

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: Ahron

Last Name: Darnell

Mailing Address: 35 Crandon Blvd uppr

City: Cheektowaga

Country: United States

State or Province: NY

ZIP/Postal Code: 14225

Email Address: ahron@tcotu.net

Organization Name: Hospice Buffalo

Comment: I urge you to reject these rules. I've been in the IT industry for over a decade and the modifications this will prevent are essential to fixing serious problems. There have been an uncountable number of situations where I and others have had to modify firmware using community based open alternatives that promote software innovation and competition.

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: Aidan

Last Name: Lawrence

Mailing Address: 1971 Livingston St

City: Riverside

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 92506

Email Address: Aidan.lawrence34@gmail

Organization Name:

Comment: This should absolutely NOT pass. Consumers should be free to modify their electronic purchases no matter what. With how common radio frequency devices are in modern electronics, preventing any modifications to said electronics would simply be ludicrous. This harms the consumer and is only good for greedy corporations.

Do not support.

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: Samantha

Last Name: Fialko

Mailing Address: 411 Sherman Street

City: Middleville

Country: United States

State or Province: MI

ZIP/Postal Code: 49333

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: This is not okay to restrict personal freedom of installation on wifi. This is not a governmental issue and should be left to the private sector.

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: Karl

Last Name: Larsson

Mailing Address: 11403 3rd St N

City: Saint Petersburg

Country: United States

State or Province: FL

ZIP/Postal Code: 33716

Email Address: adrianklarsson@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: This goes against the fundamental STEM educational core, CS and EE studies, hobbyists, amateur radio operators, tons of learning opportunities will be gone.

Windows, linux and osx would not exist if these rules were enforced 30 years ago. We have literally built our society on open computing.

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: Nathaniel

Last Name: Rinehart

Mailing Address: 1723 Shorewell Drive

City: High Point

Country: United States

State or Province: NC

ZIP/Postal Code: 27260

Email Address: nathsters@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: It is in my personal interest and many of others' like mine that you not pass this rule. It prevents technology enthusiasts from being able to easily install drivers for other operating systems and being able to freely install whatever I want to my android device. Please I beg of you all to not pass this.

Thanks for reading.

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: Sasha

Last Name: Limarev

Mailing Address: varagor@gmail.com

City: Haifa

Country: Israel

State or Province: Haifa

ZIP/Postal Code: 3313311

Email Address: varagor@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: This is a terrible idea that will hurt innovation in the mobile space. Please, don't do it.

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: Sam

Last Name: Stuewe

Mailing Address: 1702 Laurel Ave.; Apt 7

City: Saint Paul

Country: United States

State or Province: MN

ZIP/Postal Code: 55104

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: I would like to respectfully ask the FCC to cease all attempts to restrict consumer choice. In particular, this proposal would likely cause many people (myself included) to avoid purchasing any new technology covered by the proposal at all since very few, if any, of the devices on the market come pre-setup to my liking.

In fact, restricting the installation of Free Software does not just hinder consumer choice, it detracts general security, causes disproportionately negative outcomes for those that cannot afford proprietary software, and stifles free expression (as a developer that actively works on Free Software, the notion that the ability for me to continue my work might be hindered many of my projects will only run under the operating systems that will be restricted by this proposal is deeply distressing).

Please do not accept this proposal, and consider taking a hard-line stance against further encroachment upon consumer freedom.

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: Gary

Last Name: Cameron

Mailing Address: 42 Oakdale Crt. Kitchener, Ontario

City: Kitchener, Ontario

Country: Canada

State or Province: Ontario

ZIP/Postal Code: N2P 2S9

Email Address: gfcameron@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Requiring the "lockdown" on computing devices with a radio component will effectively destroy a large number of useful open source projects and prevent people from extending hardware features or new protocols beyond what the manufacturer chooses to support. This will result in:

- i) A lot of useful hardware ending up in landfill because the manufacturer does not choose to support it and would rather customers purchase new equipment
- ii) A lot of excellent open source projects such a Tomato router, DD-Wrt, and open source android being shut down
- iii) Very useful apps such as cellular range extenders being killed off.

I am not a US citizen, but what happens in the US will inevitably happen in other countries as well.

Please do not contemplate this. We should be moving away from a locked down future, that is exactly the wrong direction to go.

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: John

Last Name: Milton

Mailing Address: 1600 Penn Ave.

City: Washington, DC

Country: United States

State or Province: DC

ZIP/Postal Code: 50183

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: This proposed rule is a threat to liberty and anonymity on the web. Controlling and locking down devices will only hurt sales.

