

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Anonymous

Last Name: Anonymous

Mailing Address: 333575 Georgia Atlanta Station

City: Atlanta

Country: United States

State or Province: GA

ZIP/Postal Code: 30332

Email Address: null

Organization Name: null

Comment: I want to be able to control what software to put on my devices. I do not approve of this proposed rule.

I want to be able to control what software to put on my devices. I do not approve of this proposed rule.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Anthony

Last Name: Coleman

Mailing Address: 2441 Wine Ridge Dr

City: Birmingham

Country: United States

State or Province: AL

ZIP/Postal Code: 35244

Email Address: anthony.coleman@gamil.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Why prevent us from modifying items that WE LEGALLY OWN??

This goes against free property rights and is not american.

Why prevent us from modifying items that WE LEGALLY OWN??

This goes against free property rights and is not american.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Walter

Last Name: Seme

Mailing Address: 16 Tower Rd

City: Martinsville

Country: United States

State or Province: NJ

ZIP/Postal Code: 08836

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Dear FCC,

Please DO NOT pass this proposed rule. This is a terrible rule for the freedom of the Internet and the security of American citizens. By not allowing individuals to install the software they want, American citizens will be restricted and vulnerable to more software exploits. If everyone is using the same software and a bug exists, then more people will be exposed to that bug. This rule is also putting a monopoly on the software that is received. Like Internet Service Providers, monopoly's do not have the interest in the consumer. Lastly, there is no way to enforce this law. If an individual physically controls a device, they will do what ever they want with it and there is no way that this can be changed. Even with security measures in place, if there is a flaw in the router software, then it will be exploited.

A better alternative than this rule would be make router and wifi devices more secure and transparent with what the devices are doing. This also includes exposing the 'super cookies' and tracking that is being done that Internet Services Providers are known to do. One way this could be done is to make the software Open Source so it could be criticized and reviewed by multiple groups and individuals to ensure such devices are secure and not prone to misuse. That is the world that will make American citizens safe and secure from improper use and ensure that these wifi devices and routers are updated and maintained properly. But that is NOT what this rule is proposing.

Please DO NOT pass this rule.

Dear FCC,

Please DO NOT pass this proposed rule. This is a terrible rule for the freedom of the Internet and the security of American citizens. By not allowing individuals to install the software they want, American citizens will be restricted and vulnerable to more software exploits. If everyone is using the same software and a bug exists, then more people will be exposed to that bug. This rule is also putting a monopoly on the software that is received. Like Internet Service Providers, monopoly's do not have the interest in the consumer. Lastly, there is no way to enforce this law. If an individual physically controls a device, they will do what ever they want with it and there is no way that this can be changed. Even with security measures in place, if there is a flaw in the router software, then it will be exploited.

A better alternative than this rule would be make router and wifi devices more secure and transparent with what the devices are doing. This also includes exposing the 'super cookies' and tracking that is being done that Internet Services Providers are known to do. One way this could be done is to make the software Open Source so it could be criticized and reviewed by multiple groups and individuals to ensure such devices are secure and not prone to misuse. That is the world that will make American citizens safe and secure from improper use and ensure that these wifi devices and routers

are updated and maintained properly. But that is NOT what this rule is proposing.

Please DO NOT pass this rule.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Steve

Last Name: Marks

Mailing Address: Valley Road

City: Waterbury

Country: United States

State or Province: CT

ZIP/Postal Code: 06770

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: If this passes, the FCC could have the ability to...

1. Restrict installation of alternative operating systems on your PC, like GNU/Linux, OpenBSD, FreeBSD, etc.
2. Prevent research into advanced wireless technologies, like mesh networking and bufferbloat fixes
3. Ban installation of custom firmware on your Android phone
4. Discourage the development of alternative free and open source WiFi firmware, like OpenWrt
5. Infringe upon the ability of amateur radio operators to create high powered mesh networks to assist emergency personnel in a disaster.
6. Prevent resellers from installing firmware on routers, such as for retail WiFi hotspots or VPNs, without agreeing to any condition a manufacturer so chooses.

