TO: Jim Silrum, Deputy Secretary of State
FROM: Brian D. Newby, Elections Director
DATE: November 5, 2021
RE: Analysis of “thebiglie.frankspeech.com”

Following a note sent by a voter to Senator Brad Bekkedahl, which was forwarded to our office on September 23, we asked the North Dakota Information Technology (NDIT) Cyber Operations Team to assess claims made regarding data on the website “thebiglie.frankspeech.com.” The concern in the email related to claims of vote changes in Williams County, although the site purported to link vote count manipulation to each county in North Dakota.

A report from NDIT’s Cyber Operations Team is attached.

Our office’s conclusion—informed by this report as well as our own analysis—is that the information presented on “The Big Lie” is just that, totally fabricated. Our staff watched the South Dakota event as it took place, have gone back and reviewed much of the materials shown, have reviewed national IT cyber experts’ views of the claims (including those cyber experts who were at the event), and conducted our own evaluation of our results compared to what is stated.

The information presented on the site used a common percentage of vote changes across the country. The percentage was the same across the country. Ostensibly, the authors tried to suggest what the outcome SHOULD have been, as opposed to WHAT it was. It’s akin to someone expecting turnout to be a percentage based upon population and previous turnout history. Or, perhaps, someone expecting the outcome in a race to reflect what pre-election poll data predicted.

The attached report begins to explain this.

NDIT’s conclusions were not unexpected. Other states have looked at similar data. For instance, in the state of Idaho, the same site claimed that all 44 counties supposedly were electronically intercepted and manipulated remotely over the Internet. However, the Idaho Secretary of State’s office immediately identified seven of these counties because they tally all votes by hand. These small seven counties do not tabulate results electronically.

The Idaho Secretary of State’s office conducted recounts in those counties against the initial hand-counting to prove there were, of course, no changes possible and actually sent a bill for these costs of the recount to Mike Lindell. Admittedly, that final step appeared to be a publicity stunt, but they did that to draw attention to the fact that results can’t be electronically altered if they never were tabulated electronically in the first place.
A similar analysis to NDIT’s was conducted in Oklahoma and also is attached. In addition, we know that the North Dakota Auditor’s office has looked at these allegations as well, and we await findings from the Auditor, expected in 2022.

It’s worth noting that while there are credible reports demonstrating the lack of truth in the claim that votes flipped in North Dakota and elsewhere, there also have been no credible reports or evidence supporting the claims of Dr. Frank and Mr. Lindell.

Our own evaluation, before any other entity looked at this information, began with the understanding that the voting system in North Dakota is “physically isolated,” which means it is not connected to the North Dakota state network or to the internet in any way--not directly, indirectly, or wirelessly.

For a deeper dive, we looked into the IP address in question from the email, 104.198.152.237, which is registered to a server in Council Bluffs, Iowa, that hosts numerous governmental websites, including Williamsnd.com. This server and IP address are not owned or managed by the State of North Dakota and are on a completely separate network from any state assets, including the Secretary of State maintained Election Night Reporting (ENR) website.

Also included in the email were figures that appeared to be vote totals. We searched williamsnd.com, but did not find any vote totals listed on that site. The site only had voter turnout statistics and a link back to the Secretary of State ENR site. Here is a screenshot from williamsnd.com:

**Elections**

The County Auditor serves as the election administrator for primary, general and special county, state, and federal elections. These are normally held every two years on even years.

**Current Election Information**

**General Election:** November 3, 2020

General Election results can be found on the [Secretary of State's website](https://www.nd.gov/secretaryofstate).  

**Williams County voter turnout**

8,514 Absentee Ballots  
4,554 Voters at the ARC  
1,351 Voters at the Tioga Community Center  
14,419 total voters
The votes for presidential candidates in Williams County reported on the Secretary of State’s ENR site, are pictured below:

These totals match one set of numbers from the email, highlighted below in yellow:

**WILLIAMS COUNTY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SOURCE IP</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LAT1</th>
<th>LONG1</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>ACTUAL VOTES</th>
<th>VOTES AFTER HACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The highlighted results reflect the Final Official results, certified by the bipartisan Williams County Canvassing Board on 11/9/2020, not the vote totals on 11/6/2020, the date provided in the email.

As for the other figures listed that also resemble vote totals, we could not attribute those totals to any known data source. To further analyze these figures, we reviewed the full data set from the website linked in the email.