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: Matthew

Last Name: Troia

Mailing Address: 735 Belmont Ave E

City: Seattle

Country: United States

State or Province: WA

ZIP/Postal Code: 98102

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Disagree with your proposed action. Locked down hardware is a security risk to the end user. The proposal is too extreme for your goals. If someone that creates firmware that violates FCC rules, than the FCC should prosecute that individual or entity. Making is illegal to make any firmware changes to devices that I own infringes on my freedoms and puts me at risk. Do not pass this measure.

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: Marcus

Last Name: Tobey

Mailing Address: 1060

City: RANCHO CORDOVA

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 95670

Email Address: pedruin_1@yahoo.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I oppose this rule change. I feel it limits what the end user is able to do with the devices they pay for.

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: Joshua

Last Name: Hoffer

Mailing Address: 9429 South East Cherry Creek Road

City: Franktown

Country: United States

State or Province: CO

ZIP/Postal Code: 80116

Email Address: hoffer.joshua@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I strongly disagree the FCC's decision to regulate the software consumers can run on wireless devices. Many open source products including openwrt, ddwrt and more represent a community effort built upon the work and collaboration of volunteers around the globe. These communities strive to improve the software running on everyday routers due to "stock" firmwares often being poorly designed and using old and vulnerable software versions. Manufacturers have benefited from these open source pursuits and often incorporate open source code in their official firmware such as Asus's use of code from the Tomato open source firmware.

The FCC's proposed requirement to require security features to prevent the installation of "unauthorized" software would likely result in future routers being completely locked down as manufacturers will have no incentive to only lock down the radio controlling portion of the firmware.

While the FCC may fear the installation of unauthorized firmware will result in interference with radar and other technologies in the 5GHz band, only a small subset of users is inclined to install 3rd party firmware and do so for entirely different reasons such as adding features such as VPN, ad-blocking and others. The number of users installing custom firmware to use unauthorized frequency bands is miniscule and the number of users doing so and actually interfering with other wireless devices is even smaller (a user using unauthorized frequencies in a rural area isn't likely to interfere with any other devices anyway).

A better approach would be to assist these open source efforts by providing guidelines and tools for writing firmware and software compliant with the FCC's regulations.

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: Cadan

Last Name: Woolstencroft

Mailing Address: 10 Leacrest Road

City: Toronto

Country: Canada

State or Province: Ontario

ZIP/Postal Code: M4G 1E3

Email Address: cadanwool@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I believe that this should not be in place because I believe in the freedom of choice.

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: Glen

Last Name: Koppe

Mailing Address: 5102 Patricia Street

City: Bacliff

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 77518

Email Address: grkoppe@verizon.net

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.

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: lance

Last Name: cowart

Mailing Address: 9369 root dr

City: streetsboro

Country: United States

State or Province: OH

ZIP/Postal Code: 44241

Email Address: lance.k.cowart@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.

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: Craig

Last Name: Repoli

Mailing Address: 923 N Randolph St

City: Philadelphia

Country: United States

State or Province: PA

ZIP/Postal Code: 19123

Email Address: craig731@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: This is one of those rules you come across and wonder if anyone in authority has comprehension of the damage they are incurring on normal every day users.

Forcing a lockdown on devices like this will impact far more people than I believe the FCC realizes. Routers which have been unservicable by standard users, have been updated and made better performing and more secure for American citizens.

Phones, which the FCC have repeatedly shown should be able to be unlocked by users, will have that made impossible through separate laws as shown here.

In addition to citizens, this will impact small and medium sized businesses. As an IT director at a few companies, I have used open-sourced abilities that are currently allowed, to let businesses network function competitively. Being able to buy a consumer level router and upgrade it with the work of open-source developers, these small companies can spend a few hundred instead of a few thousand, for features that are simply behind a large-corporation paywall.

My current company used this to get on their feet, building a server and company room until we could afford more on spending.

I would ask the FCC be shown what damages to citizens of the United states and other countries this proposal is trying to address.

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: Stephen

Last Name: Stouffer

Mailing Address: 8401 Mud Creek road

City: Indianapolis

Country: United States

State or Province: IN

ZIP/Postal Code: 46256

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.

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: Eduardo

Last Name: Santiago

Mailing Address: 166 Navajo Rd

City: Los Alamos

Country: United States

State or Province: NM

ZIP/Postal Code: 87544

Email Address: fcc@edsantiago.com

Organization Name:

Comment: This proposal worries me. It is apt to be interpreted by manufacturers as "lock down the firmware", making it impossible for consumers to secure their own devices. Once a manufacturer releases a device, they have no incentive to release further security updates; to the contrary, they have every incentive *not* to do so, in order to force consumers to buy new equipment. Fortunately there are growing open-source communities providing secure, reliable upgrades for our three-year-old routers and cell phones and other devices. I encourage the Commission to reevaluate this proposal.

