

Re: CAN-SPAM Act Rulemaking, Project No. R411008

To the Commissioners,

I applaud your efforts to curb the problem of un-solicited bulk email. However, I am concerned about the proposed requirement for merchants to maintain suppression lists.

There are so many problems and costs associated with this idea, and so much damage done to consumers and businesses alike, that I feel I must urge you to consider this matter most carefully.

Requirement of the use of suppression lists will seriously damage many of the legitimate publications available on the net. My specific concern is for harm to publishers who require permission from the consumer prior to adding them to any list.

They're not who CAN-SPAM was designed to put out of business, but this requirement will very likely have that effect

As you are aware 95% of start ups go out of business within 5 years, our costs are high as it is, I beg you Not to introduce this as it stands, I personally think that the system of double opt in that we are currently using is enough to stop decent hardworking people spam, it is the people who spam that need to be closed down, that can only be done if the internet is policed properly, not by introducing something that will close down all but those that are well off and well established on the net. This will mean the rich getting richer and the start ups-well there won't be any, PLEASE RECONSIDER.

There's also the potential for significant harm to consumers, because of the problem of properly knowing their intent when they unsubscribe from a list. On top of that, these suppression lists could easily fall into the hands of spammers, leading to more spam instead of less.

I was quite surprised at the potential problems this ruling could involve, and urge you in the strongest possible terms to reconsider its implementation in light of these problems,

Yours Faithfully

Ian Urquhart  
Cracking Prices  
Aberdeen Scotland