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: Josey
Last Name: Baumberger
Mailing Address: 6605 N Cassidy Rd
City: Evansville
Country: United States
State or Province: WI
ZIP/Postal Code: 53536
Email Address: jbaum2011@live.com
Organization Name:
Comment: I oppose the locking down of computing devices (pc, phones, routers, etc.) and anything that can harm net neutrality. Please quit trying to infringe on our privacy. This is only going to create more problems. This is not what us consumers want.

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: Stanislav
Last Name: Geyko
Mailing Address: Ustoychiviy, 7a
City: Rostov-on-Don
Country: Russia
State or Province: Rostov region
ZIP/Postal Code: 344000
Email Address: ineedthisbox@gmail.com
Organization Name:
Comment: Wireless devices must be free from such restrictions. I'm against your proposal. We need freedom to change our wireless devices and their firmwares.

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: No
Last Name: Because
Mailing Address: I
City: Think
Country: Yemen
State or Province: You
ZIP/Postal Code: Are
Email Address: Stupid@Stupid.com
Organization Name: GoFuckYourselves
Comment: What you're thinking of doing is stupid.

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: Ellis-Adams
Mailing Address: 45 saint germain st #2
City: boston
Country: United States
State or Province: MA
ZIP/Postal Code: 02115
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: This hurts American tech if users aren't allowed to modify wireless devices they own. I think consumers should have full control of devices once they purchase them. Voiding a warranty by modifying existing tech is a great way to innovate. Please do not prevent people from having access to modify wireless 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: Samarth
Last Name: Agarwal
Mailing Address: 15 Avenue des Cavaliers
City: Chne-Bougeries
Country: Switzerland
State or Province: Genve
ZIP/Postal Code: ======1224
Email Address: Samu.agarwal@gmail.com
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

@swissnetizen

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: Asher
Last Name: Russell
Mailing Address: 108
City: Exeter
Country: United Kingdom
State or Province: Devon
ZIP/Postal Code: EX15 1JA
Email Address: asher.russell6@outlook.com
Organization Name:
Comment: I think this is wrong as it would:
-Restrict installation of alternative operating systems on your PC, like GNU/Linux, -OpenBSD, FreeBSD, etc.
-Prevent research into advanced wireless technologies, like mesh networking and bufferbloat fixes
-Ban installation of custom firmware on your Android phone
-Discourage the development of alternative free and open source WiFi firmware, like OpenWrt
-Infringe upon the ability of amateur radio operators to create high powered mesh networks to assist emergency personnel in a disaster.
-Prevent resellers from installing firmware on routers, such as for retail WiFi hotspots or VPNs, without agreeing to any condition a manufacturer so chooses.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices
FR Document Number: 2015-18402
RIN:
Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:
First Name: Crystal
Last Name: Miller
Mailing Address: 441 Osprey Drive
City: Richmond Hill
Country: United States
State or Province: GA
ZIP/Postal Code: 31324
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: These words are not mine, but they are the most accurate and eloquent version of what I wish to say about this topic:

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: Ryan
Last Name: Duke
Mailing Address: 501 Marion Road
City: York
Country: United States
State or Province: PA
ZIP/Postal Code: 17406
Email Address: rbduke@gmail.com
Organization Name:
Comment: We need to do away with locked devices. If I buy something, I own it and should be able to do with it what I want. I should not be forced to live with defects if I could have modified something myself to fix it. Cellphones, computers, gaming systems. Why should I spend hundreds of dollars on these devices if I can't do with them what I want?

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: Doug
Last Name: Lynch
Mailing Address: 6328 Valhalla Dr
City: Douglasville
Country: United States
State or Province: GA
ZIP/Postal Code: 30135
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: This is wrong! I buy a piece of hardware(phone, router, etc) and I expect to be able to do anything I want with it. The government or any corporation shouldn't be allowed to enforce such rules

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: Lewicki
Mailing Address: 18 Hurds Drive
City: Morrill
Country: United States
State or Province: ME
ZIP/Postal Code: 04952
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: I am vehemently against this proposal. Requiring the lock-down of all wireless-capable devices does nothing to secure the device's against determined foes, and serves only to prevent advanced users and developers from getting the most out of their devices, which could adversely affect device sales and, thus, the economy.

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: Jit
Last Name: Kanetkar
Mailing Address: 15 Cloverleaf Drive
City: New Fairfield
Country: United States
State or Province: CT
ZIP/Postal Code: 06812
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: I feel modern technology has become so great because of it's open nature. I feel uneasy having to buy something for hundreds of dollars, only to be told I don't actually own it and am severely limited in what I can do.