If this passes, the FCC could have the ability to...

1. Restrict installation of alternative operating systems on your PC, like GNU/Linux, OpenBSD, FreeBSD, etc.
2. Prevent research into advanced wireless technologies, like mesh networking and bufferbloat fixes
3. Ban installation of custom firmware on your Android phone
4. Discourage the development of alternative free and open source WiFi firmware, like OpenWrt
5. Infringe upon the ability of amateur radio operators to create high powered mesh networks to assist emergency personnel in a disaster.
6. Prevent resellers from installing firmware on routers, such as for retail WiFi hotspots or VPNs, without agreeing to any condition a manufacturer so chooses.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Rudy

Last Name: Klecka

Mailing Address: 13210 Madrone Mountain Way

City: Austin

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 78737

Email Address: rudy\_klecka@email.com

Organization Name: null

Comment: Please do not implement rules that take away the ability of users to install the software of their choosing on their computing devices. I work for a major manufacturer of such devices and even I install my own modified software on them.

The Open Source community has shown time and again its usefulness to both security and general functionality and the passage of this will most certainly kill such communities.

Please do not implement rules that take away the ability of users to install the software of their choosing on their computing devices. I work for a major manufacturer of such devices and even I install my own modified software on them.

The Open Source community has shown time and again its usefulness to both security and general functionality and the passage of this will most certainly kill such communities.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Anonymous

Last Name: Anonymous

Mailing Address: Anonymous

City: Anonymous

Country: United States

State or Province: WI

ZIP/Postal Code: Anonymous

Email Address: null

Organization Name: null

Comment: Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

It is with great concern that I write you today regarding the latest proposal to restrict free use and research by private citizens of alternative wireless and computing systems.

The ability for private citizens alongside, but not in conjunction with, federally approved researchers to conduct their own research and use of any and all methods of electronic communication is paramount to the future progress of technological advancement of this very necessary field of technology.

On the subject of liberty it is not at all acceptable that, given we live in a free society, our use of technology should be dependent upon federal approval of certain manufacturer's technology nor should our separate but intersecting third party devices be limited by some arbitrarily concocted regulations. It is not within the federal government's powers or mandate to codify specific software and hardware solely on the basis that it lies outside standard mainstream consumer products. Further, information security is paramount in today's world and often alternative operating systems offer a higher degree of internal systems security not found in most popular and conventional forms of consumer products. The FCC could find itself in quite a precarious position should a large number of citizens find their data in the hands of unscrupulous individuals which could have been averted were they able to use alternative technology systems but were denied due to the FCC's own regulatory measures.

Americans must also be able to secure their own data when the companies we rely on abstain from patching their own security flaws. That the FCC would be considering a proposal which could leave private citizens at the mercy of individuals operating outside the boundaries of the law is worrisome to say the least and in the past it has often been the case that privacy gaps and security flaws in wireless hardware which transmits sensitive data has been fixed as a result of the efforts of private individuals. This and many similar actions would be banned under the NPRM.

The FCC may also run afoul of the First Amendment to the Constitution by limiting those citizens who seek to use alternative methods and hardware to transmit wireless data as a matter of political principals and the desire to express political dissent through legitimate consumption practices. The NPRM would stifle this very legitimate speech, protected under the First Amendment, and may find itself on the wrong side of Constitutional Law and Supreme Court precedent.

I hope my words have not been met by deaf ears and the Federal Communications Commission takes seriously the implications of this very dangerous precedent being set should this regulatory measure come into effect. I am confident in the FCC's ability to make the right choice by setting aside this regulatory measure and hanging it up in the "extremely

bad" category of regulatory ideas.

Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

It is with great concern that I write you today regarding the latest proposal to restrict free use and research by private citizens of alternative wireless and computing systems.

The ability for private citizens alongside, but not in conjunction with, federally approved researchers to conduct their own research and use of any and all methods of electronic communication is paramount to the future progress of technological advancement of this very necessary field of technology.

