Ursula Sasso
Financial Destination, Inc.

June 19, 2006

Federal Trade Commission/Office of the Secretary, Toom H-135(Annex W)
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20580

RE: Business Opportunity Rule, R511993

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing this letter because I am concerned about the proposed New Business Opportunity Rule R511993. I am afraid that in its present form, it could severely hurt Financial Destination, Inc. I understand that part of the FTC's responsibility 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 Financial Destination to continue as a business.

FDI is a privately held corporation that was founded in June 2003 by Mr. William Andreoli, President & CEO. The company's headquarters are in Derry, New Hampshire. FDI has assembled a strong core management team to ensure the company's competitive edge. FDI's mission is to **Stamp Out Financial Illiteracy Across the Country!** Too many families are needlessly struggling financially. We teach people to **Know More. About Money.** From Real Estate and Stock Market Training to Cashflow Management, FDI's team of educators help people become financially free. FDI strives to provide customers and independent representatives with only the best the market has to offer and makes a firm commitment to continually seek out the most innovative and affordable new products and services to enhance the FDI membership. We have more 20,000 independent reps. One of the most confusing and burdensome sections of the proposed rule is the seven day waiting period to enroll new independent reps. Our company offers financial memberships to both independent reps as well as customers. The basic package for a rep or a customer to get started using the services is $39.95 and they choose from a monthly membership. Consumers make many purchases such as TVs, cars, and other items that cost much more than that and they do not have to wait seven-days. This waiting period creates the impression that there might be something wrong with the plan. This seven-day waiting period is unnecessary, because FDI offers a 10 day period which

allows reps and customers to change their mind for a full refund. Under this waiting period requirement, FDI will need to keep very detailed records when a FDI rep makes contact with a prospective purchaser and will then have to retain these documents for three years. The related administrative costs will be very expensive.

Also, Under the proposed rule, FDI's plan would fall under FTC regulatory authority, since the existing $500 threshold under existing franchise rule will be eliminated and FDI will now have to produce numerous pieces of documented materials in order to comply with the proposed rule. The proposed rule also calls for the release of **any** information regarding prior litigation and civil or criminal legal actions 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. We at FDIsee little value in disclosing these lawsuits unless FDI is found guilty. Otherwise, FDI is put at an unfair advantage even though we have done **nothing** wrong. In addition, it seems that everyone throws claims for misrepresentation into every complaint these days. Should prospective distributors be concerned, for example, about litigation between the company and a software provider if their contract dispute contains a claim for misrepresentation? It seems appropriate to include only litigation that is related to the earning opportunity offered to the prospective distributor.
]
The proposed rule regarding earnings claims requires direct sellers to gather information such time periods, independent reps, demographic/geographic data and earnings claims. We are concerned that this approach will be ineffective in preventing the targeted business opportunity fraud, since those perpetuating fraudulent business opportunities will not provide accurate data. However, direct sellers such as FDI, which will try to faithfully comply, will have the difficult if not impossible challenge of interpreting and meeting some of the proposed requirements.

Finally, the proposed reference rule requires the disclosure of a minimum of 10 prior purchasers nearest to the prospective purchaser. FDI is glad to provide references, but in these days of identity theft, we are very uncomfortable giving out the personal information of individuals (without their approval) to strangers. Ironically, the requirement to provide references may result in privacy lawsuits, which under the proposed rule, we would have to report. Also, giving out this information without any controls on how it could be used will very likely and unfairly benefit our competitors. In order to generate the list of the 10 prior purchasers, we will need to obtain the address of the prospective purchaser, search our database for the geographically nearest existing independent reps, use a software program or online service such as Mapquest to confirm these are the correct reps, and then send these results to them. 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 and so are we from a privacy litigation standpoint. Individuals will be reluctant to share their personal information with individuals they may have never met.

FDI appreciates the work of the FTC to protect consumers, but we believe this proposed new rule has many unintended consequences, which may destroy my business. We also believe that there are less burdensome alternatives available in achieving the consumer protection goals stated in the proposed rule.

My daughter is a single mother, who is not receiving consistent child support payment from her son’s father, changes to the way we do business right now could have a negative effect on how she is currently managing to keep a roof over her head, without the assistance of government funding. Because of FDI’s services (credit restoration, debt elimination, teaching how to make money in real estate and stock market) and because of the business opportunity which allows monthly residual income, she has been able to care for her children without asking for food stamps or TANF. I believe there are numerous mothers in this situation that would be negatively effected by the proposed rules.

Thank you for your time in considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ursula Sasso
Financial Destination
Independent Representative