

From: Justin G Cooper  
To: Abedin Huma  
Date: Saturday, October 29, 2011 11:52:17 PM

---

**RELEASE IN FULL**

Fyi clintonemail.com is down due to an outage with our ISP.  
Our actual systems are up.  
If it looks to be long term ie past tomorrow I will reroute the mail.  
U or oscar can tell hrc

**REVIEW AUTHORITY: Archie Bolster,  
Senior Reviewer**

From: Justin Cooper  
To: Abedin, Huma  
Cc: Oscar Flores; Jon Davidson  
Subject: Re: S mentioned BB not working  
Date: Thursday, December 29, 2011 11:46:03 AM

RELEASE IN FULL

No issues on our end.  
As u know parts of the house there have bad service.  
Adding jd and oscar who are there to see if they are having trouble

REVIEW AUTHORITY: Archie  
Bolster, Senior Reviewer

---

From: Abedin, Huma [mailto:AbedinH@state.gov]  
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2011 11:42 AM  
To: Justin Cooper  
Subject: Fw: S mentioned BB not working

Are we having problems with clintonemail? Not usually otherwise an issue in punta cana

---

From: Meehan, Bernadette M  
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2011 11:06 AM  
To: Mills, Cheryl D; Sullivan, Jacob J; Abedin, Huma; Hanley, Monica R  
Cc: Wells, Alice G; S\_SpecialAssistants  
Subject: S mentioned BB not working

On the call with Blair, S mentioned her BB is down and she is not getting emails. Not sure if this is a battery issue or something wrong with the BB, but FYI.

From: Justin Cooper  
To: Mills, Cheryl D; jcooper [redacted]; Abedin, Huma  
Subject: Re: Warning: could not send message for past 4 hours  
Date: Saturday, February 27, 2010 5:53:42 PM

D6

Ur funny. We are on the same server.

RELEASE IN PART D7,D6

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

From: Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>  
To: jcooper [redacted] <jcooper [redacted]>; Abedin, Huma <AbedinH@state.gov>  
Sent: Sat Feb 27 08:00:15 2010  
Subject: Fw: Warning: could not send message for past 4 hours

D6

Fyi - hrc email coming back - Is server okay?

REVIEW AUTHORITY: Archie Bolster, Senior Reviewer

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

From: postmaster <postmaster@state.gov>  
To: Mills, Cheryl D  
Sent: Sat Feb 27 03:05:06 2010  
Subject: Warning: could not send message for past 4 hours

This is a MIME-encapsulated message

--o1R856Uc010583.1267257906/e\_server [redacted]  
\${fe\_shelo}state.gov  
\${daemon\_flags}  
\${fe\_client} [redacted]  
\${if\_addr} [redacted]

D7

D7  
D7

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\* THIS IS A WARNING MESSAGE ONLY \*\*  
\*\* YOU DO NOT NEED TO RESEND YOUR MESSAGE \*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

The original message was received at Sat, 27 Feb 2010 03:41:40 GMT  
from:  
<MillsCD@state.gov>

----- Transcript of session follows -----

451 4.4.1 reply: read error from mail.clintonemail.com.  
<hdr22@clintonemail.com>... Deferred: Connection timed out with mail.clintonemail.com.  
Warning: message still undelivered after 4 hours  
Will keep trying until message is 1 day old

--o1R856Uc010583.1267257906/e\_server [redacted]  
\${fe\_shelo}state.gov  
\${daemon\_flags}  
\${fe\_client} [redacted]  
\${if\_addr} [redacted]  
Content-Type: message/delivery-status

D7

D7  
D7

Reporting-MTA: dns; e\_server [redacted]  
\${fe\_shelo}state.gov  
\${daemon\_flags}  
\${fe\_client} [redacted]  
\${if\_addr} [redacted]  
\${fe\_chelo} [redacted]  
\${auth\_authen}

D7

D7  
U/  
D7

\$(fe\_mta)sendmail  
S<MillsCD@state.gov>  
MDeferred: Connection timed out with mail.clintonemail.com.  
rRFC822; hdr22@clintonemail.com  
RPFID: <hdr22@clintonemail.com>  
H??Return-Path: <a>

H??Received: from [redacted]  
by vance2.state.gov with ESMTP id o1R3fe0R011956  
for <hdr22@clintonemail.com>; Fri, 26 Feb 2010 22:41:40 -0500

D7

H??Received: from [redacted]  
with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.3959);  
Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:13:22 -0500