On the subject of liberty it is not at all acceptable that, given we live in a free society, our use of technology should be dependent upon federal approval of certain manufacturer's technology nor should our separate but intersecting third party devices be limited by some arbitrarily concocted regulations. It is not within the federal government's powers or mandate to codify specific software and hardware solely on the basis that it lies outside standard mainstream consumer products. Further, information security is paramount in today's world and often alternative operating systems offer a higher degree of internal systems security not found in most popular and conventional forms of consumer products. The FCC could find itself in quite a precarious position should a large number of citizens find their data in the hands of unscrupulous individuals which could have been averted were they able to use alternative technology systems but were denied due to the FCC's own regulatory measures.

Americans must also be able to secure their own data when the companies we rely on abstain from patching their own security flaws. That the FCC would be considering a proposal which could leave private citizens at the mercy of individuals operating outside the boundaries of the law is worrisome to say the least and in the past it has often been the case that privacy gaps and security flaws in wireless hardware which transmits sensitive data has been fixed as a result of the efforts of private individuals. This and many similar actions would be banned under the NPRM.

The FCC may also run afoul of the First Amendment to the Constitution by limiting those citizens who seek to use alternative methods and hardware to transmit wireless data as a matter of political principals and the desire to express political dissent through legitimate consumption practices. The NPRM would stifle this very legitimate speech, protected under the First Amendment, and may find itself on the wrong side of Constitutional Law and Supreme Court precedent.

I hope my words have not been met by deaf ears and the Federal Communications Commission takes seriously the implications of this very dangerous precedent being set should this regulatory measure come into effect. I am confident in the FCC's ability to make the right choice by setting aside this regulatory measure and hanging it up in the "extremely bad" category of regulatory ideas.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Chase

Last Name: Weddle

Mailing Address: 10 West Raccoon Ridge

City: Sylva

Country: United States

State or Province: NC

ZIP/Postal Code: 27998

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

It is with great concern that I write you today regarding the latest proposal to restrict free use and research by private citizens of alternative wireless and computing systems.

The ability for private citizens alongside, but not in conjunction with, federally approved researchers to conduct their own research and use of any and all methods of electronic communication is paramount to the future progress of technological advancement of this very necessary field of technology.

On the subject of liberty it is not at all acceptable that, given we live in a free society, our use of technology should be dependent upon federal approval of certain manufacturer's technology nor should our separate but intersecting third party devices be limited by some arbitrarily concocted regulations. It is not within the federal government's powers or mandate to codify specific software and hardware solely on the basis that it lies outside standard mainstream consumer products. Further, information security is paramount in today's world and often alternative operating systems offer a higher degree of internal systems security not found in most popular and conventional forms of consumer products. The FCC could find itself in quite a precarious position should a large number of citizens find their data in the hands of unscrupulous individuals which could have been averted were they able to use alternative technology systems but were denied due to the FCC's own regulatory measures.

Americans must also be able to secure their own data when the companies we rely on abstain from patching their own security flaws. That the FCC would be considering a proposal which could leave private citizens at the mercy of individuals operating outside the boundaries of the law is worrisome to say the least and in the past it has often been the case that privacy gaps and security flaws in wireless hardware which transmits sensitive data has been fixed as a result of the efforts of private individuals. This and many similar actions would be banned under the NPRM.

The FCC may also run afoul of the First Amendment to the Constitution by limiting those citizens who seek to use alternative methods and hardware to transmit wireless data as a matter of political principals and the desire to express political dissent through legitimate consumption practices. The NPRM would stifle this very legitimate speech, protected under the First Amendment, and may find itself on the wrong side of Constitutional Law and Supreme Court precedent.

I hope my words have not been met by deaf ears and the Federal Communications Commission takes seriously the implications of this very dangerous precedent being set should this regulatory measure come into effect. I am confident in the FCC's ability to make the right choice by setting aside this regulatory measure and hanging it up in the "extremely

bad" category of regulatory ideas.

Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

It is with great concern that I write you today regarding the latest proposal to restrict free use and research by private citizens of alternative wireless and computing systems.

The ability for private citizens alongside, but not in conjunction with, federally approved researchers to conduct their own research and use of any and all methods of electronic communication is paramount to the future progress of technological advancement of this very necessary field of technology.