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: Taylor

Last Name: Mascia

Mailing Address: 3 Cherrywood Drive

City: Milford

Country: United States

State or Province: CT

ZIP/Postal Code: 06461

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.

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: Kyle

Last Name: Wadsworth

Mailing Address: 3191 yellowtail dr

City: Los Alamitos

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 90720

Email Address: kyle.a.wadsworth@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: This is an awful idea for many reasons:

- 1) Why the heck would non-US people buy US routers if they wanted to modify them? It will hurt business.
- 2) I purchased the device. I can modify software I buy, I can modify my computer I bought, why the heck can't I modify my router?
- 3) This is a huge threat to open source software, identity protection against doxxing, mesh nets, etc. Any benefits are not worth harming these.

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: Alec

Last Name: Jimenez

Mailing Address: 7562 Ellis ave apt B5

City: Huntington Beach

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 92648

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: This is, in no way a good idea. Limiting what people can do with their possessions in which they paid for is absurd. Please do not move along with 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: chris

Last Name: neglia

Mailing Address: 315 wolf mountain trail

City: hendersonville

Country: United States

State or Province: NC

ZIP/Postal Code: 28792

Email Address: negutron@gmail.com

Organization Name: dabo llc

Comment: It seems the FCC is trying to make decisions over personal electronics outside of the domains of 1) transmit power harm to individuals, 2) operation outside of the strict definitions of broadcast bands of electromagnetic communication, 3) obscenity over radio broadcasts. The FCC thus is acting outside of the domain over which it administers. In other words, the FCC is trying to 'assume power' they were never intended to have. My recommendation is that the FCC stop immediately this nonsense and go back their original charges. The FCC has never been, nor ever ought be a decision maker in the realm of software or electronics beyond ensuring their conformity to FCC rules regarding device signal strength levels.

The FCCs role has been to guard the invisible world of communication, in the air, in the sea, through the wires. The only limitations on speech that the FCC is allowed to impose are regarding radio broadcasts Now the FCC is trying to extend this control beyond that domain and I can assure you that is unconstitutional. Speech is protected. The FCC has never been nor never should be the ministry of speech over the internet.

By creating a federal rule to control firmware choices that can be put on a device by a user; on a device that was pre-certified at the factory to conform to all the FCC regulations in its operation, the FCC would be violating freedoms of speech and expression. I assert that 'liberties' and 'freedoms of speech and expression' are applicable here because: 'liberty' because I believe privacy is protected as a 'liberty', and 'speech/expression' because the possibility of remote deactivation software, speech filtering software, surveillance backdoors, ad-networks, botnets, security flaws, or any other forms of malware that exists on the device's stock firmware from the factory interferes with freedoms of speech.

We have a constitutionally protected right to remove firmware because of the mere possibility of 'unknown' software backdoors, security 'bugs', flaws or any other trappings of incompetent firmware designers from the companies who produce the hardware. It's a well known fact that these hardware companies do not write their own firmware. They contract this firmware out to foreign firms that rush the job and introduce problems. Futhermore, we have proof that the NSA has a subdivision of their org called TAO--tailored access operations--who have intercepted devices and placed 'backdoors' on them in order to be increasingly and very likely illegally-able to surveil their target. So there are 2 basic problems with stock firmware: 1) they have bugs, 2) they have potential 'intentional' insecure software. We have a right to remove these by putting in 3rd party software on our devices.

Again, FCC's job is to make sure the devices don't harm the user with broadcast power or harm equipment with communication signal strength. Again, these are certified by the factory, so why does the FCC think it has a role to play here? It does not. Therefore, I can only recommend the FCC cease and desist all manner of activity to this end, lest the FCC become irrelevant, untrustworthy and anti-citizen in the eyes of the public; a perception that will be very difficult to reverse in times of budgetary allocation decisions for the FCC.

Now shifting a bit to a different topic: why are you trying to do this? I think I know why. It's about KONTROL. It seems to me that there can be no other goal that this is attempting to accomplish other than to provide 'unfettered access' of the intelligence community to regular citizens's personal networks, illegally.

I believe intrusive surveillance is not only immoral, it ought be illegal if it isn't. Courts are actually deciding this now so the FCC may find itself on the wrong side of history (if not ethics) should it attempt to make a ruling in this matter.