In our analysis, the website yielded images of two data sets without any accompanying information related to the source or authenticity of data.
Below is one of the data set images and some conclusions drawn from that data set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Source*</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Official</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/3/20</td>
<td>9:07 AM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48.4096</td>
<td>25.4809</td>
<td>58.3262</td>
<td>68.6562</td>
<td>76.6562</td>
<td>84.6562</td>
<td>8.4596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/20</td>
<td>3:20 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49.0896</td>
<td>26.0896</td>
<td>59.0896</td>
<td>69.0896</td>
<td>77.0896</td>
<td>85.0896</td>
<td>8.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/20</td>
<td>3:20 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49.0896</td>
<td>26.0896</td>
<td>59.0896</td>
<td>69.0896</td>
<td>77.0896</td>
<td>85.0896</td>
<td>8.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/20</td>
<td>3:20 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49.0896</td>
<td>26.0896</td>
<td>59.0896</td>
<td>69.0896</td>
<td>77.0896</td>
<td>85.0896</td>
<td>8.4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The data in columns 15 & 16, appear to be the final and official vote totals that are available from [https://results.sos.nd.gov/Default.aspx?map=Cty](https://results.sos.nd.gov/Default.aspx?map=Cty), website, which is the public-facing Election Night Reporting (ENR) website for the State of North Dakota.
  - The final and official results were uploaded by the counties to the ENR site on or shortly after 11/9/20. However, the dates in column 1 range from 11/3/20 to 11/6/20, days before final results were certified by the county canvassing boards.
  - Vote totals are lower prior to canvass, because set-aside ballots, as well as mail-ballots received that were postmarked before election day, are presented to the county bipartisan canvassing board to accept prior to being included in the vote totals.

- Even more interesting is the data presented in columns 13 & 14. No source could be found to correlate the data, but after comparing the data to the final, official votes in columns 15 & 16, it appears that the numbers in column 13 are roughly 4.2% lower than the corresponding number in the same row in column 15. The inverse is true for column 14, which is approximately 4.2% higher than the corresponding number in the same row in column 16. Therefore, the figure in column 17 is 8.4% of the difference between the four columns in each row.
It is unknown why the author applied a uniform formula to the official, final results and chose to display it in this manner.

Regardless, a major red flag anomaly with this data comes with Barnes County’s “final results” from 10:09 on November 3, 2020. The times on this report appear to be military time, as several are listed with hours, for instance, of “15,” “17,” and “23.” The time zone for any of these listed is unknown.

However, on election night (November 3), the Barnes County auditor had mechanical issues with the feeding of ballots into its DS 450 scanner. A support technician was unable to arrive and address this issue until after midnight, and Barnes County did not complete scanning ballots until 5:00 a.m. on November 4. There is no way to reconcile the actual completion date and time of reporting with the “results” on the report, approximately 19 hours earlier.

Back to the report, in the next section, “TargetIP” occasionally appears to be the IP address for servers that in some cases appear to be hosting a website that belongs to a county. In other instances, the IP address appears to be related to a server hosting a website outside of North Dakota.
An investigation we conducted of a random sample of the Target IP addresses from the list shows:

- Billings County: IP Address in Manhattan, Kansas
- Cavalier County: IP Address in San Francisco
- Morton County: IP Address in Edina, MN
- Nelson County: IP Address same as Oliver County, in Edina, MN
- Oliver County: IP Address same as Nelson County, in Edina, MN
- Sioux County: IP Address in Washington, Virginia

Recall the original foundation of our analysis—North Dakota’s voting system is not connected to the Internet and, thus, does not have associated IP addresses. It’s not just that these aren’t the correct IP addresses listed—there are no IP addresses for North Dakota’s voting system. This is a fact we fully expect to be verified with the North Dakota auditor’s security assessment that is about to be underway.

**Conclusion**

In the end, the “source of truth” are the paper ballots at our counties, not any website that lists results. The “Big Lie” numbers show results with dates from election night, before additional ballots were tabulated nearly a week later when county canvassing boards certified official results. The shenanigans claim is simply false, but had it happened as claimed, it would have been caught at the time of the county canvassing board meetings.

One final data point supporting correct outcomes in 2020 are recounts that were conducted. The North Dakota Secretary of State does not have the authority to initiate recounts (there is a process for election contests spelled out in North Dakota Century Code, at the county level), but nine recounts in the State were conducted in 2020, all validating the initial totals:

- Mayor, Ayr
- Council Member, Gardner
- School Board Member, West Fargo School District #6
- Fullerton City Measure #1, Fullerton
- Home Rule Charter City of Arnegard, Arnegard
- Publication of Minutes, Mantador
- Forest River Publication, Forest River
- Commissioner, Velva
- County Commissioner, McKenzie

It’s a shame that such ridiculous claims have generated such traction. This mis-information sullies the incredible work our North Dakota county auditors and their election teams did on behalf of all North Dakotans in a year that saw uncertainty from a pandemic and, yet, incredibly high voter turnout. **I have complete confidence that those certified as winners in all North Dakota state and federal races in 2020 were duly elected and properly seated as the winners in their races.**
NORTH DAKOTA
CYBERSECURITY PROGRAM
Re: Assessment of Election Information
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Introduction
This report is regarding your request for the NDIT Cyber Operations Team to assess data posted on the thebiglie.frankspeech.com website. Allegations made on this site suggest that specific IP addresses are associated with the voting system in North Dakota and that IP addresses belonging to North Dakota counties were purportedly visited by out-of-state and international IP addresses.

