Attached is the agenda/talking points for the hot wash.
1. **Equipment location:**
   a. Unclassified Partner System:
      i. Server: Basement Telephone Closet
      ii. Telephone Set: Various rooms
   b. Classified Fax:
      i. STE/Secure Fax: Third Floor
   c. Classified Red Switch: Third Floor

2. **Status of Installation:**
   a. Unclassified Partner Telephone System: Completed.
   b. Classified STE/Fax: Completed
   c. Classified Red Switch: Completed
   d. Unclassified Ops Drop: Verizon is still working to finalize path.
   e. CMS Classified Video: Declined
   f. CMS Classified Voice: Declined

3. **Issues:**
   a. T1 Telephone Services were not available upon arrival
   b. Analog lines (2) for the Partner system was not ordered.
   c. Red Switch Technicians arrived 2 days later than scheduled.
   d. SDS Data Cable was left in Washington
   e. Former President’s wireless headset was disconnected
   f. Secretary Clinton’s headset noise cancelling was not selected
   g. Speed Dial for Secretary Clinton Unclassified telephone was not working properly.
   h. Secretary’s Clinton’s business lines were not set up in a “Hunt Group”
Let's get separate address or device but I don't want any risk of the personal being accessible.

Also, I didn't get an ops email, only the Jake one. I'm forwarding my response to Dan on Kyi.

----- Original Message -----
From: Huma Abedin
To: H
Sent: Sat Nov 13 13:31:53 2010
Subject: Re:

We should talk about putting you on state email or releasing your email address to the department so you are not going to spam. It's not the phone message system, it is the device delay.

----- Original Message -----
From: H
To: Huma Abedin
Sent: Sat Nov 13 13:04:47 2010
Subject: Re:

I emailed back yes but ops told me they didn’t hear from you so didn’t make call which I just ordered them to do. Also Jake said had been trying to reach me and ops said they had called you about that too. This is not a good system.

----- Original Message -----
From: Huma Abedin
To: H
Sent: Sat Nov 13 12:28:17 2010
Subject: RE:

Kouchner can do 12:45
ok?
C
SSHRQ@state.gov

---------- Original Message ----------
From: Bentel, John A
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 04:15 PM
To: Hanley, Monica R
Subject: RE: S berry

Monica: We actually have an account previously set up: SSHRQ@state.gov. There are some old emails but none since Jun ’11 – we could get rid of them. You should be aware that any email would go through the Department’s infrastructure and subject to FOIA searches.

Let me know if any questions and what you would like us to do.

Thank you,
John

SSU
This email is UNCLASSIFIED

---------- Original Message ----------
From: Hanley, Monica R
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:59 PM
To: Bentel, John A
Subject: S berry

Do you know what her email address would be on a state dept berry?
D
Fyi clintonemail.com is down due to an outage with our ISP. Our actual systems are up. If it looks to be long term I'll past tomorrow I will reroute the mail. U or oscar can tell hrc
No issues on our end.
As you know parts of the house there have bad service.
Adding jd and oscar who are there to see if they are having trouble

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

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.
Ur funny. We are on the same server.

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

Fyi - hrc email coming back - is server okay?

----- 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

--01R856Jc010583.1267257906/e_server
$(fe_shelo)state.gov
$(daemon_flags)
$(fe_client)
$(if_addr)

******************************************************************************
** 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. <hd@22@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

--01R856Jc010583.1267257906/e_server
$(fe_shelo)state.gov
$(daemon_flags)
$(fe_client)
$(if_addr)

Content-Type: message/delivery-status

Reporting-MTA: dns; e_server
$(fe_shelo)state.gov
$(daemon_flags)
$(fe_client)
$(if_addr)
$(fe_chelo)
$(auth_authen)
it was back up now

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

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.

