

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: Burke

Mailing Address: 401 Normal st

City: east stroudsburg

Country: United States

State or Province: PA

ZIP/Postal Code: 18301

Email Address: c3g6b2@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment:

Wireless networking, and for that matter, ANY KIND OF independent research depends on the ability of researchers to investigate and modify their personal property, and has always encompassed our devices.

Because no single company, entity, nor human - is/are perfect, we know not our future. Whom will be hacked, what vulnerabilities exist, etc. It is the collective USA's IT experts duty to solve Zero-day vulnerabilities. There's a large group of independently-operating, benevolent security patchers out there. 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. Not only that.

We demand protocols that let users view what data is sent to who.

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. Restricting something you physically sell to someone cheapens the product, and the market will search for a replacement device, or a workaround. Not only that, it sets a dangerous precedence for further restrictions on our devices. It failed with making unlocking cell phones illegal. Just saying.

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: Eric

Last Name: Mitchell

Mailing Address: 4254 Burlington Avenue North

City: Saint Petersburg

Country: United States

State or Province: FL

ZIP/Postal Code: 33713-8228

Email Address: embetazed@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: It is of the utmost importance that people have the ability to use and modify the devices they own without restriction. What people do with their property is their business until it interferes with the ability of others to enjoy that same right.

In this case, I must point out, that I would be adversely affected personally because I do not agree to the licensing terms imposed by major operating systems such as Microsoft Windows or Apple OS X. I therefore remove that operating system and install a GNU/Linux distribution of my choosing which serves my purposes. This would hurt my ability to install such an OS on a laptop I have purchased and own.

There are also implications for security and wireless researchers who may need to modify their devices in the name of scientific and security research to improve current methods or prevent security holes from being exploited.

I urge the FCC, in its wisdom, not to adopt this measure so that people can have the freedom to use the devices they own as they see fit.

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: Seth

Last Name: Jones

Mailing Address: 3514 Robina Ave

City: Berkley

Country: United States

State or Province: MI

ZIP/Postal Code: 48072

Email Address: seth.jones@nerdheroes.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Any regulation regarding technology needs to take into account the advancement, and the possible advancement of technology. Specifically, anyone who purchases a product, should be able to modify, tweak, or change it in anyway without fear of breaking the law. If I purchase a product, it needs to be mine. This not only ensures that someone purchasing a product is a true purchaser, but it allows for people to advance technology. By definition, the next technology must be built upon todays. Any regulation that prevents this, or makes its difficult should be prevented from being law.

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: Noelle

Last Name: Littman

Mailing Address: 31 regency drive

City: poughkeepsie

Country: United States

State or Province: NY

ZIP/Postal Code: 12603

Email Address: Njl1287@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: James

Last Name: McDowell

Mailing Address: 4218 Brookfield Drive

City: Kensington

Country: United States

State or Province: MD

ZIP/Postal Code: 20895

Email Address: Diamondmyr@gmail

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: James

Last Name: Evans

Mailing Address: 28 Dunbarton avenue

City: Helensvale

Country: Australia

State or Province: Qld

ZIP/Postal Code: 4532

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: Dan

Last Name: Buckley

Mailing Address: 444 School St

City: Belmont

Country: United States

State or Province: MA

ZIP/Postal Code: 02478

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: Daniel

Last Name: Campbell

Mailing Address: 2326 1/2 N Spaulding

City: Chicago

Country: United States

State or Province: IL

ZIP/Postal Code: 60647

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.

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.

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: Brett

Last Name: Newman

Mailing Address: 4080 N Cooper Lake Rd

City: Smyrna

Country: United States

State or Province: GA

ZIP/Postal Code: 30082

Email Address: brett@inquisive.com

Organization Name:

Comment: The FCC should not be limiting consumer control of the devices they own. The FCC should not be instituting policy that encourages monopolization of technology.

The FCC should not be applying policy which dictates tracking of American citizens. By requiring that all software be approved for use by the government prohibits my right to free speech and encroaches on my right to not be subject to unlawful, warrantless searches.

The FCC should not be making policies which provide more control of the flow of information to internet service providers. This act, by a government agency is why I feel as if the 1st amendment is not being respected. I should maintain the ability to confer and congress without the approval, acknowledgement, permission, or overseeing from a government entity.

If you enable this policy you will be in direct conflict with my ability to set up and operate a VPN of my choosing on a wireless router. By doing so the government is actively suppressing citizen congregation and actively limiting our ability to discuss the affairs of the US government without their spying eyes and ears.

As a consumer, who purchases and owns an item I have the right to know and understand every bit of the product I own.