Initial background of Elections Infrastructure:

- The voting system in North Dakota is an air-gapped system and is not connected to the Internet. The voting system is physically isolated, with no Internet connections either directly, indirectly, or wirelessly.
- An Election Security Operations Task Force was formed leading up to the 2020 election cycle. This multi-disciplinary advisory team consisted of members from the NDIT Cyber Operations Center, Secretary of State, North Dakota National Guard, ND Department of Emergency Services - Homeland Security, along with representatives from numerous other state agencies.
- Under the guidance of the Election Security Operations Task Force, an Election Security Operations Center (ESOC) was stood-up and tasked with the mission to identify, protect, detect, respond, and recover to/from threats and/or attacks aimed at disrupting and/or impacting the State of North Dakota's elections, election infrastructure, and/or election results.
- The ESOC actively monitored the election infrastructure in conjunction with the federal Election Infrastructure Information and Sharing Center (EI-ISAC) leading up to, during, and after both, the primary and general election in 2020.

Initial observations of data posted to “frankspeech” site:

- The information provided on the site, “frankspeech,” appears to be constructed from uncorrelated data. The longitude and latitude is mismatched and calls into question the validity of the data. PCAP files show TCP/IP traffic and not physical location of assets.
- The data posted to the “frankspeech” site implies that certain source IP addresses communicated with target IP addresses at specific dates and times and that those communications had an impact on election results.
- The data gives no indication as to whether the traffic was blocked, what protocol was used, what port was traversed, or what action, if any, was taken on the alleged systems.
- The data gives no indication if the target IPs were determined to be related to elections infrastructure and, in some cases, does not provide a target IP at all.

Despite concerns with the data, the NDIT Cyber Operations Team agreed to perform an assessment and provide additional context.

Analysis
Analysis by the Cyber Operations Team included the “Source” domains and IP addresses in question with the following findings:

- Some host names indicate that the IP addresses are used for DSL, cable, service providers, or other broadband Internet services that would typically be seen in Internet traffic.
The existence of such connections originating from foreign countries is not unexpected nor unusual. International IPs are normal on public-facing systems such as websites that are publicly available.

The Cyber Operations Team also reviewed the “destination” domains and IP addresses in question. The results are as follows:

- None of the IP addresses are associated with the North Dakota election infrastructure or the Secretary of State maintained Election Night Reporting (ENR) website.
- Most county websites are hosted out-of-state by third party web hosting and cloud computing companies, despite latitude and longitude numbers indicating otherwise. Again, these items are not typically formatted this way in log files or PCAPs.
- Third party web hosting/cloud providers would not show a location such as Bismarck or Ward County.

Summary

There is no validity to the information regarding North Dakota as it is incomplete. At no time during or after the 2020 election cycle, was any cyber security incident identified that could have affected the confidentiality, integrity, or availability of the North Dakota election infrastructure, information systems, data, or services related to the election process.

Please let us know if you’d like to have further discussions regarding this analysis or if other information is needed.
LETTER FROM STATE ELECTION BOARD SECRETARY PAUL ZIRIAX

To the Honorable Members of the Oklahoma Senate and Oklahoma House of Representatives,

In recent weeks some of you have reached out to me after hearing from constituents regarding allegations made at a “Cyber Symposium” held in South Dakota in August, hosted by MyPillow® CEO Mike Lindell. A series of incredible claims were made at the “Cyber Symposium” regarding elections in Oklahoma and elsewhere – including that Oklahoma’s November 2020 Presidential General Election results in all 77 counties were electronically manipulated by cyber intruders. Data purporting to show evidence of the alleged cyber manipulation of our election results have now been published on Mr. Lindell’s “The Big Lie” website.

Upon an initial review the data posted on the website did not appear to be credible, but we nevertheless felt it was our duty to fully investigate it in order to protect the integrity and reputation of Oklahoma’s election system. Therefore, I requested an independent investigation by OMES’s Oklahoma Cyber Command, as well as a thorough internal review by the State Election Board’s staff and vendors.

I am pleased to report to you that following Cyber Command’s independent investigation and our own internal review, the allegations posted on the website are entirely without merit.

INTERNAL AND INDEPENDENT REVIEW AND FINDINGS

A table on the website purports to show the following:
- The date and time of each alleged cyber intrusion.
- The “source IP” address of each alleged cyber intrusion, and its location.
- The “target IP” address of each site that was allegedly penetrated, and its location.
- A comparison of election results: The certified results (labeled “The Big Lie”) and the purported actual results (labeled “The Truth”).