Ebenezer Mensah  
Exchange Systems Engineer  
IR(MOPS/MSQ/EML)  
SkyePoint Decisions Support Contractor  
(202) 634-0278  
Mensahel@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-span 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/MSO/EML
SkyPoint Decisions Support Contractor
(202) 634-0278
Mensahan@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 and If it is really necessary to to the other settings, let's setup a conference call later today.
TREND MICRO® ScanMail for Microsoft Exchange

Current server: SESM132U

Real-time monitor

Server Management

Summary
Virus Scan
Attachment Blocking
Content Filtering
Anti-Spam
Manual Scan
Scheduled Scan
> Updates
> Alerts
> Reports
> Logs
> Quarantine
> Administration

Anti-Spam

☐ Enable Anti-Spam

Target

Action

Spam Catch Rate

Spam detection level: medium

☑ Detect Phishing

Approved Senders

Email from addresses or domain names in this list will not be treated as spam:
(for example: idomain.com, username@domain.com, or @domain.com)

@state.gov

Add

Remove

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

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 ant-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/MSO/EML
SkypePoint Decisions Support Contractor
(202) 634-0278
Mensah@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 Humà

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 Humà

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 Humà

Humà 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 Humà

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 Humà

1. Version of ScanMail?
4. Which device or application were those failed delivery messages sent from (it doesn’t seem to be Outlook sources but i may be wrong). I.E. sent from a BlackBerry.

5. Were there any attachments associated with any of these messages that were stripped off? Not that we are aware of.

6. 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? I don’t know, the email address was H822@clintonemail.com.
Jay E. Gazlay  
Worldwide Information Network Systems  
Office: 202.647.4525 | Mobile:           
In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not classified.

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 [date] 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 sender’s email address in the very message, instead it appears as letter “H”. Any reason the address wasn’t there?

Ebenezer Mensah  
Exchange Systems Engineer  
IRM/OPS/MSO/EML  
SkypePoint Decisions Support Contractor  
(202) 634-0278  
Mensaheli@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:           
In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not classified.

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 its 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 [BLANK] and other SES Exchange BH servers. Thanks.

Ebenezer Mensah
Exchange Systems Engineer
IRM/OPS/MSO/EML
SkypePoint Decisions Support Contractor
(202) 634-0278
Mensaehi@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: [BLANK]
In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not classified.

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

[There is the one from the 13th. I looked for the one on the 14th and could not find one with a blank subject. I did find one sent at that time to long 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: [email protected]  
Cc: Lawrence, Thomas W  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

I was able to forward the entirety of the message including the header information. It is available for review here.

Regards,

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

---

From: [email protected]  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 4:25 PM  
To: Gazlay, Jay E; Lawrence, Thomas W  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

Jay, I've been able to forward the entirety of the message including the header information. It is available for review.

Bryan

---

From: Gazlay, Jay E  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 4:20 PM  
To: [email protected]  
Cc: Lawrence, Thomas W  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

I have been able to forward the entirety of the message. It is available for review.

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

---

From: Pagliaro, Bryan M  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 4:19 PM  
To: Gazlay, Jay E
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 for both recipients at 12/13/2010 07:10:02

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: 202.647.4625 | Mobile:  
In accordance with E.O. 13526 this message is not-classified.

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 but was not delivered. See details below.

 Have contact with hot line on mail server. His name is Bryan Pagliano and he actually now works for State.
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 chetwan@mail.house.gov.
   - Recipient responded, but she didn’t get the response. I found that the response arrived and is on __________ 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 ________________.

3. On 12/13, Hdr22@clintonemail.com sent a message to huma@clintonemail.com; elli@anjil@state.gov and stern@state.gov at 7:09 pm. 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 sent a message to huma@clintonemail.com and 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 Ålimovar
S/ES Supervisory Systems Administrator
S/ES-IRM POEMS Help Desk
U.S. Department of State
Phone: 202-647-8328 | Fax: 202-647-8191
I had to shut down the server
Someone was trying to hack us and while they did not get in I didnt want to let them have the chance
to.
I will restart it in the morning.
From: Justin Cooper <Justin@presidentclinton.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 09, 2011 2:59 PM
To: Abedin, Huma; Doug Band
Subject: Re:

Thanks. We were attacked again so I shut it down for a few min. It shld be working now

--- Original Message ---
From: Abedin, Huma <AbedinH@state.gov>
To: Justin Cooper; Doug Band
Sent: Sun Jan 09 14:33:52 2011
Subject:

My clintron bqry not working.
I got your email about varkey
I emailed him earlier about plans.
He only responded a few minutes ago saying they could come. Will close the loop.
From: Abedin, Huma
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2011 1:31 AM
To: Sullivan, Jacob J; Mills, Cheryl D
Subject: Don't email hrc anything sensitive. I can explain more in person.