As far as I know, there haven't been any issues caused by radio interference. This would only interfere with legitimate uses, not actual malicious intent, which would still be impossible 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: Mauro
Last Name: Mombelli
Mailing Address: bifrost@hotmail.it
City: Stockholm
Country: Sweden
State or Province: Stockholm
ZIP/Postal Code: 11127
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: My concern foes on a security.

If we look at the real world, vendor update are always slower to roll out (if they are done at all) than open source and community based.

Many example can be found, the bigger of all can be seen with the recent Android bug that poses risk to over 80% of the devices: unofficial and community based version of Andorid like CynogenMod and ParnaoidAndorid was patched in the same nighty/week, while official version by producer like Samsung, HTC or similar are still to be roll out for some models, and all that are not anymore supported will remain vulnerable.

This mean million of devices ready to be infected and became botnet.

If we prevent those people to find unofficial safe and supported firmware or update for their own devices, instead of increasing security we are creating thousand of similar situation.

I propose that when a product became retired, in less that 1 or 2 year:

- If in any moment a security flaw is discovered and producer does not fix the issue in more that 6 month, the product become retired.

- The producer implement the needed support/firmware in an existing open source project, at least for the main functionality.
OR, if not applicable, then
ALL of the source code, schematics, firmware and documentation needed by eventual developer to keep the system updated and secure must be released and easy to access without registration or fee, with GPL licence or similar.

- The switch even for non-technical user from the official system to the chosen implementation must be as easy as possible.

- If the official and unsupported implementation is found to have security flaw, an official statement must be published asking the users to move to the unofficial alternative.

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: Rez
Last Name: Shad
Mailing Address: 609 South Grove Avenue
City: Anaheim
Country: United States
State or Province: CA
ZIP/Postal Code: 92805
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

-Rez

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: Hunter
Last Name: Kippen
Mailing Address: 131 Carriage court
City: Plymouth Meeting
Country: United States
State or Province: PA
ZIP/Postal Code: 19462
Email Address: hunterkipt@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: Adrian
Last Name: Moy
Mailing Address: 1007 Fourth St.
City: New Orleans
Country: United States
State or Province: LA
ZIP/Postal Code: 70130
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: M
Last Name: B
Mailing Address: 4
City: Mentone
Country: Australia
State or Province: vic
ZIP/Postal Code: 3194
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: Forcing consumers to run hardware locked by the manufacturer will not only restrict their choice, but goes against the ruling made a few years ago, to allow jailbroken, rooted, or modified phones. It also increases the chance of a business taking advantage of a consumer, by forcing them to only purchase software or hardware replacements from the original manufacturer, instead of being able to purchase from a competitor. This could raise a rather large anti-trust issue.

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: Paulson
Mailing Address: 718 Decorah Ave.
City: Decorah
Country: United States
State or Province: IA
ZIP/Postal Code: 52101
Email Address: gyhjams1@gmail.com
Organization Name:
Comment: I feel as though creating a law that makes it harder for a consumer to modify his/her machine would be detrimental to all of the progress that technology has made. By forcing users to operate the machine that they bought with the stock software you are creating a situation in which a user cannot use his machine to the top of it's capabilities. Please do not create any sort of ruling restricting the customization of a person's machine.

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: Clam
Last Name: Chowda
Mailing Address: 123 main street
City: Boston
Country: United States
State or Province: MA
ZIP/Postal Code: 02134
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: 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.

These new regulations will harm amateur radio operators, custom computer builders like myself, and would make Android phone customization / unlocking illegal once 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: Thomas
Last Name: Ott
Mailing Address: 4215 Long Green Rd
City: Glen Arm
Country: United States
State or Province: MD
ZIP/Postal Code: 21057
Email Address: tomottoco@gmail.com
Organization Name:
Comment: This will be a major threat to mesh/ad-hoc networks and the ability to control the devices that we ostensibly 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: Florian
Last Name: Siffer
Mailing Address: Nelkenstarsse 10
City: Liestal
Country: Switzerland
State or Province: Basel-Land
ZIP/Postal Code: 4410
Email Address: f.siffer@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: Will
Last Name: Marshall
Mailing Address: 7 Elton Lane
City: Winterley
Country: United Kingdom
State or Province: Cheshire
ZIP/Postal Code: CW11 4TN
Email Address: will.marshall13@gmail.com
Organization Name: Assurant Solutions
Comment: This is a huge threat to mesh nets, anonymity, open source, and maintaining control over the devices you buy!