For your convenience, I have enclosed a copy of Oklahoma’s Chief Information Security Officer Matt Singleton’s report to me on Oklahoma Cyber Command’s official findings. In this report, Mr. Singleton notes, “There is not now, nor has there been, any credible evidence of a cyber incident or event that could have interfered with the State of Oklahoma’s 2020 General Election.” Mr. Singleton also discusses the numerous safeguards that were in place to protect against cyber intrusions like those alleged on “The Big Lie” website.

---

1 https://thebiglie.frankspeech.com/OKLAHOMA/index.html, ©Michael J. Lindell, 2021
Here are some examples of the State of Oklahoma’s findings that debunk the website’s allegations and data:

- None of the IP addresses that were purported to be “targeted” by hackers belong to the State Election Board, nor any county election board, nor any Oklahoma election system.
- Many dates and times of alleged “cyber intrusions” are after the final election results were already certified by county election boards in Oklahoma.
- The latitude and longitude data do not appear to have any actual relationship to the physical locations of the IP addresses that were supposedly targeted.

Both the internal review by the State Election Board and the independent investigation by Oklahoma Cyber Command have confirmed that there is absolutely no merit to the website’s allegations that Oklahoma’s election results were electronically manipulated.

Additionally, Oklahoma is not the only state to debunk the website’s allegations. For example, here is a recent news release from the Idaho Secretary of State: https://sos.idaho.gov/2021/09/29/election-validation.

CONCLUSION

As I mentioned in my August 13 letter to you, no one cares more about the security and integrity of our state’s elections than me. Credible allegations of violations of Oklahoma election law are always reported to district attorneys for investigation. A cyber breach or incident – if one were to occur – would always be thoroughly and independently investigated. State law also authorizes candidates to challenge election results by requesting a recount or alleging irregularities.

Unfortunately, several Oklahomans have seen or read misinformation like that provided at the “Cyber Symposium” and on “The Big Lie” website and have demanded a so-called “forensic audit” of Oklahoma’s 2020 General Election – something that is neither justified by the evidence nor authorized under the laws enacted by the Legislature. Feel free to share this letter with any constituents who may contact you regarding these allegations so they can know the facts.

The people of Oklahoma can rest assured that our state has one of the most accurate and secure voting systems in the entire world. The true and correct results of Oklahoma’s 2020 elections are those results that were certified by Oklahoma election officials.

Sincerely,

Paul Ziriax
Secretary, Oklahoma State Election Board

ENCLOSURE

---

DATE: 1 October 2021

TO: Secretary Paul Ziriax, State Election Board

FROM: Matt Singleton, Office of Management and Enterprise Services

RE: “The Big Lie” Inquiry Investigation

In response to your 23 September 2021 inquiry regarding the information purporting to prove election interference in the State of Oklahoma’s 2020 General Election as posted on https://thebiglie.frankspeech.com/OKLAHOMA/index.html, Oklahoma Cyber Command conducted a full investigation.

The posting claims to show out-of-state IP addresses connecting to in-state IP addresses related to the election and insinuates voting discrepancies of approximately 128,000 votes between what was officially reported and a listed total which source is not identified.

Our investigation found the posting included source/destination IPs and associated latitude and longitude coordinates for dates of 3 November 2020 through 6 November 2020. The source of the latitude/longitude coordinates was not identified in the original posting. While it might be possible the source IPs listed correlated with machines in the locations listed on those dates, at the time of our analysis many of those IPs were defunct. Those still active resolved to publicly available scanning engines. After de-duplicating the provided destination IPs, there were a total of seventeen unique IP addresses. Five led to State of Oklahoma resources and the remainder led to cloud providers and other out-of-state technology organizations. One State of Oklahoma IP address (204.87.112.104) was listed fifty times yet had different latitude/longitude coordinates for each entry. This IP address is associated with the Secretary of State’s website and has been since at least May 2020. Unlike some other states, Oklahoma’s Secretary of State does not oversee elections. **None of the five State of Oklahoma IPs were/are associated with the State of Oklahoma’s election infrastructure.**

These findings are not unexpected. As you know, the election infrastructure in Oklahoma is centralized and the components in the counties are not directly accessible via the internet. Further, Oklahoma Cyber Command was actively monitoring all connectivity to the election infrastructure during the General Election and even had been on high alert status in the weeks leading up to the election. This was in addition to the regularly assigned personnel provided to the State Election Board and our specific operations to identify mis- and dis-information campaigns surrounding the General Election.

**There is not now, nor has there been, any credible evidence of a cyber incident or event that could have interfered with the State of Oklahoma’s 2020 General Election.**

Please let me know if you’d like to have further discussions regarding this inquiry or if other information is needed.