

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Kyle

Last Name: Rota

Mailing Address: 12404 E Gibson Rd, APT B204

City: Everett

Country: United States

State or Province: WA

ZIP/Postal Code: 98204

Email Address: ksrota@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 create regulations that would make many Americans less safe against an increasing rash of network attacks.

Sincerelyg

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: Jacob

Last Name: Parry

Mailing Address: 219 South Street

City: London

Country: Canada

State or Province: Ontario

ZIP/Postal Code: N6B1B5

Email Address: fcc@jacobparry.ca

Organization Name:

Comment: To whom it may concern,

I'm writing this to express my desire for the FCC to not implement rules that would take away from a user's ability to install and modify the software on their computing devices.

This is used in a variety of fields for many reasons, including creating new technologies, having existing technologies interoperate with each other, and for investigating and finding security flaws by security researchers. It is also used extensively from a hobbyist perspective, which provides inspiration for a variety of people.

Thank you for your time.

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: Frank

Last Name: Mazzarella

Mailing Address: 83 adams ave

City: Olyphant

Country: United States

State or Province: PA

ZIP/Postal Code: 18447

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Please dont! This is a terrible idea and will not at all help protect privacy

- a computer scientist

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: Pratyush

Last Name: Nalam

Mailing Address: 400 W 119 St, #5Q

City: New York

Country: United States

State or Province: NY

ZIP/Postal Code: 10027

Email Address: pratyushnalam@outlook.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

bad" category of regulatory ideas.

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: Nick

Last Name: Poplawski

Mailing Address: 1303 Webster Ln

City: Des Plaines

Country: United States

State or Province: IL

ZIP/Postal Code: 60018

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Hello! I respectfully ask the FCC to not implement rules that take away the ability that users have to install their own software and modify it.

Without this ability, consumers would be forced to rely upon the manufacturer to secure their device, which has proven not to be successful. The consumer should be able to protect themselves if need be. Especially if the manufacturer cannot keep up with it's own security flaws.

Wireless Networking Research is based upon being able to modify the hardware and software in said devices. Allowing this to continue is very important.

Allowing companies to install public WiFi stations or allowing public networks, and allowing consumers to use their device/software where they'd like, goes against the proposed rules that the FCC would like to implement. Please do not implement rules that take away that ability.

A device a user paid for, they should have complete control over. The hardware and software is theirs to use at their own leisure and they should be able to do whatever they want with it.

The proposed rules by the FCC remove many consumer and user abilities. Please do not implement them.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: Raymond

Mailing Address: 1101 Manitou Dr Apt 407

City: Traverse City

Country: United States

State or Province: MI

ZIP/Postal Code: 49686

Email Address: kderaymond@gmail.com

Organization Name: Hagerty Insurance

Comment: By limiting open source development you directly limit innovation in this field and give established players a regulatory leg up. This is not an example of the free market.

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: McGraw

Mailing Address: 228 paddock rd

City: Clarksville

Country: United States

State or Province: TN

ZIP/Postal Code: 37043

Email Address: Jpmcgraw@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: 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: Murray

Last Name: Colpman

Mailing Address: 107 Carnation Road

City: SOUTHAMPTON

Country: United Kingdom

State or Province: There is no state or province

ZIP/Postal Code: SO16 3JH

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: This proposal will seriously harm the viability of certain completely legitimate devices and usage scenarios worldwide. People experimenting with new means of using WiFi, or those legitimately using higher powers as licensed radio amateurs in countries where this is legal, should be able to perfectly legitimately use modified firmware to do so.

There are many other reasons why this is a bad idea. For example, manufacturers are often poor at responding to security threats. For those who are actually serious about their security, the ability to update software yourself is vital.

A much better alternative is for you to police your spectrum better. If you're having problems, target the individuals causing those problems, rather than using a sledgehammer to crack a nut. Perhaps work with DD-WRT and OpenWRT to make devices use the correct power for your country by default. If you're not having problems, stop trying to ruin the world's WiFi 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: Lucas

Last Name: Van Overberghe

Mailing Address: Hofistrasse 24

City: Triesenberg

Country: Liechtenstein

State or Province: Triesenberg

ZIP/Postal Code: 9497

Email Address: lucasvo1@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I don't quite understand how you could come to the conclusion that this idea is actually a good thing.

Sincerely hoping that this doesn't come through.

Lucas Van Overberghe

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: Gabriel

Last Name: Finch

Mailing Address: Rua Bione 220

City: Recife

Country: Brazil

State or Province: PE

ZIP/Postal Code: 50.030-390

Email Address: gf@cesar.org.br

Organization Name: CESAR Brasil <http://www.cesar.org.br/>

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.

Although I am not a resident of the USA, I believe that the FCC's actions will have international repercussions, since manufacturers will be unlikely to implement multiple versions of their products to suit international legal variations.

As a professional software engineer, it has been my experience to work with customised router hardware on several occasions in my career. Please allow me to illustrate a couple of projects which would be impossible if the FCC rules locking down router software were in place.

The first project involved automatic monitoring of irrigation systems on farms in developing countries. For this project we relied on various selling points, including that the project should be cheap to set up, and it should be reliable since the end users were in various rural areas. Since the project required a router to connect the irrigation monitors to the internet, we decided to use that router as the basis for all of the monitoring software too. For example, if the internet connection is broken (as can happen frequently in such remote locations) the data are retained on the router until the connection is re-established, whereupon they are transmitted to the monitoring center. The router also provides a custom graphical interface to allow the operators on the farm to see the current status. This project proved highly successful and is currently in the roll-out phase.