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: Harper
Mailing Address: 927 Vineville St
City: Columbus
Country: United States
State or Province: GA
ZIP/Postal Code: 31904
Email Address: Charper132@gmail.com
Organization Name:
Comment: Awful idea. Requiring devices be locked down to prevent any modification is completely horrible, especially since it'll only sabotage developer communities and severely restrict consumer/user choice, which is already in grave danger.

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: Jeffrey
Last Name: Vohlers
Mailing Address: 415 Page Street
City: Cary
Country: United States
State or Province: NC
ZIP/Postal Code: 27511
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: I disagree with the proposed rule modifications as they place too many restrictions on the individual user and limit choices. The modifications are unnecessarily obtuse and would hurt 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: Bennett
Last Name: silberman
Mailing Address: 286 paseo bernal
City: 286 paseo bernal
Country: United States
State or Province: CA
ZIP/Postal Code: 94556
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: This will restrict users to install Linux as their OS, edit their Android phone's OS, even though it's open source, all because you don't understand 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: Alberto
Last Name: Ramos
Mailing Address: 1279 c. 80a
City: Cuauhtemoc
Country: Mexico
State or Province: Chihuahua
ZIP/Postal Code: 31528
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: The ability to install third party firmware is a very important part of engineering, it allows us to learn and pushes the creation of a lot of new amazing technologies, the android development screen is a great example of this, not only should you not stop people from being able to install 3rd party firmware you should make it illegal to lock boot loaders as we have seen on some phones.

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: Jonathan
Last Name: Michael
Mailing Address: 207 Whitefriar Lane
City: Morrisville
Country: United States
State or Province: NC
ZIP/Postal Code: 27560
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: As a citizen of the United States, I cannot support this regulation in any way. Regulations that are meant to prevent me from using a device that I purchased or allow a company to retain ownership in some way over things that I have purchased outside of reproduction of said property in a way to break a trademark is completely against the right to private property.

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: Donald C.
Last Name: Smith
Mailing Address: 2934 Palm Dr
City: Punta Gorda
Country: United States
State or Province: FL
ZIP/Postal Code: 33950-3109
Email Address: july01@embarqmail.com
Organization Name:
Comment: I could copy and past someone else's comment , but to be short I am totally against this proposal as it will styme new innovative development.

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: Gunnar
Last Name: Guvararson
Mailing Address: None of your buissness 9001
City: Nowhere
Country: Iceland
State or Province: Iceland doesnt have states
ZIP/Postal Code: 000
Email Address: gunni@wave.is
Organization Name: None
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: Sam
Last Name: Green
Mailing Address: 1025 N ARIZONA AVE
City: Chandler
Country: United States
State or Province: AZ
ZIP/Postal Code: 85225
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: You must not put forward any regulations limiting rights of individuals. Equipment sold to consumers must wholly belong to consumers. If anything, you should mandate that equipment manufacturers must unlock any device sold to consumer by request.

Remember, you are government, we are the people. We were here before you. We made you. You don't tell us what to do and what not to do.

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: Viktor
Last Name: Federov
Mailing Address: ttemplate223@gmail.com
City: Uppsala
Country: Sweden
State or Province: Sdermansland
ZIP/Postal Code: 63239
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, but also any other citizen in any other country 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 fallen on 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: Darrien
Last Name: Glasser
Mailing Address: 617 Middlesex Turnpike
City: Billerica
Country: United States
State or Province: MA
ZIP/Postal Code: 01821-4324
Email Address: darrienglasser@outlook.com
Organization Name:
Comment: The idea of locking computers (mobile or not) down to specific and possibly proprietary operating systems is simply ridiculous. For those without the capital to afford proprietary operating systems, this makes home built computers (desktops or the like) impossible. And for those who would like to load alternative operating systems on their computer (GNU/Linux, BSD, etc.), or it is critical that they do so for their jobs, this proposal is twice as ridiculous. I'm currently typing this out right now, on my laptop, running Linux, and as a Computer Science Major (with a field eventually in the same area), it is essential that I'm able to run Linux, and other open source operating systems on my computer. Simply running the default OS would not be feasible.

Alternatively, when talking about mobile devices (e.g. smartphones, tablets, etc.), most mobile devices lose support from manufacturers after two years longest. For anybody looking to keep a mobile device for more than two years, or someone who buys a mobile device, say, a year after it is released, and then decides to keep it for two years, the ability to load third party/aftermarket OSes onto the device is very necessary, as older versions of the OS do not get security updates once the OEM stops supporting it.

