

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

To the Commissioners.

I am so concerned re your ideas in this instance re unsolicited email, that I have taken the step of writing to you from the UK.

I'm an ethical online marketer from the UK, I never ever indulge in sending spam etc, yet your Act hits me a small business person the most.

I'm as distressed as the next person at the fact that I dare not let my children open emails because of the often vile content, but do you really think the major spammers who operate in countries such as India and China are going to suddenly stop sending their unsolicited rubbish? (I think not).

I applaud your efforts to curb the problem of unsolicited bulk email. However, I am concerned about the proposed requirement for merchants to maintain suppression lists. (I might as well give up my business now and live off the state by claiming welfare).

There are so many problems and costs associated with this idea, and so much damage will be done to both 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.

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,

Respectfully,

Kim Standerline North Lincolnshire UK

(Storal)