I have the right and ability to ensure the piece of equipment functions according and is not committing any nefarious acts. By limiting my ability to control the products I OWN, you are weakening security procedures and setting up the ability for the US government to take control of the devices I own.

I am a user of DD-WRT and a supporter of Open Source Software. I do not believe any US government agency should be taking a position that removes citizens ability to use FREE, community based software in favor of a business. The FCC is not meant to force citizens into spending money on corporate interests. By enacting a policy like so you are complicit in creating a corporation backed government. You do not work for any corporation. You work for the people.

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: Gibbons

Mailing Address: 1390 Rockport rd.

City: San Antonio

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 78264

Email Address: stphngbbns2@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: Zach

Last Name: LaRue

Mailing Address: 3290 Venus St. Apt. H

City: Las Cruces

Country: United States

State or Province: NM

ZIP/Postal Code: 88012

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: To whom it may concern:

I respectfully request the FCC to NOT implement rules that take away a user's/consumer's ability/right to install software of their own choosing to their own device(s).

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: Nicolas

Last Name: B

Mailing Address: _

City: Caen

Country: France

State or Province: Calvados

ZIP/Postal Code: 14000

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Please do not implement rules that prevent people from doing whatever they want with devices they own. If someone wants to modify a device they own in order to fix a security flaw, conduct research experiments, fix bugs that the manufacturer will not fix, etc, it should be allowed as long as it does not cause trouble to others.

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: Christian

Last Name: Gauger-Cosgrove

Mailing Address: 38-150 Gateshead Cres.

City: Stoney Creek

Country: Canada

State or Province: Ontario

ZIP/Postal Code: L8G 4A7

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: As a Canadian, whose purchased devices fall under FCC regulations I feel the need to speak up about these rules.

I ask that the FCC not implement these rules which restrict the freedom and rights of users to install software on their devices, especially when such restrictions would affect not only the American people, but those who use devices which must conform with FCC rules but who are in other countries.

Research on wireless networks rely on the fact that researches can investigate and modify their devices, something which would be blocked under the proposed rule. The ability of users to patch flaws and bugs in their devices, sometimes serious ones, and sometimes when the device manufacturer refuses to do so would be taken away under these rules, and place many users at risk. 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.

These rules discourage the develop of free and open source alternative Wi-Fi firmware, like OpenWRT. And reading into the rules it implies that installation of alternative operating systems such as FreeBSD, OpenBSD, NetBSD, GNU/Linux, et cetera would be restricted ensuring a duopoly on computing devices by Microsoft and Apple.

I therefore kindly, and respectfully ask that the FCC not implement the proposed rules. 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: Michael

Last Name: Beals

Mailing Address: 817 1/2 Walnut Drive.

City: Wayne

Country: United States

State or Province: NE

ZIP/Postal Code: 68787

Email Address: spinnermaster@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I really do not like the idea that I would not be able to load software that I wrote on a device that I own.

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: Alexander

Last Name: Merker

Mailing Address: 520 Baintree Run

City: Downingtown

Country: United States

State or Province: PA

ZIP/Postal Code: 19335

Email Address: 3deamerker@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: Andrew

Last Name: Hashem

Mailing Address: 45 pratt ave

City: lowell

Country: United States

State or Province: MA

ZIP/Postal Code: 01851

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Please do not implement rules that take away the ability of users to install the software of their choosing on their computing devices.

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.

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: Ivan

Last Name: G

Mailing Address: 5735 NW 47Th St

City: Warr Acres

Country: United States

State or Province: OK

ZIP/Postal Code: 73122

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: There is no good in doing this. It's just a example of too much government interference. If I choose to replace my routers firmware with dd-wrt that's my business. As long as I do not try to reverse engineer or tweak the manufacturer's firmware we should be A-ok to do what we please. The same goes for other Wifi equipment. Why don't you guys instead spend the time helping ensure net neutrality and leave me and my devices alone.

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: Quinn

Last Name: Mikelson

Mailing Address: 1982 N. Refugio Rd

City: Santa Ynez

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 93460

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: I find it disheartening to learn of a companies (or federal commision) diving into the deep end.

Metaphorically I'm trying to explain the feeling of knowing one's end. I do not want this bill to pass. The only thing I have is the open source movements. I am a really smart kid, and I have great ideas. As long as I have the freedom to learn in my own twisted way, I can keep becoming great. Possibly someone who knew exactly why this bill had to be declared. Still I protest, no I don't underatand why this was declared necessary, but I sure as hell have nothing left and I'm willing to take a stand.

Look me up, you have my name, my address, and access to all the information you can handle. I'd like to meet you, and explain myself.