D7

H??Received: from [redacted] by [redacted] with  
Microsoft SMT  
Arrival-Date: Sat, 27 Feb 2010 03:41:40 GMT

D7

Final-Recipient: RFC822; hdr22@clintonemail.com  
Action: delayed  
Status: 4.4.2  
Last-Attempt-Date: Sat, 27 Feb 2010 08:05:06 GMT  
Will-Retry-Until: Sun, 28 Feb 2010 03:41:40 GMT

--o1R856Uc010583.1267257906/e\_server [redacted]  
\$(fe\_shelo)state.gov  
\$(daemon\_flags)  
\$(fe\_client) [redacted]  
\$(if\_addr) [redacted]  
Content-Type: message/rfc822

D7

Return-Path: <MillsCD@state.gov>

Received: from [redacted]  
by vance2.state.gov with ESMTP id o1R3fe0R011956  
for <hdr22@clintonemail.com>; Fri, 26 Feb 2010 22:41:40 -0500

D7

Received: from [redacted]  
with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.3959);  
Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:13:22 -0500

D7

Received: from [redacted] with  
Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.3959);  
Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:13:21 -0500

D7

Received: from [redacted] with Microsoft  
SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.2499);  
Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:13:20 -0500

D7

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.5  
Content-class: urn:content-classes:message  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----\_NextPart\_001\_01CAB763.16C28431"  
Subject: Fw: Warning: could not send message for past 4 hours (RESENT BY CDM)  
Date: Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:12:34 -0500

Message-ID: <24BE1118E6623A44970C232D080C268505D78F58@ [redacted]>

D7

X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
Thread-Topic: Warning: could not send message for past 4 hours  
Thread-Index: Acq3XMAAtBnagXVEISJGgsxcS40ladAABIY17  
From: "Mills, Cheryl D" <MillsCD@state.gov>  
To: <hdr22@clintonemail.com>  
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 27 Feb 2010 04:13:20.0944 (UTC) FILETIME=[32718800:01CAB763]  
X-TM-AS-Product-Ver: SMEX-8.0.0.4125-6.000.1038-17216.006  
X-TM-AS-Result: No--11.737700-0.000000-31  
X-TM-AS-User-Approved-Sender: Yes





From: Justin Cooper  
To: Abedin, Huma  
Subject: Re: Is Clinton email down?  
Date: Wednesday, October 10, 2012 10:55:34 AM

---

RELEASE IN FULL

it was  
back up now

REVIEW AUTHORITY: Archie  
Bolster, Senior Reviewer

On Oct 10, 2012, at 8:38 AM, Abedin, Huma wrote:

>



**From:** Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 22, 2010 2:30 PM  
**To:** Lawrence, Thomas W; Jammes, Trey; Gazlay, Jay E  
**Cc:** Wilson, Nancy L; LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Jacks, Yvette R  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

**RELEASE IN PART  
D6, D7**

Thank you Thomas and we also appreciate all the assistance and team coordination on this matter as well. I will continue to work with your team so long as this and all other ScanMail issues persist. So, please do not hesitate to call or keep me in the loop if there are any issues or concerns relating to ScanMail or have any questions. I have a couple of meetings schedule with both VIRT/Trend Micro support on this matter and will continue to highlight the continuous problem areas as well as user frustrations going forward. Again, thanks for all the local assistance on this matter.

**REVIEW  
AUTHORITY:  
Archie Bolster,  
Senior Reviewer**

Ebenezer Mensah  
Exchange Systems Engineer  
IRM/OPS/MO/EML  
SkyePoint Decisions Support Contractor  
(202) 634-0278  
Mensahet@State.Gov

---

**From:** Lawrence, Thomas W  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 22, 2010 12:22 PM  
**To:** Mensah, Ebenezer T; Jammes, Trey; Gazlay, Jay E  
**Cc:** Wilson, Nancy L; LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Jacks, Yvette R  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

EB,

This was my call. Because I don't have all the facts to what exactly is going on with SMEX, I decided to be methodical. This is due to the fact both content filtering and anti-virus checking on that BH has blocked malicious content in the recent past. If we find the changes made are not affective, our next steps will be:

- A. Disable Content Filtering and restart SMTP services
- B. Verify - if problem continues....
- C. Disable AV Filtering and restart SMTP services
- D. Verify - if problem continues....
- E. Escalate

We will continue to communicate with you over the next couple of days as I have asked of you.

