bilateral agreements that discuss security cooperation. But not part of the permanent treaty.

CR:

- This may have gone backwards because we didn't follow the script!
- [Palestinians to define roles and responsibilities, the rest to be discussed together.]

[Israeli side notes that this is not their position. A discussion ensues on which tracks are bilateral Pal-Isr, and which are bilateral with the US, etc., and whether or not the Jones track forms a basis for anything. SE notes that Israel is trying to prove that the only answer is an Israeli presence, and that that is not going to fly. CR expresses frustration over having to repeat herself so many times.]

TL:

- Equipment that they need will be part of the bilateral treaty. It needs the consent of Israel.

CR:

- Of course it needs consent. [You need to hear each other say the “magic words”.]

TL:

- The idea is to withdraw, but to keep a presence, not close to the situation today, on the EWS, on passages...

[CR notes that these are not exactly the magic words. CR tries to get AA to note no army of any kind.]

CR:

- I don't even understand. You are so tangled up in bizarre rhetoric that you sound like martians. The Palestinians [need to define the roles and responsibilities, how to enforce the rule of law, counter-terrorism, protect the state and neighbors against smuggling and infiltration... limitations will be agreed with Israel.]

TL:

- And these are the only responsibilities – [i.e. no other security forces with different responsibilities, no additional roles, etc.]

[Discussion continues in heated terms.]

CR:

- We've agreed, sovereignty/security. The two values. Palestinian security –

SE:

- [Starts to read from the list of suggested functions proposed by Palestinians for the security forces.]

TB:

- [Notes that sometimes the language includes borders and aggression and sometimes it doesn't. He also notes that they get the sense that the Palestinian side is deliberately not willing to make progress.]

TL:

- I've heard that they want this plus a Palestinian or third party army.

CR:

- What I've heard – we need to decide what a third party would do. No one wants Israel to come in. When you talk about the third party – you are talking about different roles for the third parties. Israeli needs on monitoring, etc.

SE:

- Threats from Palestinians?

CR:

- Also from outside threats...

SE:

- It's ironic that third parties are already here, but in permanent status we need them to consent.

CR:

- Without prejudice, the US will look at what a third party would look at. Do you all remember that?

TB:

- I remember the “without prejudice” bit the best.
- AA has refused to discuss until we know that there is a full Israeli withdrawal and a third party.

AA:

- [We need to understand what you want from a Palestinian state.]

CR:

- The gorilla in the room are what rights is Israel claiming in the state?
- You have a lot of tools... Roadmap implementation, transitional period.
- You need to have a practical discussion about infiltration and smuggling and what that means. The problems that Palestinians are having with internal security.

TL:

- It is not our intention to do that the day after [i.e. continuation of incursions].

[Agreement to discuss the practical impact of a Palestinian state.]

AA:

- Discuss everything.