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: Daniel

Last Name: Kong

Mailing Address: 527 Holyoke Street

City: San Francisco

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 94134

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: The goal is noble but this is too far.

Taking away the ability of a consumer to modify a device that they bought is insane.

By doing this consumers will be left beholden to the whims of the manufacturer who may decide not to bother and say "just by the next version!"

Find another way.

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: Dave

Last Name: Gailey

Mailing Address: 10 parrell

City: foothill ranch

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 92610

Email Address: ravengailey@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Hello, what you have proposed would negatively impact consumers and users everywhere, preventing users from fixing bugs/flaws that manufacturers choose not to, affect massive industries that have formed around it such as secure wifi vendors, hotspot retail vendors, and near destroy mesh networking, which has been found to be useful in emergency situations.

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: Marshall

Last Name: Mason

Mailing Address: 103 Parkwood Drive

City: Ashland

Country: United States

State or Province: OH

ZIP/Postal Code: 44805

Email Address: marshallmason5@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: This law would only create a monopolized environment for the end user. Open source router firmware like OpenWRT allows the experienced user to increase the abilities of their router if they wish to do so. I sincerely believe that restricting the installation of custom firmware on consumer routers would violate not only Anti-Trust laws, but 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: Tren

Last Name: Russell

Mailing Address: 507 Alberta Ave.

City: Sunnyvale

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 94087

Email Address: trent.russell.ucsd@gmail.com

Organization Name: Computer Scientist

Comment: I need to install multiple operating systems on my computers to work as a software engineer. Don't make this illegal. #saveWIFI

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: Boiles

Mailing Address: 1 Seawall Dr

City: Berkeley

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 94710

Email Address: johnaboiles+fcccomment@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I strongly urge the FCC to not implement any rules that dictate what users can install on their devices. This would be damaging to the open source community, and slow technical 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: Michael

Last Name: Percy

Mailing Address: 100 Buckingham Dr, Apt 262

City: Santa Clara

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 95051

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Please do not restrict the rights of consumers of electronics by preventing the installation of third-party and aftermarket firmware and software onto devices with wireless radios built into them. The ability of researchers and enthusiasts to repair and modify the software that runs on their own devices is an important freedom that allows us to move the state of the art forward in networking and electronics. It is also important to be able to repair security problems with devices when the manufacturer is unable or neglects to do so.

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: Christopher

Last Name: Livingston

Mailing Address: 5219 W Cambridge Ave

City: Visalia

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 93612

Email Address: crash24@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: As a law-abiding user of third-party software (Linux and OpenWRT) on wireless networking hardware, I find these proposed regulatory changes to be disturbingly shortsighted. While it is critical to keep our spectrum safe, forcing manufacturers to restrict the freedom of the user is anathema to the conditions that have made the United States a leader in technological 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: Stwve

Last Name: Layman

Mailing Address: 7632 Hollister Ave #249

City: Goleta

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 93117

Email Address: Stev3.layman@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: Adam

Last Name: Honse

Mailing Address: 615 E Lakota St

City: Gardner

Country: United States

State or Province: KS

ZIP/Postal Code: 66030

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: As a computer engineering graduate and software engineer in the embedded software industry, I have serious concerns regarding the FCC's proposal to restrict software access to wireless hardware devices. This move would hurt user freedom and security while providing little benefit.

The open source software community has long sought to improve the security, usability, and feature set of consumer hardware devices. To do this, they need access to the hardware. These developers are not associated with the manufacturer, instead, they are devoted end users with the technical experience and commitment to fix bugs, patch security holes, and add features to devices which otherwise go neglected by their manufacturers.

The software industry thrives on openness. The Linux kernel, started as a hobbyist project, is now one of the most, if not the most widely used operating system kernel in the world. It powers everything from smart watches and appliances all the way up to world class supercomputers. This would not have been possible without the freedom of users and companies alike to contribute and experiment. The FCC's proposal would make developments like Linux very difficult, as much of the open source world is comprised of end users building software for devices they have purchased at retail.

On Android phones, for instance, it is common for manufacturers to provide a few updates per year for 1.5-2 years after the phone's release. After that, the manufacturer considers the device unsupported. However, these devices still have plenty of use in them, but without steady updates end users can become the target of hackers due to unpatched security holes. Allowing users to install their own software means that they will be able to patch the security holes themselves and keep their devices going for much longer.

In addition, we also choose to run custom software on our devices that add functionality not available anywhere else. For instance, the OpenWRT project provides a custom firmware for consumer grade network appliances, most commonly home routers/gateways. The OpenWRT software provides frequent security patches, allows for remote configuration, and can host a variety of networking software such as OpenVPN not available commercially on any consumer grade equipment.

