

Angela Kelley
Pure Romance by Angela

June 14, 2006

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 Pure Romance consultant. 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 Pure Romance products.

I have been a Pure Romance consultant for almost 2 years. Originally, I became a Pure Romance consultant in my company because I felt the products were exceptional and I wanted to earn some additional income. Now, I am currently putting myself through school to get my criminal justice bachelors degree and next fall I will also put myself through law school, which I will do solely on the support of my direct selling business. This is the only job where I can afford to live on my own, pay my own bills and still be able to devote the time I will need for my law studies. The future of my of my school success is dependent on the stability of the direct selling industry.

One of the most confusing and burdensome sections of the proposed rule is the seven-day waiting period to enroll new consultants. Pure Romance's sales kit only costs \$250 and we regularly put a cheaper kit of \$149 or \$99 if someone cannot afford the \$250 or the bigger kits. 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. Under this waiting period requirement, I will need to keep very detailed records when I first speak to someone about Pure Romance 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 Pure Romance is found guilty. Otherwise, Pure Romance and I are put at an unfair advantage even though Pure Romance 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 Pure Romance 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,

Angela Kelley