

Kevin Schreier  
Developnet World-Wide

May 30, 2006

[  
Federal Trade Commission/Office of the Secretary, Room H-135 (Annex W)  
Re: Business Opportunity Rule, R511993  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20580

RE: Business Opportunity Rule, R511993

**[You may also send your letter electronically by using the following Web link:  
<https://secure.commentworks.com/ftc-bizopNPR/>]**

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing this letter because I am concerned about the proposed Business Opportunity Rule R511993. I believe that in its present form, it could prevent me from continuing as a Mannatech Inc. Independent Distributor]. I understand that part of the FTC's responsibilities is to protect the public from "unfair and deceptive acts or practices," but some of the sections in the proposed rule will make it very difficult if not impossible for me to sell Mannatech Inc. products. In a very competitive market, potential consumers could be inundated with volumes of paper that they may not even be interested in. Some consumers of Mannatech's products want to use only the product while others would engage in the distribution or both.

I am absolutely opposed to the seven day waiting rule, not because of fear that Mannatech is doing things illegitimately, but the unnecessary burden it puts on small home based business people, single moms etc. One of the most confusing and burdensome sections of the proposed rule is the seven day waiting period to enroll new Independent Distributors. The price of Mannatech Inc. sales kits vary. As mentioned, some buy the products, some want to conduct business. Not everyone wants to sell the product but it places the same level of burden on the distributor regardless of the potential interest. People buy TVs, cars, and other items that cost much more than that and they do not have to wait seven-days. This waiting period gives the impression that there might be something wrong with the plan. I also think this seven-day waiting period is unnecessary, because Mannatech Inc. already has a buyback policy for all products including sales kits purchased by a salesperson within the last twelve months. Under this waiting period requirement, I will need to keep very detailed records when I first speak to someone about Mannatech Inc. and will then have to send in many reports to Mannatech Inc. headquarters.

The proposed rule also calls for the release of **any** information regarding lawsuits involving misrepresentation, or unfair or deceptive practices. It does not matter if the company was found innocent. Today, anyone or any company can be sued for almost anything. It does not make sense to me that I would have to disclose these lawsuits unless Mannatech Inc. is found guilty. Otherwise, Mannatech Inc. and I are put at an unfair advantage even though Mannatech Inc. has done **nothing** wrong.

Finally, the proposed rule requires the disclosure of a minimum of 10 prior purchasers nearest to the prospective purchaser. I am glad to provide references, but in this day of identity theft, I am very uncomfortable giving out the personal information of individuals (without their approval) to strangers. Also, giving away this information could damage the business relationship of the references who may be involved in other companies or businesses including those of competitors. In order to get the list of the 10 prior purchasers, I will need to send the address of the prospective purchaser to Mannatech Inc. headquarters and then wait for the list. I also think the following sentence required by the proposed rule will prevent many people from wanting to sign up as a salesperson "If you buy a business opportunity from the seller, your contact information can be disclosed in the future to other buyers." People are very concerned about their privacy and identity theft. They will be reluctant to share their personal information with individuals they may have never met.

I have been a Mannatech Inc. Independent Distributor for more than 2 years. Originally, I became a Mannatech Inc. product user because I like them and wanted to earn some additional money. There are many people who feel the same way, who may not receive this information and have the opportunity to respond; it wasn't advertised in the newspapers, or on television, it hasn't been in the press, so how is it, a rule so potentially devastating to an industry, be so limited in its broadcast and notice to the public? My family depends on this extra income to supplement our budget, but moreover, relies completely on the products for optimal health, a right guaranteed under DSHEA.

I appreciate the work of the FTC to protect consumers, but I believe this proposed new rule has many unintended consequences and that there are less burdensome alternatives available in achieving its goals.

Thank you for your time in considering my comments.  
Sincerely,

Kevin Schreier