On the subject of liberty it is not at all acceptable that, given we live in a free society, our use of technology should be dependent upon federal approval of certain manufacturer's technology nor should our separate but intersecting third party devices be limited by some arbitrarily concocted regulations. It is not within the federal government's powers or mandate to codify specific software and hardware solely on the basis that it lies outside standard mainstream consumer products. Further, information security is paramount in today's world and often alternative operating systems offer a higher degree of internal systems security not found in most popular and conventional forms of consumer products. The FCC could find itself in quite a precarious position should a large number of citizens find their data in the hands of unscrupulous individuals which could have been averted were they able to use alternative technology systems but were denied due to the FCC's own regulatory measures.

Americans must also be able to secure their own data when the companies we rely on abstain from patching their own security flaws. That the FCC would be considering a proposal which could leave private citizens at the mercy of individuals operating outside the boundaries of the law is worrisome to say the least and in the past it has often been the case that privacy gaps and security flaws in wireless hardware which transmits sensitive data has been fixed as a result of the efforts of private individuals. This and many similar actions would be banned under the NPRM.

The FCC may also run afoul of the First Amendment to the Constitution by limiting those citizens who seek to use alternative methods and hardware to transmit wireless data as a matter of political principals and the desire to express political dissent through legitimate consumption practices. The NPRM would stifle this very legitimate speech, protected under the First Amendment, and may find itself on the wrong side of Constitutional Law and Supreme Court precedent.

I hope my words have not been met by deaf ears and the Federal Communications Commission takes seriously the implications of this very dangerous precedent being set should this regulatory measure come into effect. I am confident in the FCC's ability to make the right choice by setting aside this regulatory measure and hanging it up in the "extremely bad" category of regulatory ideas.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Sean

Last Name: Kerr

Mailing Address: 167 S Lexington St

City: St Augustine

Country: United States

State or Province: FL

ZIP/Postal Code: 32084

Email Address: skerr.sa@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I understand the background reasons for adding rules to govern software on wifi signal devices, however this category is entirely too broad. I am vehemently opposed to the (hopefully) unintended consequences. Such as the prevention of changing operating systems, adding operating systems, and generally modifying software on pc's, phones, and tablets. Please reconsider as this restricts personal freedom and freedom of innovation.

I understand the background reasons for adding rules to govern software on wifi signal devices, however this category is entirely too broad. I am vehemently opposed to the (hopefully) unintended consequences. Such as the prevention of changing operating systems, adding operating systems, and generally modifying software on pc's, phones, and tablets. Please reconsider as this restricts personal freedom and freedom of innovation.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Joseph

Last Name: Maziar

Mailing Address: 846 W Armitage Ave

City: Chicago

Country: United States

State or Province: IL

ZIP/Postal Code: 60614

Email Address: jmaziar3@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

It is with great concern that I write you today regarding the latest proposal to restrict free use and research by private citizens of alternative wireless and computing systems.

The ability for private citizens alongside, but not in conjunction with, federally approved researchers to conduct their own research and use of any and all methods of electronic communication is paramount to the future progress of technological advancement of this very necessary field of technology.

On the subject of liberty it is not at all acceptable that, given we live in a free society, our use of technology should be dependent upon federal approval of certain manufacturer's technology nor should our separate but intersecting third party devices be limited by some arbitrarily concocted regulations. It is not within the federal government's powers or mandate to codify specific software and hardware solely on the basis that it lies outside standard mainstream consumer products. Further, information security is paramount in today's world and often alternative operating systems offer a higher degree of internal systems security not found in most popular and conventional forms of consumer products. The FCC could find itself in quite a precarious position should a large number of citizens find their data in the hands of unscrupulous individuals which could have been averted were they able to use alternative technology systems but were denied due to the FCC's own regulatory measures.