Finally, putting in place such a rule would shut down projects like the Raspberry Pi (a singleboard computer that people can load any OS they want onto), which is used to teach computer science, and server fundamentals/simple programming to students and hobbyists. Such a rule would be hugely detrimental to those attempting to learn computer science on their own, and scrap many in-school projects where the learning is dependent on such devices, and their ability to load alternative operating systems on the device.

All in all, this rule is not feasible, and simply does not make sense to implement. It would disrupt far too much, with little to no gain.

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: Ninort
Last Name: Audisho
Mailing Address: 9241 Washington rd
City: Morton Grove
Country: United States
State or Province: IL
ZIP/Postal Code: 60053
Email Address: naudisho060@s207.org
Organization Name:
Comment: I wish to maintain control over the devices I own.

I do not support 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: M
Last Name: M
Mailing Address: No
City: Edmonton
Country: Canada
State or Province: Alberta
ZIP/Postal Code: H0H0H0
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: Please take five seconds to consider how dumb this is, then fire everyone who was involved and hire people who actually understand technology, because the people writing this do not! They want to prevent progress and research. This would set the US back decades compared to other countries. Don't be so naive in thinking that you can control what people do with their hardware.

Everyone has the free choice if they want to run Windows, Mac or a Linux distro, and change their mind down the road and change it! Everyone has the free choice to mess with their phone, risk breaking it, and running a custom ROM better suited for their needs.

Research into more advanced wifi technologies will effectively be killed by this proposal.

This does nothing but hamper technology. It's not needed.

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: Matti
Last Name: Peltola
Mailing Address: Porvoonkatu 4 C 56
City: Kerava
Country: Finland
State or Province: Uusimaa
ZIP/Postal Code: 04200
Email Address: masapelt@gmail.com
Organization Name:
Comment: I understand your need for these requlatory actions, because the RF band gets dirty.
However:

1) This proposal would limit or even criminalize Open Source-projects.
2) This would essentially make it possible for hardware manufacturers (and if needed, other parties) to force Customers to have an unwanted backdoor that they could not get rid off.
3) Hampering Open Source and free development cannot be in the best interest of any government agency or party, because essentially it would only increase the costs of licensed providers product; there would be no (legal) free choices for customers, therefore increasing costs of the customers and other parties.

In short:
I understand why this regulatory action is wanted, however it would need severe tinkering.

Limiting hardware manufacturers and "killing off" open source-projects on Wireless communications would essentially only lead to home-made RF chips and their sale. It would be the same as with HAM radio. Anyone with basic tools and know-how can make their own Radio and as long as it would not interfere with other users, no one could ever know about that being homemade.

Just a little thing to think about, really.
Do you want to limit the freedom of choice for customers and government? Do you want to enforce a limit, that would in the best case mostly affect tinkerers changing actually nothing and in worst case would limit the freedom of users?

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: Alex
Last Name: Fogal
Mailing Address: 22 Birch
City: Guelph
Country: Canada
State or Province: Ontario
ZIP/Postal Code: N1G2N3
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: I implore the FCC not to 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.

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: Luke
Last Name: Sieber
Mailing Address: 821 Cormier Road Apt 2
City: Green Bay
Country: United States
State or Province: WI
ZIP/Postal Code: 54304
Email Address: hewtheline@gmail.com
Organization Name:
Comment: Dear FCC

These new regulations are a major step back in terms of consumer rights. Many, many of the retail hardware equipment I use require modification in some way, the foremost of which is Open WRT/DD-WRD firmware.

As you are aware, this firmware grants the user exceptional flexibility in maintaining their own network, and includes improvements on both firmware behavior and software handling. These proposed regulations would greatly limit our freedoms in setting up and maintaining our own networks in the fashion we desire.

I ask you personally to consider another way to achieve the same results. As you don't appear to have significant data in regards to the possible harm being caused by such devices in breach of current regulations, it seems hasty to reduce the usefulness of an entire class of devices for a whole nation based on anecdotes or possible misuse.

Thanks

Luke

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: Marco
Last Name: Falchi
Mailing Address: Via Bernardino Galliari 30
City: Torino
Country: Italy
State or Province: TO
ZIP/Postal Code: 10125
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: Roger
Last Name: Hutcherson
Mailing Address: 4841 S Bailey St.
City: Republic
Country: United States
State or Province: MO
ZIP/Postal Code: 65738
Email Address: rwhutcherson@gmail.com
Organization Name: Missouri State University
Comment: Any rules that infringe upon the end user's ability to modify their purchased laptop and desktop computers is a terrible idea. The ability to remove all the software from a computer is a widely used tool to combat viruses and other intrusions, and any gains from locking this part down further would be at a cost that is far greater.