Again, thank you for your assistance. While we are frustrated with the situation, please don't misunderstand that is directed towards you. We are appreciative of all your efforts.

tom

---

**From:** Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 22, 2010 11:12 AM  
**To:** Jammes, Trey; Gazlay, Jay E; Lawrence, Thomas W  
**Cc:** Wilson, Nancy L; LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Jacks, Yvette R  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma



Jay,

It's correct that Anti-spam need to be disabled per our recommendation but that was before we started receiving complaints for these isolated issue with categorizer problems and through workaround, we discover that adding these two filters on our BHs eliminate that problem. And we've already brought it to VIRT and Trend Micro attention. We continue to work with them daily on these issue and believe they're working through those issues in the version 10 (Pilot) which seem to experience similar issue as Trey already elaborated on (also these new settings are not in original documentation).

So, in order to eliminate the categorizer issue which seem to be our primary concern, then you will want to disable the two additional filters as recommended and we will let you know if anything changes in the near future or else you will not get the user/customer satisfactory result on that very issue if those filters are still enabled. Thanks.

Attach is a copy of the installation guide for ScanMail 8.

Ebenezer Mensah  
Exchange Systems Engineer  
IRM/OPS/MO/EML  
SkyePoint Decisions Support Contractor  
(202) 634-0278  
[Mensahet@State.Gov](mailto:Mensahet@State.Gov)

---

From: Jammes, Trey  
Sent: Wednesday, December 22, 2010 9:47 AM  
To: Gazlay, Jay E; Lawrence, Thomas W; Mensah, Ebenezer T  
Cc: Wilson, Nancy L; LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Jacks, Yvette R  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

I am not confident that Trend will provide an update for SMEX 8. That is two revs behind their current offering, SMEX 10, and they are pushing us to go to that (currently in pilot), and they have never not yet been able to deliver a fool-proof solution for an issue that has been around for at least 2 years. Unfortunately, we have seen similar problems with SMEX 10. EB, correct me if I'm wrong though, I don't think that we have seen the problem with SMEX 10 when running without the anti-SPAM piece.

Tom, what type of update are you looking for by 1500? I do think that turning off anti-SPAM is a resolution if that is what was causing the problem. Did the SMTP service ever get restarted? I don't think I got an answer on that.

Trey Jammes

---

From: Gazlay, Jay E  
Sent: Wednesday, December 22, 2010 9:35 AM  
To: Lawrence, Thomas W; Mensah, Ebenezer T; Jammes, Trey  
Cc: Wilson, Nancy L; LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Jacks, Yvette R  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

As per my instructions from Kenny, last night at 7:30 I turned off "Anti-Spam" on our bridgeheads, [redacted] and [redacted]. If it is really necessary to to the other settings, let's setup a conference call later today.

D7

## TREND MICRO™ ScanMail™ for Microsoft™ Exchange

Current server: SE55ML32U
Real-time monitor
Server Management

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summary</li> <li>Virus Scan</li> <li>Attachment Blocking</li> <li>Content Filtering</li> <li>Anti-Spam</li> <li>Manual Scan</li> <li>Scheduled Scan</li> <li>▶ Updates</li> <li>▶ Alerts</li> <li>▶ Reports</li> <li>▶ Logs</li> <li>▶ Quarantine</li> <li>▶ Administration</li> </ul>	<h3>Anti-Spam</h3> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Enable Anti-Spam</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Target</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Action</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b>Spam Catch Rate</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Spam detection level: medium ▼</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detect Phishing ⓘ</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b>Approved Senders</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Email from addresses or domain names in this list will not be treated as Spam: (for example: domain.com, username@domain.com, or @domain.com)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">@state.gov</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 2px;"> <input type="button" value="Add"/> <input type="button" value="Remove"/> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Target	Action	<b>Spam Catch Rate</b>		Spam detection level: medium ▼		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detect Phishing ⓘ		<b>Approved Senders</b>		Email from addresses or domain names in this list will not be treated as Spam: (for example: domain.com, username@domain.com, or @domain.com)		@state.gov	<input type="button" value="Add"/> <input type="button" value="Remove"/>
Target	Action														
<b>Spam Catch Rate</b>															
Spam detection level: medium ▼															
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detect Phishing ⓘ															
<b>Approved Senders</b>															
Email from addresses or domain names in this list will not be treated as Spam: (for example: domain.com, username@domain.com, or @domain.com)															
@state.gov	<input type="button" value="Add"/> <input type="button" value="Remove"/>														

Jay E. Gazlay  
 Worldwide Information Network Systems  
 Office: 202.647.4525 | Mobile:   
 In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not classified.