Americans must also be able to secure their own data when the companies we rely on abstain from patching their own security flaws. That the FCC would be considering a proposal which could leave private citizens at the mercy of individuals operating outside the boundaries of the law is worrisome to say the least and in the past it has often been the case that privacy gaps and security flaws in wireless hardware which transmits sensitive data has been fixed as a result of the efforts of private individuals. This and many similar actions would be banned under the NPRM.

The FCC may also run afoul of the First Amendment to the Constitution by limiting those citizens who seek to use alternative methods and hardware to transmit wireless data as a matter of political principals and the desire to express political dissent through legitimate consumption practices. The NPRM would stifle this very legitimate speech, protected under the First Amendment, and may find itself on the wrong side of Constitutional Law and Supreme Court precedent.

I hope my words have not been met by deaf ears and the Federal Communications Commission takes seriously the implications of this very dangerous precedent being set should this regulatory measure come into effect. I am confident in the FCC's ability to make the right choice by setting aside this regulatory measure and hanging it up in the "extremely bad" category of regulatory ideas.

Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

It is with great concern that I write you today regarding the latest proposal to restrict free use and research by private citizens of alternative wireless and computing systems.

The ability for private citizens alongside, but not in conjunction with, federally approved researchers to conduct their

own research and use of any and all methods of electronic communication is paramount to the future progress of technological advancement of this very necessary field of technology.

On the subject of liberty it is not at all acceptable that, given we live in a free society, our use of technology should be dependent upon federal approval of certain manufacturer's technology nor should our separate but intersecting third party devices be limited by some arbitrarily concocted regulations. It is not within the federal government's powers or mandate to codify specific software and hardware solely on the basis that it lies outside standard mainstream consumer products. Further, information security is paramount in today's world and often alternative operating systems offer a higher degree of internal systems security not found in most popular and conventional forms of consumer products. The FCC could find itself in quite a precarious position should a large number of citizens find their data in the hands of unscrupulous individuals which could have been averted were they able to use alternative technology systems but were denied due to the FCC's own regulatory measures.

Americans must also be able to secure their own data when the companies we rely on abstain from patching their own security flaws. That the FCC would be considering a proposal which could leave private citizens at the mercy of individuals operating outside the boundaries of the law is worrisome to say the least and in the past it has often been the case that privacy gaps and security flaws in wireless hardware which transmits sensitive data has been fixed as a result of the efforts of private individuals. This and many similar actions would be banned under the NPRM.

The FCC may also run afoul of the First Amendment to the Constitution by limiting those citizens who seek to use alternative methods and hardware to transmit wireless data as a matter of political principals and the desire to express political dissent through legitimate consumption practices. The NPRM would stifle this very legitimate speech, protected under the First Amendment, and may find itself on the wrong side of Constitutional Law and Supreme Court precedent.

I hope my words have not been met by deaf ears and the Federal Communications Commission takes seriously the implications of this very dangerous precedent being set should this regulatory measure come into effect. I am confident in the FCC's ability to make the right choice by setting aside this regulatory measure and hanging it up in the "extremely bad" category of regulatory ideas.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Walter

Last Name: Stern

Mailing Address: 320 Smith Ave Apt 3

City: Montevideo

Country: United States

State or Province: MN

ZIP/Postal Code: 56265

Email Address: waldo686@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I'm here because I read this article:

"The FCC wants to prevent you from installing custom firmware/OSs on routers and other devices with WiFi. This will also prevent you from installing GNU/Linux, BSD, Hackintosh, etc. on PCs"

That is some BS, and this proposed rule is way outta line

I'm here because I read this article:

"The FCC wants to prevent you from installing custom firmware/OSs on routers and other devices with WiFi. This will also prevent you from installing GNU/Linux, BSD, Hackintosh, etc. on PCs"

That is some BS, and this proposed rule is way outta line

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Anonymous

Last Name: Anonymous

Mailing Address: Nope

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

State or Province: Canterbury

ZIP/Postal Code: 8062

Email Address: null

Organization Name: null

Comment: Please don't do this

Please don't do this

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: David

Last Name: Youngquist

Mailing Address: 1214 Clinton Ave.

