
Subject: Spam Trap setup

Posted by [eastwood](#) on Thu, 18 Aug 2005 09:56:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Can I setup more than one Spam trap filter?

But will each spam trap filter address use up a licenced user?

Also the manul says the address that you setup doesnt have to be a valid mailbox on the server, so what happens to the mail that gets sent to this spam trap?

Does it simply get learned as spam and then deleted or does it build up and store i somewhere?

Subject: Re: Spam Trap setup

Posted by [support](#) on Fri, 19 Aug 2005 07:51:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> Can I setup more than one Spam trap filter?

There is usually no need, because you can set up multiple addresses for one filter.

> But will each spam trap filter address use up a licenced user?

With the latest version, (2.3.x), spam trap addresses will not count.

> Also the manul says the address that you setup doesnt have to

> be a valid mailbox on the server, so what happens to the mail

> that gets sent to this spam trap?

> Does it simply get learned as spam and then deleted or does it

> build up and store i somewhere?

The filtering action is accept/delete, after it has been learned, the mail simply vanishes.

Subject: Re: Spam Trap setup

Posted by [ScubaCat](#) on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 20:01:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Any plans on fixing the licensing issue with spam trap?

Subject: Re: Spam Trap setup

Posted by [support](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 12:19:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> Any plans on fixing the licensing issue with spam trap?

There is no such issue. Make sure you put all the spam trap address patterns on the list of "address patterns to disable filter" of the other filters. After this, the spam trap address will no longer be counted as licensed address.

Subject: Re: Spam Trap setup
Posted by [ScubaCat](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 17:50:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I apologize - you are correct. That makes sense now that I think of it, given that the rules are processed in order.