D6

**From:** Lawrence, Thomas W  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 22, 2010 8:34 AM  
**To:** Mensah, Ebenezer T; Jammes, Trey  
**Cc:** Wilson, Nancy L; LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Gazlay, Jay E  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

Thank you for all your efforts. We are grateful for your persistence on this matter and we are ready to assist in any manner.

To officially indicate the obvious from S/ES-IRM, we view this as a Band-Aid and fear it's not 100% fully effective. We are eager for Trend Micro to fully resolve, quickly. I want an update on the status by 1500 today, even if it's nothing changed.

Trey do you agree with my position? If not, please simply contact me direct. Thanks

tom

**From:** Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 22, 2010 8:10 AM  
**To:** Lawrence, Thomas W; Jammes, Trey; LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Gazlay, Jay E  
**Cc:** Wilson, Nancy L  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

The anti-phishing filters settings should be left as it is now, it should be the 3 filters on the instruction I sent Jay and his team yesterday. Just so you know, we're still working with Trend Micro on some of these filter related issues and will update you if any changes are necessary. Thanks.

Ebenezer Mensah

Exchange Systems Engineer  
IRM/OPS/MO/EML  
SkyePoint Decisions Support Contractor  
(202) 634-0278  
[Mensahel@State.Gov](mailto:Mensahel@State.Gov)

---

**From:** Lawrence, Thomas W  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 21, 2010 4:01 PM  
**To:** Jammes, Trey; LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Gazlay, Jay E; Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Cc:** Wilson, Nancy L  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

Thanks, we are discussing now. What about the anti-phishing filter? Same?

---

**From:** Jammes, Trey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 21, 2010 2:39 PM  
**To:** Lawrence, Thomas W; LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Gazlay, Jay E; Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Cc:** Wilson, Nancy L  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

Turning off the anti-spam filter on the server is recommended at least to verify that it resolves the problem (assuming this is recurring). Instructions were sent to Jay. It is also recommended to restart the SMTP service when the Categorizer is not processing messages properly.

Trey Jammes

---

**From:** Lawrence, Thomas W  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 21, 2010 1:36 PM  
**To:** LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Gazlay, Jay E; Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Cc:** Wilson, Nancy L; Jammes, Trey  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

Huma is asking for an update. Do we have one?

---

**From:** LaVolpe, Kenneth E  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 21, 2010 10:01 AM  
**To:** Gazlay, Jay E; Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Cc:** Wilson, Nancy L; Jammes, Trey; Lawrence, Thomas W  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

Just looping Trey and Tom into this.

---

**From:** Gazlay, Jay E  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 21, 2010 9:56 AM  
**To:** Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Cc:** LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Wilson, Nancy L  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

1. Version of ScanMail?

Component	Current Version
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Virus pattern	7.709.00
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Additional heuristic pattern	11.3.100
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> InhibitTrap pattern	10.147.00
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> InhibitTrap response pattern	11.0.161.100
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scan engine	9.200.1012
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spam team	17.832.003
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spam engine	6.500.1024

2. Screenshot of message delivered to the categorizer on [redacted] as stated below?

D7

Message History

Message ID: 75A1FD8953C795458F180C5BA666D560F538A7DBA9@HRM21.US.House.gov

Event Time	Event
12/17/2010 6:47 AM	SMTP: Message Submitted to Advanced Queue
12/17/2010 6:47 AM	SMTP: Started Message Submission to Advanced Queue
12/17/2010 6:47 AM	SMTP: Message Submitted to Categorizer

D7

Message History

Message ID: 75A1FD8953C795458F180C5BA666D560F538A7DBA9@HRM21.US.House.gov

Event Time	Event
12/17/2010 7:11 AM	SMTP: Message Submitted to Advanced Queue
12/17/2010 7:11 AM	SMTP: Started Message Submission to Advanced Queue
12/17/2010 7:11 AM	SMTP: Message Submitted to Categorizer

D7

3. Search conducted [redacted]
- Which device or application were those failed delivery messages sent from (it doesn't seem to be Outlook sources but I may be wrong). It was sent from a blackberry.
  - Were there any attachments associated with any of these messages that were stripped off? No that we are aware of.
  - Was there any reason I couldn't see the sender's email address in the very message, instead it appears as letter "H". Any reason the address wasn't there? I don't know, the email address was H0R22@clintonemail.com.