City: Des Moines

Country: United States

State or Province: IA

ZIP/Postal Code: 50313

Email Address: null

Organization Name: null

Comment: I LOVE my DD-WRT modified router. I run a secure home network that bothers NONE of my neighbors. You regulators should stop needlessly bothering good US citizens and do something useful. You should be working to stop the monopoly of wealthy corporate control of citizen's radio airwaves.

I LOVE my DD-WRT modified router. I run a secure home network that bothers NONE of my neighbors. You regulators should stop needlessly bothering good US citizens and do something useful. You should be working to stop the monopoly of wealthy corporate control of citizen's radio airwaves.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Jim

Last Name: Salter

Mailing Address: 1005 Natchez Trail

City: West Columbia

Country: United States

State or Province: SC

ZIP/Postal Code: 29169

Email Address: federalregister@jrs-s.net

Organization Name: JRS Systems LLC

Comment: Please do not implement this regulation as it is described.

Requiring manufacturers to "lock down" devices containing a transceiver would have grave unintended side effects on the marketplace and in the freedom of American citizens.

Manufacturers of routers and wireless bridges frequently leave their devices "abandoned" in terms of software and security updates, very nearly from the moment they are sold. Currently, consumers have the option and ability to fix these issues with open source firmware; this regulation would take away that freedom.

Further, and even more troubling, it would make it legally impossible to install Linux, BSD, or other free and open source operating systems on many if not most general purpose PCs and other computing devices. This would have SEVERE impact on the economy, as these operating systems form the backbone of all internet services, and most internet professionals - and students who will eventually become professionals learn and grow by using these operating systems on their own devices.

Please do not implement this regulation as it is described.

Requiring manufacturers to "lock down" devices containing a transceiver would have grave unintended side effects on the marketplace and in the freedom of American citizens.

Manufacturers of routers and wireless bridges frequently leave their devices "abandoned" in terms of software and security updates, very nearly from the moment they are sold. Currently, consumers have the option and ability to fix these issues with open source firmware; this regulation would take away that freedom.

Further, and even more troubling, it would make it legally impossible to install Linux, BSD, or other free and open source operating systems on many if not most general purpose PCs and other computing devices. This would have SEVERE impact on the economy, as these operating systems form the backbone of all internet services, and most internet professionals - and students who will eventually become professionals learn and grow by using these operating systems on their own devices.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Isaiah

Last Name: Soul

Mailing Address: 281 Lexwood Dr

City: Woodville

Country: United States

State or Province: AL

ZIP/Postal Code: 35776

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: The actions proposed in this rule are far too restrictive to American consumers and should not be enacted.

The actions proposed in this rule are far too restrictive to American consumers and should not be enacted.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Schwaller

Mailing Address: 3225 W 25th St.

City: Lawrence

Country: United States

State or Province: KS

ZIP/Postal Code: 66047

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: While updating the certification and authorization of transmitting devices is important, changes that would inhibit endusers from modifying their electronics in legitimate ways would be detrimental to consumers. This includes installing new operating systems on to home computers, tablets, cellular phones, routers, etc.

While updating the certification and authorization of transmitting devices is important, changes that would inhibit endusers from modifying their electronics in legitimate ways would be detrimental to consumers. This includes installing new operating systems on to home computers, tablets, cellular phones, routers, etc.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Get

Last Name: Rekt

Mailing Address: 1234 rekt rd

City: seattle

Country: United States

State or Province: OR

ZIP/Postal Code: 98101

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Dont be a dick and dont do this you dummies

Restrict installation of alternative operating systems on your PC, like GNU/Linux, OpenBSD, FreeBSD, etc.

Prevent research into advanced wireless technologies, like mesh networking and bufferbloat fixes

Ban installation of custom firmware on your Android phone

Discourage the development of alternative free and open source WiFi firmware, like OpenWrt

Infringe upon the ability of amateur radio operators to create high powered mesh networks to assist emergency personnel in a disaster.

Prevent resellers from installing firmware on routers, such as for retail WiFi hotspots or VPNs, without agreeing to any condition a manufacturer so chooses.

