

A

[REDACTED]

From: Lee, Purcell N
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 1:35 PM
To: Waggoner, Kevin L; Bentel, John A; Scott, Andrew C
Cc: Duncan, Bruce E
Subject: Secretary Residential Installation Hotwash
Attachments: Secretary Residential Installation Hotwash.docx

RELEASE IN PART
D6

REVIEW AUTHORITY: Archie
Bolster, Senior Reviewer

Attached is the agenda/talking points for the hot wash.

Secretary Residential Installation Hotwash

RELEASE IN FULL

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**

REVIEW AUTHORITY: Archie
Bolster, Senior Reviewer

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"**

B

From: H <HDR22@clintonemail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 13, 2010 1:40 PM
To: Huma Abedin <Huma@clintonemail.com>
Subject: Re:

RELEASE IN FULL

Let's get separate address or device but I don't want any risk of the personal being accessible.

REVIEW AUTHORITY: Archie Bolster, Senior Reviewer

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 13:21:53 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. Its not the phone message system, its 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 hed 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?

HA 09/01/2015

C

RELEASE IN FULL

From: Hanley, Monica R
To: Abedin, Hama
Subject: Fw: S berry
Date: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 4:19:15 PM

SSHRC@state.gov

REVIEW AUTHORITY: Archie Bolster,
Senior Reviewer

----- 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: SSHRC@state.gov. There are some old emails but none since Jan '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.

Thanks!
John

SBU
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

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; [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]>
X-MS-Has-Attach:
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

D7

Thread-Topic: Warning: could not send message for past 4 hours
Thread-Index: Acq3XMAtBnagXVEISJGgsxcS40ladAABIY7
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

X-TM-AS-User-Blocked-Sender: No

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_001_01CAB763.16C28431

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8" Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Tm90IHN1cmUgd2h5IHRoZXRNIiGNhbWUgYmFjayAtIHNjcm9sbCBkb3duIGZvdBtZXNzYWdlcw0K DQoL... [Base64 encoded content]

-----=_NextPart_001_01CAB763.16C28431

Content-Type: application/octet-stream; name="ATT1011450.txt" Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64 Content-Description: ATT1011450.txt Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="ATT1011450.txt"

UmVwb3J0aW5nLU1UQTogZG5zOyANCkFycml2YWwtRGF0ZTogRnJpLCAyNIBGZWIGMjA0MCAyMjA0 MjoxNiBHTVQNCg0KRmluYWwtUmVjaXBpZW50OibSRkM4MjI7IGhkcjIyQGNsaW50b25lbWVpbC5j b20NCkFjdGlvbjogZGVsYXIIZA0KU3RhdHVzOIA0LjQuMg0KTGFzdC1BdHRibXB0LURhdGU6IFNhdCwG MjcgRmVlIDwMTAgMDI6NTM6MjYgR01UDQpXaWxsLjVJldHU5LVVudGlsOibTYXQsIDI3IEZl YIAyMDEwIDYyOjQyOjE2IEEdNVAOK

-----=_NextPart_001_01CAB763.16C28431

Content-Type: message/rfc822 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-class: urn:content-classes:message MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8" Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64 Return-Path: <MillsCD@state.gov> X-OriginalArrivalTime: 26 Feb 2010 23:15:47.0045 (UTC) FILETIME=[A0B0F150:01CAB739] X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.5 X-TM-AS-Product-Ver: SMEX-8.0.0.4125-6.000.1038-17216.006 X-TM-AS-Result: No--14.798600-0.000000-31 X-TM-AS-User-Approved-Sender: Yes X-TM-AS-User-Blocked-Sender: No Subject: Fw: Thank you. Date: Fri, 26 Feb 2010 18:15:36 -0500 Message-ID: <24BE1118E6623A44970C232D0B0C26B505D78F49@sessml35u.ses.state.sbu>

X-MS-Has-Attach:
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:
Thread-Topic: Thank you.
Thread-Index: Acq30FWxlaMz+kTNQw66t8pMw0zzawAAURs
From: "Mills, Cheryl D" <MillsCD@state.gov>
To: <hdr22@dintonemail.com>

RnlpDQoNCI9fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fX19fDQoNCkZyb206IEld2lzlCBS
ZXRhIEpvaIA0KVG86IE1pbGxzLlRlbnVudogVGHbmsgeW91LIANCg0KDQoNCkNoZXJ5bDoNCg0KIA0KDQpJlHJY2Vp
MjAxMA0KUA3ViamVjdDogVGHbmsgeW91LIANCg0KDQoNCkNoZXJ5bDoNCg0KIA0KDQpJlHJY2Vp
dmVklGEgY2FsbCBmcm9tIFBhdCB0aGF0IHNaWQgYWxsIHdvdWxklGJlHRha2VuIGNhcmUgb2Yg
dG9kYXkuICBUaGFua3Mgc28gbXVjaC4gIEldOKAmXMgdGFsayBuZxh0IHdlZWsuDQoNCIANCg0K
UmVOYSANCg0K

-----=_NextPart_001_01CAB763.16C28431--

--o1R856Uc010583.1267257906/e_server} [redacted]

\$(fe_shelo)state.gov

\$(daemon_flags)

\$(fe_client) [redacted]

\$(if_addr) [redacted]

D7

--o1R856Uc010583.1267257906/e_server} [redacted]

\$(fe_shelo)state.gov

\$(daemon_flags)

\$(fe_client) [redacted]

\$(if_addr) [redacted]

D7

D7

D7

D7

D7

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

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																
Summary	Anti-Spam																		
Virus Scan	<input type="checkbox"/> Enable Anti-Spam																		
Attachment Blocking	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Target</th> <th>Action</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">Spam Catch Rate</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">Approved Senders</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></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><input type="button" value="Add"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>@state.gov</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><input type="button" value="Remove"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Target	Action	Spam Catch Rate		Spam detection level: medium ▼		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detect Phishing ⓘ		Approved Senders		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)			<input type="button" value="Add"/>	@state.gov	<input type="button" value="Remove"/>
Target	Action																		
Spam Catch Rate																			
Spam detection level: medium ▼																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detect Phishing ⓘ																			
Approved Senders																			
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)																			
	<input type="button" value="Add"/>																		
@state.gov	<input type="button" value="Remove"/>																		
Content Filtering																			
Anti-Spam																			
Manual Scan																			
Scheduled Scan																			
▶ Updates																			
▶ Alerts																			
▶ Reports																			
▶ Logs																			
▶ Quarantine																			
▶ Administration																			

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: 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

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	1.3.100
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> InhibitTrap pattern	0.147.00
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> InhibitTrap response pattern	0.161.100
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scan engine	9.200.1012
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spam team	17.832.009
<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

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

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 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 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
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
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:	First: <input type="text" value="Bryan"/> Initials: <input type="text" value="M"/> Last: <input type="text" value="Reglano"/>	Factor: <input type="text" value="Reglano, Bryan M"/>	Miss: <input type="text" value="ReglanoB"/>	
Address:	<input type="text" value="American Red Cross Building"/>	City: <input type="text" value="Washington"/>	State: <input type="text" value="DC"/>	Zip code: <input type="text" value="20005"/>
Country/Region:	<input type="text" value="United States"/>	Office: <input type="text" value="SA-9 Room (HSS007)"/>	Phone: <input type="text" value="202-634-3481"/>	
		Company: <input type="text" value="US Department of State"/>	Department: <input type="text" value="Information Resource Management"/>	Special Ad-In: <input type="text" value="Special Ad-In"/>

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.
 - 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

D7
D7

3. On 12/13, hdr22@clintonemail.com sent a message to huma@clintonemail.com, sullivanj@state.gov and 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 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 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

E

From: Justin Cooper
To: Abedin Huma
Date: Sunday, January 09, 2011 2:57:19 AM

RELEASE IN FULL

REVIEW
AUTHORITY:
Archie Bolster,
Senior Reviewer

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:

RELEASE IN
PART D6

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

REVIEW AUTHORITY: Archie
Bolster, Senior Reviewer

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

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

My clinton berry 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.

RELEASE IN FULL

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