Finally, remember that nothing is unbreakable. If this proposal succeeds in locking down hardware, it will only be a matter of time before the lock is broken. Reverse engineers will try whatever they can to decode the workings of lockout mechanisms. It has been done on smartphones, game consoles, and more. Once one product is successfully reverse engineered, power users will buy it and make use of custom software again. Ultimately, this proposal will not keep users out of their own devices, but will definitely increase the vulnerability of users due to unpatched security holes in the stock software, especially on devices with a long lifespan.

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: Muhammad

Last Name: Ahsan

Mailing Address: 5 Massey Sq

City: Toronto

Country: Canada

State or Province: Ontario

ZIP/Postal Code: M4C5L1

Email Address: sirtimmytimbit@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Please do not implement rules that take away the ability to install the software of my choosing on my computing devices. I should be able to manipulate and control all aspects of my devices. No vendor will provide support/warranty/updates forever, I need to be able to take care of that on my own once their support ends.

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: Michael

Last Name: Lawson

Mailing Address: 4806 Heintz St

City: Kansas City

Country: United States

State or Province: MO

ZIP/Postal Code: 64133

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: Nariman

Last Name: Abdullayev

Mailing Address: Rizvan Teymurov

City: Baku

Country: Azerbaijan

State or Province: Baku

ZIP/Postal Code: AZ1015

Email Address: nariman.ab@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: If I buy a device it is mine. It means it belongs to me. Why I should not allowed to change its firmware? If you continue like this the next step will be a prohibition to change a device box color or something similar.

It is like buying PC with Windows OS and have no right to install Linux on 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: Ryan

Last Name: A

Mailing Address: 123 Timmins ave

City: Timmins

Country: Canada

State or Province: Ontario

ZIP/Postal Code: A1A1A1

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: With all the spying going on in commercial software like Windows it is completely absurd to force people to use this software. People should be allowed to put any OS such as Linux on the device that they paid money for. They should be allowed to fully own their device and do what they want with it whether it's install different software or modify the hardware to fit their needs.

If they modify it in such a way that it is illegal such as violating FCC rules, well there are already laws that will govern that. There is no need for a blanket law that simply acts are restricting people for the sake of restricting them. It is quite tiring how government and powers are constantly wanting to restrict people. This needs to stop.

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: Lars

Last Name: Gebraad

Mailing Address: 1736 West 49th Avenue

City: Vancouver

Country: Canada

State or Province: British Columbia

ZIP/Postal Code: V6M2S4

Email Address: larsgebraad@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

I took notice of your Proposed Rule using the most powerful tools man has ever known; electricity, computers and internet. All these technologies have empowered so many people across so many countries. Lately, many social networking sites have taken up the habit of alerting the 'masses' about all kinds of legalizations. This mostly concerns US Law. I do, however, believe that the US is (and has been for a long time) a very leading power in all kinds of technological advancements.

Being a citizen of the Netherlands, but also one of the world due to our amazing contemporary technology, I am delighted every moment technology helps humans and nature alike in all kinds of aspects, being it education or minimizing our ecological footprint. While a good part of technological advancements come from large companies and research institutes, it is still essential to acknowledge the individual, and their endeavours on any kind of software platform. It enables the youngest of individuals to get acquainted with all kinds of aspects of development.

By limiting these options, the operations of devices with custom, 'homebrewed', software, as simple as Linux, individuals all over the world get seriously maimed in their ability to develop themselves. It strongly urge you to stop any legislation that hampers the possibilities of the amazing platforms we have now.

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: Carl

Last Name: Bennett

Mailing Address: 2990 Blackburn St Apt 5122

City: Dallas

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 75204

Email Address: zalu.cb@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: Rye

Last Name: Heidinger

Mailing Address: 1236 E Villa Maria Drive

City: Phoenix

Country: United States

State or Province: AZ

ZIP/Postal Code: 85022

Email Address: rsh77@nau.edu

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: David

Last Name: Plante

Mailing Address: 2936 E Indian School Rd, C320

City: Phoenix

Country: United States

State or Province: AZ

ZIP/Postal Code: 85016

Email Address: dplante67@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: John

Last Name: smith

Mailing Address: 15 privacy street

City: anonymousville

Country: Azerbaijan

State or Province: Turd

ZIP/Postal Code: 2495

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Fuck this shit

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: Abdoul

Last Name: Abraham

Mailing Address: 15 rue Turbigio

City: Paris

Country: France

State or Province: paris

ZIP/Postal Code: 75002

Email Address: Aabraham@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.