

June 6, 2006

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing 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 an independent Photomax 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 Photomax's products.

I've been a distributor in the direct selling industry for more than three years. Originally, I became a distributor in my company because I read a number of books which detailed how powerful the direct selling model is for people who want their own business, and also want to tap into the power of leverage. As a mother of five, with number six on the way, I have no desire to contribute to our family's finances while putting my children in daycare. Rather, a major component of the appeal of direct sales is that I work from the comfort of my own home, during hours I choose. And at the same time, I am in the process of creating a substantial contribution to our family's income.

For me, one of the most confusing and burdensome sections of the proposed rule is the seven-day waiting period to enroll new distributors. Photomax's sales kit only costs \$350 (or less). People buy TVs, cars, and other items that cost much more and they do not have to wait seven days. 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 NuSkin Enterprises (NSE) 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 Photomax 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 NSE is found guilty. Otherwise, NSE and I are put at an unfair advantage even though NSE 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 NSE 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,