Further, I believe the FCC's response should be like everyone else's in america: you should tell the CIA to do their actual job, stopping real terrorism instead of spying on the people they exist to protect. This means traditional police work: obtaining warrants, proving to a judge they have reason to suspect, etc. Catching 'real criminals'. The 99.99% of people they wish to surveil are not criminals.

Thank you for hearing my discussion on this matter. Take it seriously. Thanks again.

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: brandon

Last Name: schlichter

Mailing Address: 360 e. ohio st

City: circleville

Country: United States

State or Province: OH

ZIP/Postal Code: 43113

Email Address: brandonschlichter@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I am opposed to this legislation as it hinders the development and use of modified, legal devices by Americans. I am a licensed HAM radio operator and believe that this kind of law is extremely hazardous to the innovation of radio operators and programmers of this nation.

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: Kevin

Last Name: McGrath

Mailing Address: 525 4th Street SE

City: Washington

Country: United States

State or Province: DC

ZIP/Postal Code: 20003

Email Address: kp.mcgrath@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.

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: William

Last Name: Gray

Mailing Address: 1407 Webster St

City: Santa Cruz

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 95062

Email Address: wesleygray@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Please do not try to stop end users from modifying wireless devices. There is an important need for users such as myself to be able to upgrade and improve on the software running in wireless routers, among other things, to make them more secure because the companies making them often fail to do so. We also need to be able to add additional aftermarket security features to again, improve security.

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: Steven

Last Name: Veron

Mailing Address: 200 El Pinto Dr

City: Lumberton

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 77657

Email Address: steven.veron@gmail.com

Organization Name: Lamar University

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.

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: Levon

Last Name: Tamazyan

Mailing Address: Stoktstraat 19

City: Horst

Country: Netherlands

State or Province: NEDERLAND

ZIP/Postal Code: 5961TN

Email Address: Levontamazyan@hotmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment:

You will ruin technology like we know it and hold us back even more. Stop trying to make everything a damn business and for money and dont touch technology you dont understand.

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: Adam

Last Name: Gould

Mailing Address: 31150 North Park Drive

City: Farmington Hills

Country: United States

State or Province: MI

ZIP/Postal Code: 48331

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: You all think this is good? All I see here is stupidity. Locking down systems in this way will hinder the technology businesses in the United States. What is freedom to choose if you can't make our own choices? I understand needing regulation on certain frequencies to manage traffic, but 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz have been designated as frequencies that do not need licenses to use. Why are you now trying to change a system that has been in stable use for years? Not being able to modify computers, Wi-Fi routers, and personal cell phones? Congratulations, lots of tech support jobs in larger companies have become useless, unless corporations are going to be exempt, which is totally unfair. I strongly disagree with this plan of action. I hope the FCC realizes this plan is stupid, wrong, and expensive, and does not follow through with it.

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: Kolby

Last Name: Calhoun

Mailing Address: 14125 Canterbury Dr.

City: Edmond

Country: United States

State or Province: OK

ZIP/Postal Code: 73013

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: In regards to this proposed policy:

-This policy is designed in such a way that allows for vague interpretation(s) that do not correlate with the supposed purpose of the bill.

-Provisions here will not provide any benefit to the average consumer of these products, it does benefit a small portion of citizens in an unrepresentative manner.

-This will not be used in a manner that furthers citizen trust, faith, or approval in the current government.

Please do not consider this, it violates my desire and right to have privacy and to be forgotten.

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: ben

Last Name: Dimit

Mailing Address: 101 do not mail drive

City: place

Country: United States

State or Province: IA

ZIP/Postal Code: 51123

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: This is just wrong, the government and companies cannot keep taking away or rights to things that we own.
The people will not stand for 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: Thaddeus

Last Name: Tompkins

Mailing Address: 1734 Fairacres Ave.

City: Pittsburgh

Country: United States

State or Province: PA

ZIP/Postal Code: 15216

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Dear FCC,

From my point of view you should be doing the exact opposite. It should be illegal for OEMs and ISPs to lock down devices they sell to consumers. The fact that my phone's bootloader is locked, preventing me from updating my phone's OS with security patches, is asinine. You should be suing and fining the companies that do this because it's entirely anti-consumer.

This would more than likely restrict installation of alternative operating systems on your PC, like GNU/Linux, OpenBSD, FreeBSD, etc. And also prevent research into advanced wireless technologies, like mesh networking and bufferbloat fixes.

Moreover it will ban installation of custom firmware on your Android phone and surely discourage the development of alternative free and open source WiFi firmware, like OpenWrt.