Dont be a dick and dont do this you dummies

Restrict installation of alternative operating systems on your PC, like GNU/Linux, OpenBSD, FreeBSD, etc.

Prevent research into advanced wireless technologies, like mesh networking and bufferbloat fixes

Ban installation of custom firmware on your Android phone

Discourage the development of alternative free and open source WiFi firmware, like OpenWrt

Infringe upon the ability of amateur radio operators to create high powered mesh networks to assist emergency personnel in a disaster.

Prevent resellers from installing firmware on routers, such as for retail WiFi hotspots or VPNs, without agreeing to any condition a manufacturer so chooses.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Simon

Last Name: Dedman

Mailing Address: 234 Sycamore Street

City: San Carlos

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 94070

Email Address: simondedman@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Please do not allow this rights-violating law to pass, it's ridiculous. Thank you.

Please do not allow this rights-violating law to pass, it's ridiculous. Thank you.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Austin

Last Name: Savage

Mailing Address: 55 Sea Park Blvd Apt 405

City: Satellite Beach

Country: United States

State or Province: FL

ZIP/Postal Code: 32937-2261

Email Address: finfan321@yahoo.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Please consider the lives this will affect. My personal hobby is installing and tinkering with computers and this will mess that up. Please don't pass this, I beg you.

Please consider the lives this will affect. My personal hobby is installing and tinkering with computers and this will mess that up. Please don't pass this, I beg you.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Jeremy

Last Name: Mill

Mailing Address: 155 west main street, Apt 420

City: vernon

Country: United States

State or Province: CT

ZIP/Postal Code: 06066

Email Address: jeremymill@gmail.com

Organization Name: LivingInSyn

Comment: I believe that this is not a good rule. This action can stifle innovation, and freedom for the sole purpose of preventing something which is at most, a minor problem. Owners of a device should OWN their devices, and be free to do with them as they wish inside of the laws and regulations of the FCC.

I believe that this is not a good rule. This action can stifle innovation, and freedom for the sole purpose of preventing something which is at most, a minor problem. Owners of a device should OWN their devices, and be free to do with them as they wish inside of the laws and regulations of the FCC.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Theodore

Last Name: Rolle

Mailing Address: 1298 Old Clyde Rd, Apt E6

City: Clyde

Country: United States

State or Province: NC

ZIP/Postal Code: 28721

Email Address: TheodoreMRolle@students.abtech.edu

Organization Name:

Comment: I would like to respectfully request that the FCC not enact any laws that would prevent end users from installing their own software on wireless devices. The ability of end users to modify software on devices they own is very important for research, and allows end users to update or patch bugs and security holes in firmware that is no longer in active development by the manufacturer.

I would like to respectfully request that the FCC not enact any laws that would prevent end users from installing their own software on wireless devices. The ability of end users to modify software on devices they own is very important for research, and allows end users to update or patch bugs and security holes in firmware that is no longer in active development by the manufacturer.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices:=====

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Logan

Last Name: Skrzypczak

Mailing Address: PSC 1 Box 4066

City: APO AE

Country: United States

State or Province: NY

ZIP/Postal Code: 09009

Email Address: LoganDS@Outlook.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

It is with great concern that I write you today regarding the latest proposal to restrict free use and research by private citizens of alternative wireless and computing systems.

The ability for private citizens alongside, but not in conjunction with, federally approved researchers to conduct their own research and use of any and all methods of electronic communication is paramount to the future progress of technological advancement of this very necessary field of technology.

On the subject of liberty it is not at all acceptable that, given we live in a free society, our use of technology should be dependent upon federal approval of certain manufacturer's technology nor should our separate but intersecting third party devices be limited by some arbitrarily concocted regulations. It is not within the federal government's powers or mandate to codify specific software and hardware solely on the basis that it lies outside standard mainstream consumer products. Further, information security is paramount in today's world and often alternative operating systems offer a higher degree of internal systems security not found in most popular and conventional forms of consumer products. The FCC could find itself in quite a precarious position should a large number of citizens find their data in the hands of unscrupulous individuals which could have been averted were they able to use alternative technology systems but were denied due to the FCC's own regulatory measures.