Furthermore, It would facilitate the outright monopoly of Windows' operating systems on every device. While the ability to install other operating systems is not widely utilized, the tools it requires are all necessary for a vast amount of purchasers, usually in the form of flashing their own operating system with the software they need onto every device they purchase.

The rules that this comment applies to would harm the end user to a degree that is impossible to imagine.

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: Alistair
Last Name: Senior
Mailing Address: 123 Queensbury place
City: London
Country: United Kingdom
State or Province: England
ZIP/Postal Code: e12 6uw
Email Address: al@alsenior.co.uk
Organization Name:
Comment: These new rules would serve to destroy the efforts of the 3rd party Firmware creators who have spent the last decade and a half pushing forward the industry by increasing security and adding features to devices.

3rd party firmware makers already make significant efforts to ensure that there devices are legally compliant and to educate users that certain bands cannot be used in certain counties. Additionally there is no evidence that usage of restricted bands is even a problem that cannot be fixed by education and enforcement of existing rules.

Also these regulations would have significant affects outside of the united states as manufacturers would lock down all devices regardless of intended markets.

Finally Technology is only pushed forward by those willing to experiment and by implementing these rules the nature of experimentation that pushes forward the development of new technologies would be significantly stumped or even completely wiped out.

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: Chad
Last Name: Furman
Mailing Address: 80 Damon Rd, Apt 4206
City: Northampton
Country: United States
State or Province: MA
ZIP/Postal Code: 01060
Email Address: chad@chadfurman.com
Organization Name: Chad Furman, Inc.
Comment: Because restricting freedom and innovation is what America is all about.

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: Rodriguez
Mailing Address: 1485 Lamore Drive
City: San Jose
Country: United States
State or Province: CA
ZIP/Postal Code: 95130
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: This is exactly why we need to eradicate the FCC. This organization is not needed and all we need to do to replace it is to enforce the property rights laws that are already in place within the constitution. This organization throughout it's history has NOT helped in anyway to guarantee our rights are protected. The FCC has continually destroyed our first amendment right on all radio and television broadcasts and are now trying to do so on the internet. They are now proposing to stifle innovation with the regulation of all electronic products beginning with wireless products of which the supreme court has ruled that we have rights to alter. This is a proposal for a new kind of fascism with a few companies given an oligopoly over the entire technology industry. The language in this proposal is vague enough that it can be interpreted to whatever they want to keep this oligopoly of the large tech companies who cannot compete with the free software and open source movement. Technology throughout all of history from the discovery of making fire, to steam power, and eventually using electricity has helped our species to make our lives easier to live. This will completely destroy all that innovation and actually go back on innovating all together. END THE FCC 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: Michael
Last Name: Anderson
Mailing Address: 4309 Red Cloud Dr
City: Austin
Country: United States
State or Province: TX
ZIP/Postal Code: 78759
Email Address:
Organization Name:
Comment: I have a Ph.D. in Physics, and I'm requesting that you do not require manufactures to lock firmware on devices such as routers. There are many reasons, but from an educational standpoint, being able to modify software and install it onto devices is one important part of keeping America strong in Science & Technology. Imposing that manufactures lock down devices robs children of the opportunity to be tinker and learn about electronics.

America wouldn't have become a leader in technology if there were such strong rules blocking people from modifying the firmware on electronics back in the 1970's.

Rules that require locking phone software has unfortunately turned many Americans into simple consumers of phone apps. Countries like China don't have such lock-down rules for phones (or don't enforce it), and they are quickly becoming leaders in modifying and improving phone software.

Don't let America fall behind. Americans need the freedom to control the software on the devices they use in their daily lives.

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: Lawrence
Mailing Address: 1023 1st ave nw
City: Arab
Country: United States
State or Province: AL
ZIP/Postal Code: 35016
Email Address: all381@gmail.com
Organization Name:
Comment: This is a horrible idea. The whole idea of a PC is openness. This rule would kill it, and give Microsoft a monopoly again, since most PCs already come with Windows and they would be stuck on it. This rule would also kill the custom ROM community for mobile devices. Whenever I own a device where the manufacturer puts a bloated and broken skin over it, I turn to the ROM community to make my phone with amazing hardware also have amazing software. Please don't pass this. I'd like to keep advancing technology instead of holding us back with this rule.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices
FR Document Number: 2015-18402
RIN:
Publish Date: 8/6/2015 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:
First Name: Alex
Last Name: Fogal
Mailing Address: 22 Birch
City: Guelph
Country: Canada
State or Province: Ontario
ZIP/Postal Code: N1G2N3
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