Imagine in case of disaster it will infringe upon the ability of amateur radio operators to create high powered mesh networks to assist emergency personnel.

It's not only Anti-Consumer but also prevent resellers from installing firmware on routers, such as for retail WiFi hotspots or VPNs, without agreeing to any condition a manufacturer so chooses.

Sincerely,

Thaddeus Tompkins

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: Scanlon

Mailing Address: 1817 Seward

City: Evanston

Country: United States

State or Province: IL

ZIP/Postal Code: 60202

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: This is yet another threat to consumers and end-users that will ultimately only benefit those seeking to stifle others for their own gain.

It is proven that for true security, open-source and transparent functionality is essential. This proposal serves to diminish that.

This is the opposite of what we need as a free society.

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: William

Last Name: Leuschner

Mailing Address: 7261 Grist Mill Circle

City: Harrisburg

Country: United States

State or Province: PA

ZIP/Postal Code: 17112

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.

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: Harri

Last Name: Nieminen

Mailing Address: Opiskelijankatu 4 D 629

City: Tampere

Country: Finland

State or Province: Lnsisuomi

ZIP/Postal Code: 0000000000

Email Address: moiman2@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: The requirement to lock firmware sounds troubling to me. I need to have better firmware for security reasons. I really need to have lock free devices. So I hope that you reconsider 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: lee

Last Name: cox

Mailing Address: 810 N. Avenue C

City: Elgin

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 78621

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: I think it would create a large black market operation. People would start buying routers not through local channels but that had been brought in from other countries.

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: Paul

Last Name: Greenleaf

Mailing Address: 154 monmouth ave

City: atlantic highlands

Country: United States

State or Province: NJ

ZIP/Postal Code: 07716

Email Address: paul.r.greenleaf@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I believe this new requirement is ill advised and should not be enacted. To wit this requirement will stifle curiosity in children, prevent innocent tinkerers from modifying their own property, and allow for device manufacturer's to obfuscate the workings (or failings) of their products. Instead of this rule, no changes should be made.

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: Colin

Last Name: McCulley

Mailing Address: 2014 Dunlavy st

City: Houston

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 77006

Email Address: cmcculley@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Enforcing a 'lock down' on all radio transmitters will hurt small businesses that rely on modifying software on devices for custom installs. Small businesses that install and industries that rely on them will all be hurt.

Criminalizing the unlocking of the devices will be even worse.

Why is the FCC even interested in this to begin with?

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: McCann

Mailing Address: bigtopegi@hotmail.com

City: Parish

Country: United States

State or Province: NY

ZIP/Postal Code: 13131

Email Address: bigtopegi@hotmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment:

The rules would likely:

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.

This is an awful idea and whoever came up with it should be ashamed of themselves and end their career as a beauracrat. It's people like this that don't know how technology works and makes these stupid policies that do nothing b it restrict people. This does more harm than good.

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: Ian

Last Name: Morgan

Mailing Address: 2111 Scissortail Landing Dr

City: Edmond

Country: United States

State or Province: OK

ZIP/Postal Code: 73012

Email Address: egonspen@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Please do not allow this proposal to pass. It will prevent third party patching, user control and personal privacy as well as third party (IE company privacy)

I may have ample need to modify and patch a wireless module on a system I have purchased on behalf of my company for export-control and other serious security considerations. This will GREATLY hamper that and mire any attempts to get these things resolved in red tape.

I am sorry for my ineloquent comment but I'm just an IT guy who see's all the negative repercussions of this lurking in the background.

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: Martinez

Mailing Address: 5261 Park ridge court

City: Crozet

Country: United States

State or Province: VA

ZIP/Postal Code: 22932

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: I believe that you should have the ability to alter your device as you so desire, due to the fact that you paid for everything on the phone already, and it should belong to the person who bought it- To alter and modify.

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: Chris

Last Name: Sherman

Mailing Address: 809 Olive Way

City: Seattle

Country: United States

State or Province: WA

ZIP/Postal Code: 98101

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: I am trying to understand how removing flexibility of a device, prohibiting a device owner from modifying their OWN device is a reasonable plan?

Do we sell TVs without the ability to change channel because someone said you can only tune into a given channel? Do we sell food with only one recipe?

Items people purchase are their own to do as they see fit. Moving forward with this would encourage people to no longer purchase these items and look for these from other companies.

It is disappointing that this is even being considered. 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.

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: Brandon

Last Name: Brodine

Mailing Address: 420 Marland Heights Road

City: Weirton

Country: United States

State or Province: WV

ZIP/Postal Code: 26062-4534

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