Jay E. Gazlay  
Worldwide Information Network Systems  
Office: 202.647.4525 | Mobile: [REDACTED]  
In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not classified.

D6

---

**From:** Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 21, 2010 8:29 AM  
**To:** Gazlay, Jay E  
**Cc:** LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Wilson, Nancy L  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

All I was saying was I didn't find a trace of any of the reported messages but more information may help. So, here are the specific questions that may help as well:

7. Version of ScanMail?
8. Screenshot of message delivered to the categorizer on [REDACTED] as stated below?
9. Which device or application were those failed delivery messages sent from (it doesn't seem to be Outlook sources but I may be wrong).
10. Were there any attachment associated with any of these messages that were stripped off?
11. Was there any reason I couldn't see the senders email address in the very message, instead it appears as letter "H". Any reason the address wasn't there?

D7

Ebenezer Mensah  
Exchange Systems Engineer  
IRM/OPS/MSO/EML  
SkyePoint Decisions Support Contractor  
(202) 634-0278  
[Mensaheti@State.Gov](mailto:Mensaheti@State.Gov)

---

**From:** Gazlay, Jay E  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2010 4:14 PM  
**To:** Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Cc:** LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Wilson, Nancy L  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

EB,

With so many questions in-line, I am worried that I might not properly cover each of them. Can you please provide a bullet-list of what information you need to be successful?

Regards,

Jay E. Gazlay  
Worldwide Information Network Systems  
Office: 202.647.4525 | Mobile: [REDACTED]  
In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not classified.

D6

---

**From:** Mensah, Ebenezer T  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2010 2:52 PM  
**To:** Gazlay, Jay E  
**Cc:** LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Wilson, Nancy L  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting with Huma

Jay,

I did use different scenario to track down some of the specific message in question, as presented routing between the sender and recipient (s), but I did not find or get any specific data to analyze the cause as well as determine if these messages actually came through our system or got stuck somewhere on it's transmission or if it did not hit any of DOS Bridgeheads at all. I did use multiple methods to track down messages through all and selected BHs to try and at least get something that seem to have been deliver into the databases where the recipient mailboxes are homed but none gave me anything concrete on the subject matter. However, I saw other messages that were sent from the same users that came through from same senders without problem.

This bring us to the point where we want to know "the differences" or what types of messages were delivered without problem and those that cannot be traced from the sender point of view and how these two different messages were sent in the first place (either BB, MAPI client, OWA or through other application or device). Also, let' remember certain attachment or message sizes over 30MB will be refuse delivery.

Lastly, I will like to at least get more information or screenshot of the messages that were stuck in the categorizer, I'm not sure why I did not find them or see those as well but if I could get more information on that I think that will help our process as well (it was resent at 7:11 am by sender to huma, received and also "submitted to Categorizer" on sessml32u).

At this point I'm not relating any of these to ScanMail yet until I get answers to some the questions as well as the version of ScanMail version running on your [redacted] and other SES Exchange BH servers. Thanks.

D7

Ebenezer Mensah  
Exchange Systems Engineer  
IRM/OPS/MO/EML  
SkyePoint Decisions Support Contractor  
(202) 634-0278  
[Mensahet@State.Gov](mailto:Mensahet@State.Gov)

---

From: Gazlay, Jay E  
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2010 9:05 AM  
To: Mensah, Ebenezer T  
Cc: LaVolpe, Kenneth E; Wilson, Nancy L  
Subject: FW: Meeting with Huma

Eb,

Can you please check on your side for any information regarding this message. Please do not forward the attachment to other IRM staff without checking with our Gov't first.

Thank you,

Jay E. Gazlay  
Worldwide Information Network Systems  
Office: 202.647.4525 | Mobile: [redacted]  
In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not classified.

D6

---

From: Padillan, Bryan M  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 4:56 PM  
To: Gazlay, Jay E  
Cc: Lawrence, Thomas W  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

Here is the one from the 13<sup>th</sup>. I looked for the one on the 14<sup>th</sup> and could not find one with a blank subject. I did find one sent at that time to Iona and Huma with subject Friday which I can grab for you.

-Bryan

From: Gazlay, Jay E  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 4:26 PM  
To: ~~Pagliano, Bryan M~~  
Cc: Lawrence, Thomas W  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

~~I was actually looking for a full copy of the message including the header information that way I can provide it to our AW people for analysis.~~

Regards,

Jay E. Gazlay  
Worldwide Information Network Systems  
Office: 202.647.4525 | Mobile [redacted]  
In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not classified.

