

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
February 15, 2005

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-11830

In the Matter of

**Advanced Solutions & Technologies, Inc.,
Comparator Systems Corp.,
Emerging Enterprise Solutions, Inc., and
Shaman Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,**

Respondents.

**ORDER INSTITUTING
ADMINISTRATIVE
PROCEEDINGS AND NOTICE OF
HEARING PURSUANT TO
SECTION 12(j) OF THE
SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT
OF 1934**

I.

The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) deems it necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors that public administrative proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”).

II.

After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

A. RESPONDENTS

1. Advanced Solutions & Technologies, Inc. (f/k/a Indexonly Technologies, Inc.) (“ADVK”)¹ is a Nevada corporation headquartered in Fountain Hills, Arizona with a class of securities registered with the Commission under Exchange Act Section 12(g). ADVK is delinquent in its periodic filings, having last filed a periodic report for the period ending September 30, 2000, and it has a default status with the Nevada Secretary of State. ADVK reported assets of \$715,804, liabilities of \$1,133,472, and a net loss of \$1,481,541 for the nine months ended September 30, 2000. As of November 30, 2004, ADVK was quoted on the Pink Sheets. For the six months ended August 24, 2004, ADVK had an average daily trading volume of 549,942 shares.

2. Comparator Systems Corp. (“IDID”) (CIK 277809) is a Colorado corporation with its last known offices in Orange, California and a class of securities registered with the Commission under Exchange Act Section 12(g). On September 16, 1996, the Commission obtained a permanent injunction against IDID in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. *Securities and Exchange*

¹ The short form of each Respondent’s name is also its stock symbol.

Commission v. Comparator Systems Corporation, et al., Civ. Act. No. 96-3856 (LGB) (JG) (C.D. Cal.) (May 31, 1996). The injunction enjoined the issuer and its officers and agents from causing the issuer to fail to file timely periodic reports with the Commission in violation of Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 thereunder, as well as from violations of the anti-fraud and books and records provisions of the securities laws. As of November 30, 2004, IDID was quoted on the Pink Sheets. IDID has violated that permanent injunction and is delinquent in its periodic filings, having not filed a periodic report since the period ending December 31, 1997. IDID has a dissolved status with the Colorado Secretary of State.

3. Emerging Enterprise Solutions, Inc. (f/k/a Product Express.Com Ebusiness Services, Inc.) (“EESI”) (CIK 1041479) is an Arizona corporation headquartered in Scottsdale, Arizona with a class of securities registered with the Commission under Exchange Act Section 12(g). EESI is delinquent in its periodic filings, having last filed a periodic report for the period ending March 31, 2000. EESI reported assets of \$324,652, liabilities of \$1,123,222, and a net loss of \$226,905 for the three months ended March 31, 2000. As of November 30, 2004, EESI was quoted on the Pink Sheets. For the six months ended August 24, 2004, EESI had an average daily trading volume of 315,814 shares.

4. Shaman Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“SHPH”) (CIK 891933) is a Delaware corporation with its last known headquarters in San Francisco, California and a class of securities registered with the Commission under Exchange Act Section 12(g). SHPH is delinquent in its periodic filings, having last filed a periodic report for the period ending March 31, 2001, and it has a void status with the Delaware Secretary of State. SHPH reported assets of \$941,712, liabilities of \$8,897,111, and a net loss of \$249,580 for the three months ended March 31, 2001. On January 5, 2001, SHPH filed for bankruptcy under Chapter 11 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of California. The proceeding was later converted to a Chapter 7 proceeding. As of November 30, 2004, SHPH was quoted on the Pink Sheets. For the six months ended August 24, 2004, SHPH had an average daily trading volume of 55,103 shares.

B. DELINQUENT PERIODIC FILINGS

5. This case concerns four companies with classes of securities registered with the Commission that are delinquent in their periodic reports that are required to be filed with the Commission (*see* Chart of Delinquent Filings, attached hereto as Appendix 1). These registrants have the following facts in common. First, they have been delinquent in their periodic filing obligations with the Commission since at least August 14, 2001. Second, they are all quoted on the Pink Sheets. Third, they represent some of the highest volume delinquent issuers quoted on the Pink Sheets. Each of these companies had an average daily trading volume of over 100,000 shares during the six months ending April 7, 2004. Fourth, they all are located in the Commission’s Pacific Region.

6. Exchange Act Section 13(a) and the rules promulgated thereunder require issuers with classes of securities registered pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12 to file

with the Commission current and accurate information in periodic reports, even if the registration is voluntary under Section 12(g). Specifically, Rule 13a-1 requires issuers to file annual reports (Forms 10-K or 10-KSB), and Rule 13a-13 requires issuers to file quarterly reports (Forms 10-Q or 10-QSB).

7. As a result of the foregoing, all of the Respondents failed to comply with Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 thereunder.

III.

In view of the allegations made by the Division of Enforcement, the Commission deems it necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors to institute public administrative proceedings to determine:

A. Whether the allegations in Section II are true and, in connection therewith, to afford the Respondents an opportunity to establish any defenses to such allegations; and,

B. Whether it is necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors to suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months or revoke the registration of each class of securities of the Respondents registered pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act.

IV.

IT IS ORDERED that a public hearing for the purpose of taking evidence on the questions set forth in Section III hereof shall be convened at a time and place to be fixed, and before an Administrative Law Judge to be designated by further order as provided by Rule 110 of the Commission's Rules of Practice [17 C.F.R. § 201.110].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents shall file Answers to the allegations contained in this Order within ten (10) days after service of this Order, as provided by Rule 220 of the Commission's Rules of Practice [17 C.F.R. § 201.220].

If Respondents fail to file the directed Answers, or fail to appear at a hearing after being duly notified, the Respondents may be deemed in default and the proceedings may be determined against them upon consideration of this Order, the allegations of which may be deemed to be true as provided by Rules 155(a), 220(f), 221(f), and 310 of the Commission's Rules of Practice [17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), 201.220(f), 201.221(f), and 201.310].

This Order shall be served forthwith upon Respondents personally or by certified mail.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge shall issue an initial decision not later than 120 days from the date of service of this Order, pursuant to Rule 360(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice [17 C.F.R. § 201.360(a)(2)].

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision of this matter, except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not “rule making” within the meaning of Section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed subject to the provisions of Section 553 delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

By the Commission.

Jonathan G. Katz
Secretary

Attachment