

Sir,

I have been a Quixtar IBO since Sep 2005. I have received tremendous mentorship during this period which is helping me to develop my leadership capabilities. This business is not just helping me in monetary terms, but also helping to improve the great family relationships we enjoy. This business offers a total success package and helping me in all aspects of personal as well as professional life.

I have been given enough information & documents during the registration process. The information has helped me to make an educated decision. The choices catalog explains the business model and the fair compensation plan which is parallel to none in my opinion.

I have been able to sponsor few other IBO's into the business during this period. I have been providing the same kind of information to the new IBO's before they can make an educated decision. We also set-up a question answer session to answer any concerns the prospects might have before they can register. We also provide an environment and encourage them to talk to other IBO's before they can make a choice. All of the new IBO's understand that Quixtar business is not a get rich quick scheme nor a pyramid scheme, requires work from them, simple but not easy business. This information is covered during the presentation as well as during the question-answer session.

May I request you to consider few comments on the new draft Business Opportunity Rule?

The requirement of a seven-day waiting period

- In my opinion this clause will severely hamper the growth prospect for an ambitious IBO. I do not see any benefits a prospect will gain by waiting seven days, when he has sufficient information with him to get started and growing the business
- This has the potential to curtail the profitability of the IBO's
- This waiting period can also affect their decision making ability as there is information loss over time
- In the current process if the IBO is not happy, he can get a full refund for the products he purchases for a minimum of 60 days, no questions asked. This will cover the seven period clause well over seven days
- To summarise this requirement has not enough merits and to be removed from the proposal

The requirement to provide references

- This clause can lead to fraudulent misuses
- Affects the personal privacy by revealing the personal information
- The existing business process ensures that the prospect has all the opportunity to meet enough number of IBO's during the presentation. Also the question answer session guarantees that he has a fair chance of getting his concerns answered and ask for references if he wants to. In all cases the IBO's I registered has met other IBO's before they registered
- To summarise this requirement has the potential for misuse and to be removed from the proposal

The requirement to provide a "litigation list":

- In my opinion it is impossible to none to list the merit / non-merit cases. Especially there is no wall to internet and it is difficult to distinguish the merit / non-merit cases
- Prospective IBO's have all chances of getting wrong information while they are looking for fair business opportunity. This can hamper their ability to make educated decision

- To summarise this requirement has the potential to mislead the prospects and to be removed from the proposal

The requirement for specific earnings disclosures

- As the Quixtar business model is based on Fair Compensation Plan it is difficult to quantify the exact earnings. The earning varies by each individual even though at same level in the business level.
- The average income would be a fair disclosure to new prospects
- To summarise this requirement has not enough merits and to be removed from the proposal

The requirement for financial substantiation

- Any new prospect is given the average income potential in the Quixtar business which is a Fair Compensation Plan
- Also the impact in other lifestyle areas is shown to the new IBO's which can be non-monitory in nature
- Providing financial records will not be a proper representation as the business plan is based on Fair Compensation Plan. With exact duplication the income potential can still be different and the numbers really don't hold good in this scenario
- To summarise this requirement has not enough merits and to be removed from the proposal