D6

From: ~~Pagliano, Bryan M~~  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 4:25 PM  
To: Gazlay, Jay E  
Cc: Lawrence, Thomas W  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

~~So when you say "full header" you mean the SMTP transaction right? Only the recipient receives the header info after it's written from being passed from server to server to get to the recipient, believe?~~

~~Bryan~~

From: Gazlay, Jay E  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 4:20 PM  
To: ~~Pagliano, Bryan M~~  
Cc: Lawrence, Thomas W  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

~~Can you please check and provide full header information on the message from the 14th?~~

~~On 12/17/10 2:22 @clintonemail.com sent a message to huma@clintonemail.com and Valmorali@state.gov at 10:03 pm. The subject line was blank. Huma received at Clinton address but could not receive on her state.gov account.~~

Jay E. Gazlay  
Worldwide Information Network Systems  
Office: 202.647.4525 | Mobile [redacted]  
In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not classified.

D6

From: Pagliano, Bryan M  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 4:19 PM  
To: Gazlay, Jay E

Cc: Lawrence, Thomas W  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

So, I am on the system now and looking at the logs.

I can send you the text of the log if you want, but that message was sent through vance.state.gov which replied that the recipients were okay [redacted] for both recipients [redacted] at 12/13/2010 07:10:02

D7

While I am on, I can look up others messages

---

From: Gazlay, Jay E  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 1:36 PM  
To: Pagliano, Bryan M  
Subject: FW: Meeting with Huma

Jay E. Gazlay  
Worldwide Information Network Systems  
Office: 202.647.4525 | Mobile: [redacted]  
In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not classified.

D6

---

From: LaVolpe, Kenneth E  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 12:04 PM  
To: SES-IRM\_Tech  
Subject: Re: Meeting with Huma

Jay and Nancy could you look into this immediately. This should trump all other activities. You can also have a 1 day extension on heat tickets.

---

From: Almodovar, Cindy T  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 11:17 AM  
To: SES-IRM\_Tech  
Cc: SES-IRM\_FO-Mgt  
Subject: Meeting with Huma

I met with Huma for about 30 minutes to go over mail issues. She gave me some examples listed below, but also, things are inconsistent. But issue #1 is of an e-mail which was sent to her twice this morning, did get received on [redacted] but was not delivered. See details below.

D7

~~(I have a contact for the @Clintonemail site - his name is Bryan Pagliano and he actually now works for State) but he apparently set all of this up.~~



General	Organization	Phone Numbers	Number Of	Email Addresses	
State:	Virginia	Initials:	M	Last:	Reglano
First:	Reglano, Bryan M	Last:	Reglano		
Address:	American Red Cross Building	Office:	Special Ad-Inv		
City:	Washington	Company:	US Department of State		
State:	DC	Department:	Information Resource Manag		
Zip code:	20005	Office:	SA-9 Room (HSS007)		
Country/Region:	United States	Assistant:			
		Phone:	202-634-3481		

Huma sent several tests from her clintonemail account to Lona and myself – they were received. But there are many messages and responses not received.

2. She sent a message this morning from her state.gov account to [cheftwan@mail.house.gov](mailto:cheftwan@mail.house.gov).
  - Recipient responded, but she didn't get the response. I found that the response arrived and is on [redacted] as "submitted to Categorizer" at 6:47 this morning.
  - It was resent at 7:11 am by sender to huma, received and also "submitted to Categorizer" on [redacted]

D7  
D7

3. On 12/13, [hdr22@clintonemail.com](mailto:hdr22@clintonemail.com) sent a message to [huma@clintonemail.com](mailto:huma@clintonemail.com), [sullivanj@state.gov](mailto:sullivanj@state.gov) and [sterntd@state.gov](mailto:sterntd@state.gov) at 7:09 am. The subject line was Kudos and Espinosa. Huma received the message at the Clinton address, but the State recipients did not receive.

4. On 12/14, [hdr22@clintonemail.com](mailto:hdr22@clintonemail.com) sent a message to [huma@clintonemail.com](mailto:huma@clintonemail.com) and [Valmoroli@state.gov](mailto:Valmoroli@state.gov) at 10:03 pm. The subject line was blank. Huma received at Clinton address, but Lona did not receive on her state.gov account.



**Cindy Trodden Almodovar**

S/ES Supervisory Systems Administrator  
 S/ES-IRM POEMS Help Desk  
 U.S. Department of State  
 Phone: 202-647-8328 | Fax: 202-647-8191