

Christine Allyson
Reach For The Sky

6/21/06

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing this letter because I am deeply concerned about the proposed Business Opportunity Rule R511993 (BOR R511993). I believe that in its present form, it could prevent me from continuing as a Synergy Worldwide, distributor. I understand that part of the FTC's responsibilities is to protect the public from "unfair and deceptive acts or practices," yet some of the sections in the proposed rule will make it very difficult, if not impossible, for me to sell Synergy Worldwide products.

I have been a Synergy Worldwide, distributor for more than 3 years. Originally, I became a distributor in my company because I felt the products were exceptional and I wanted to earn some additional income. Now, I have experienced first hand the importance of the direct selling business. My husband has a physically demanding job. Last year he was in an auto accident that took him out of work for quite awhile. My check was buying our groceries. It literally meant the difference of our ability to stay afloat or not. I am blessed to be married to a man who has a job at all, as many in Michigan are losing them. At one time I sold Tupperware. I knew women who were single parents' who would not have been able to support their children or be there for the kids, had it not been for Tupperware. I witnessed the necessity for my colleagues, of being able to support their families with direct sales. This was in no way a hobby or luxury for them or their families.

I am vigorously opposed to Business Opportunity Rule R511993. One of the most confusing and burdensome sections of the proposed rule is the seven-day waiting period to enroll new consultants and distributors. People buy TVs, cars, and other items that cost much more than what it costs to become a distributor for Synergy Worldwide and they do not have to wait seven days. This business is not like buying a gun. This waiting period gives the impression that there might be something wrong with the company or the compensation plan. I also think this seven-day waiting period is unnecessary, because Synergy Worldwide already has a 90% 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 Synergy Worldwide and will then need to send in many reports to my company 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 Synergy Worldwide is found guilty. Otherwise, Synergy Worldwide and I are put at an unfair advantage even though Synergy Worldwide 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 oppose 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 Synergy Worldwide 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 appreciate the work that the FTC does to protect consumers, yet I believe this proposed new rule has many unintended consequences and there are less burdensome alternatives available to achieving your goals.

Thank you for your time in considering my comments.

Respectfully,

Christine Allyson