

June 15, 2006
Jim Shank
June 15, 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

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am pleased that you are there for us. This is my first time to write a government agency with a request. I am writing this because I am concerned about the proposed Business Opportunity Rule R511993. I believe that in its present form, this rule could prevent me from continuing as a legitimate 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 our Mannatech products.

My first objection is the seven day waiting period. **Yikes!** One of the most confusing and burdensome sections of the proposed rule is a seven day waiting period to enroll new distributors. Mannatech's sales kit only costs \$1,099. 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 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 Mannatech and will then have to send in many reports to our headquarters.

Also, 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 is found guilty. Otherwise, Mannatech and I are put at an unfair advantage even though we have done **nothing** wrong.

Finally, the proposed rule requires the disclosure of a minimum of 10 prior purchasers nearest to the prospective purchaser. Yikes again! How can this be done? I have over 1,000 associates in 24 states on my team. 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 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 Distributor for more than five years. Originally, I became a distributor because I like them and wanted to earn some additional money. Now my family depends on this extra income to supplement our budget. **I just left a 27 year employment to do this full time and cannot imagine how to manage under these proposed rules. Yikes, yikes, yikes!**

I appreciate that you are there 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,

Jim Shank