Americans must also be able to secure their own data when the companies we rely on abstain from patching their own security flaws. That the FCC would be considering a proposal which could leave private citizens at the mercy of individuals operating outside the boundaries of the law is worrisome to say the least and in the past it has often been the case that privacy gaps and security flaws in wireless hardware which transmits sensitive data has been fixed as a result of the efforts of private individuals. This and many similar actions would be banned under the NPRM.

The FCC may also run afoul of the First Amendment to the Constitution by limiting those citizens who seek to use alternative methods and hardware to transmit wireless data as a matter of political principals and the desire to express political dissent through legitimate consumption practices. The NPRM would stifle this very legitimate speech, protected under the First Amendment, and may find itself on the wrong side of Constitutional Law and Supreme Court precedent.

I hope my words have not been met by deaf ears and the Federal Communications Commission takes seriously the implications of this very dangerous precedent being set should this regulatory measure come into effect. I am confident in the FCC's ability to make the right choice by setting aside this regulatory measure and hanging it up in the "extremely

bad" category of regulatory ideas.

Bullet Points Below:

- Wireless networking research depends on the ability of researchers to investigate and modify their devices.
- Americans need the ability to fix security holes in their devices when the manufacturer chooses to not do so.
- Users have in the past fixed serious bugs in their wifi drivers, which would be banned under the NPRM.
- Billions of dollars of commerce, such as secure wifi vendors, retail hotspot vendors, depends on the ability of users and companies to install the software of their choosing.
- Mesh networking which helps first responders in emergencies, also helps provide anonymity, creates a backup/alternative communications network, will become more difficult than it needs to be with these new rules.
- Users should be able to manipulate and control all aspects of their devices.
- The ability to run fully open source software on your devices will be severely hampered and possibly impossible with these new rules.
- These new rules will make it extremely difficult if not illegal, to make an open source baseband for cellphones to prevent rogue towers like Stingrays. It will also harm any attempts to build open source cell towers and systems.

Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

It is with great concern that I write you today regarding the latest proposal to restrict free use and research by private citizens of alternative wireless and computing systems.

The ability for private citizens alongside, but not in conjunction with, federally approved researchers to conduct their own research and use of any and all methods of electronic communication is paramount to the future progress of technological advancement of this very necessary field of technology.

On the subject of liberty it is not at all acceptable that, given we live in a free society, our use of technology should be dependent upon federal approval of certain manufacturer's technology nor should our separate but intersecting third party devices be limited by some arbitrarily concocted regulations. It is not within the federal government's powers or mandate to codify specific software and hardware solely on the basis that it lies outside standard mainstream consumer products. Further, information security is paramount in today's world and often alternative operating systems offer a higher degree of internal systems security not found in most popular and conventional forms of consumer products. The FCC could find itself in quite a precarious position should a large number of citizens find their data in the hands of unscrupulous individuals which could have been averted were they able to use alternative technology systems but were denied due to the FCC's own regulatory measures.

Americans must also be able to secure their own data when the companies we rely on abstain from patching their own security flaws. That the FCC would be considering a proposal which could leave private citizens at the mercy of individuals operating outside the boundaries of the law is worrisome to say the least and in the past it has often been the case that privacy gaps and security flaws in wireless hardware which transmits sensitive data has been fixed as a result of the efforts of private individuals. This and many similar actions would be banned under the NPRM.

The FCC may also run afoul of the First Amendment to the Constitution by limiting those citizens who seek to use alternative methods and hardware to transmit wireless data as a matter of political principals and the desire to express political dissent through legitimate consumption practices. The NPRM would stifle this very legitimate speech, protected under the First Amendment, and may find itself on the wrong side of Constitutional Law and Supreme Court precedent.

I hope my words have not been met by deaf ears and the Federal Communications Commission takes seriously the implications of this very dangerous precedent being set should this regulatory measure come into effect. I am confident in the FCC's ability to make the right choice by setting aside this regulatory measure and hanging it up in the "extremely bad" category of regulatory ideas.

Bullet Points Below: