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 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

---

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.
Ur funny. We are on the same server.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Mills, Cheryl D. <MillsCD@state.gov>
To: jcooper[ ], <jcooper[ ]> ; 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

--01R856Uc010583.1267257906/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

--01R856Uc010583.1267257906/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}
$@fe_mila$sendmail
S<MillsCD@state.gov>
MD:Error: Connection timed out with mail.clintonemail.com.
rFC822; hdr22@clintonemail.com
RPFIX: <hdr22@clintonemail.com>

H??:Return-Path: <ax>

H??:Received: from
    by vance2.state.gov with ESMTP id 01R3fe0R011955
    for <hdr22@clintonemail.com>; Fri, 26 Feb 2010 22:41:40 -0500
H??:Received: from
    by vance2.state.gov with ESMTP id 01R3fe0R011955
    for <hdr22@clintonemail.com>; Fri, 26 Feb 2010 22:41:40 -0500
with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.3959);

Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:13:22 -0500
by vance2.state.gov with ESMTP id 01R3fe0R011955
with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.3959);
Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:13:22 -0500
with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.3959);
Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:13:22 -0500
Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:13:22 -0500
with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.2499);
Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:13:22 -0500

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

bounary="---- _=_ NextPart_001_01CAB763.16C28431"

Subject: Fw: Warning: could not send message for past 4 hours (RESENT BY CDM)
Date: Fri, 26 Feb 2010 23:13:22 -0500
Message-ID: <24BE111B6623A44970CC2325D80C26850D78BEF586>
X-MS-Has-Attach:
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:
Thread-Topic: Warning: could not send message for past 4 hours
Thread-Index: Acq2JXMAltBnegXVEISJGgsxP9JZ1dAAABY17
From: "Mills, Cheryl D" <MillsCD@state.gov>
To: <hdr22@clintonemail.com>
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 27 Feb 2010 04:13:20.0944 (UTC) FILETIME=[3271B800:01CAB763]
X-TM-AS-Product-Ver: SMEV-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
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) 834-0278
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

UNCLASSIFIED U.S. Department of State Case No. D-2016-06755 Doc No. C06052781 Date: 06/20/2016
Jay,

It's correct that Anti-scan 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
Mensahel@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 rews 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 server 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.
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

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
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?
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 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  
SkyPrint Declass Support Contractor  
(202) 634-0278  
Mensahel￡@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.

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 scenarios to track down some of the specific messages 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 seems to have been delivered into the databases where the recipient mailboxes are hosted 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 brings 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 BES, MAPI client, OWA or through other application or device). Also, let's remember certain attachment or message sizes over 30MB will be refused 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 sessm32u).

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 _______ [D7] and other SES Exchange BH servers. Thanks.

Ebenezer Mensah
Exchange Systems Engineer
IRM/OPS/MSO/EML
SkypePoint Decisions Support Contractor
(202) 634-0278
Menashe@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: [D6]
In accordance with EO 13526 this message is not classified.

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

(Where 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.)
From: Gazlay, Jay E  
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 4:25 PM  
To: Gazlay, Jay E  
Cc: Lawrence, Thomas W  
Subject: RE: Meeting with Huma

Regarding your request for a copy of the email, you have not received it because you are not listed in my email account.

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

---

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

Regarding your request for a copy of the email, you have not received it because you are not listed in my email account.

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

1. [have contact for the e-mail and all the e-mails the names Bryan Pagliano and he actually now works for State but he apparently deleted some e-mails]
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 [___].

3. On 12/13, hidr2@clintonemail.com sent a message to huma@clintonemail.com, slllivan@state.gov and stermd@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, hidr2@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 Álmodovar
S/ES Supervisory Systems Administrator
S/ES-IRM POEMS Help Desk
U.S. Department of State
Phone: 202-647-8328 | Fax: 202-647-8191