A second project involves a domestic robotics scenario. The team is developing an advanced robotics platform for home robotics applications (for example for elderly care, home security and so on). As part of the robotics platform, each robot is equipped with a mini WI-FI access point. This allows the robot to create a special sub-network within the home. This sub network allows for the robot to communicate with various other smart devices, without disrupting the user's regular WI-FI connection. For example, you could imagine that the user might have a wrist watch which allowed them to summon the robot for assistance. The relevant point of this is that the wireless access point on the robot needs to be automatically configurable via software and it needs to be flexible to allow the robot to link transparently to the other devices in the home and to integrate harmoniously with the existing setup.

For both of these projects, the only means to achieve the necessary outcome is via running customised software on the routers. If the FCC's proposed rules were applied and followed uniformly, neither of these projects would be possible.

I trust that the FCC will consider these comments and act accordingly by rejecting this ill-considered proposal.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Lance

Last Name: Cockrell

Mailing Address: 6827 Valley View Pl

City: Cheyenne

Country: United States

State or Province: WY

ZIP/Postal Code: 82009

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Greetings,

First of all I want to say that many of us in the internet community appreciate the FCC and much of what they do. We realize that technology is still very much an emerging facet of the American culture and is redefining and being redefined almost daily. The responsibility of regulating and overseeing much of this technology is huge and far-reaching. It's easy to see that many within the FCC just want to do the right thing by keeping the citizen of the US safe and lowering crime rates. That's great, and I, for one, know that it must be a daunting task.

Thank you for considering my comment and I hope it is seen as sincere, respectful, and well-meant.

I would ask that you very seriously consider this proposal and its implications. This proposal would severely limit the right of property that US citizens hold very dear. It would hinder and hurt the ability of those who want to make their computers and servers safe and protected, while not terribly hampering those who already participate in illegal activity.

It is very important to many of us who are tech-savy to be able to fix problems in our machines/routers/servers and enhance them, especially when the device manufacturers will not. We live in a great age where anything is possible, limited only by your resources and knowledge. While I know this also applies towards terrorists and criminals, it is something that makes our world and country so very great. It's part of the American Dream!

Putting blinders and bits on all of us in order to hinder the few who would break the law is terribly unjust. Removing our ability to make legitimate and needed changes to our own hardware and software just because some people do it for malicious purposes insults what America has always stood for. Instead, the FCC should be investing in ways to specifically find and target the wrongdoers and bring them to justice.

If this proposal is accepted, what will ultimately happen is that those who abide by the law will submit to this new act with frustration, and those who already break the law will find ways around it. And they will. The people who this targets will undoubtedly find loopholes, exploits, and tactics to use against the new protocols that will render this proposal useless in every way but for hindering and suppressing the law abiding citizens who merely desire complete control over their own property for wholly legitimate purposes.

Thank you for your consideration. Please, stop this proposal here and now and look for ways to directly target the wrongdoers instead of punishing the rest of us for the sake of the few.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Stovall

Mailing Address: 4685 Peppermint Lane

City: Arnold

Country: United States

State or Province: MO

ZIP/Postal Code: 63010

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: The new rules the FCC are trying to put in place to have routers to only allow users access to authenticated software serves no purpose other than to pander to the pleas of large corporations and restrict freedoms of citizens. The FCC should be ashamed for being so corporation focused as opposed to looking out for the good of the people. This will only cause problems, there's no way to have this work feasibly and it just shows how disconnected the government is from the actual people of America.

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: Baxter

Mailing Address: 120 Covey Ct

City: Goose Creek

Country: United States

State or Province: SC

ZIP/Postal Code: 29445

Email Address: dbax2600@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: This will interfere with the ability to innovate and the ability to use open source software. As an amateur radio operator and user of open source software, this feels like it is working against the hobbyists and the potential inventors.

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: Andrej

Last Name: Kovac

Mailing Address: None of your business

City: Galanta

Country: Slovakia

State or Province: Trnavsky

ZIP/Postal Code: 92401

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: Shane

Last Name: Stenton

Mailing Address: 684 Wells Rd

City: Boulder City

Country: United States

State or Province: NV

ZIP/Postal Code: 89005

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: chris

Last Name: mcfarland

Mailing Address: 603 Rock Face Ct

City: round Rock

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 78681

Email Address: chmcfarland@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Hi, first thanks for the chance to comment here. I would like to register my disapproval of this proposed regulation. When I or anyone else purchase a piece of equipment, it is mine to do with as I will. This regulation would impose severe and unneeded restrictions on my rights as the owner of said equipment. It would further have serious chilling effects across a broad swath of third party developers of HW and SW not to mention the effect it would have on certain avenues of research.

Please do not move forward with this unneeded regulation.

Sincerely

Chris McFarland

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: Malcolm

Last Name: Lorber

Mailing Address: 1999 Burdett ave

City: Troy

Country: United States

State or Province: NY

ZIP/Postal Code: 12180

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: Tyler

Last Name: Allgood

Mailing Address: 200 Clore Ave

City: LaGrange

Country: United States

State or Province: KY

ZIP/Postal Code: 40031

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"

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: Benjamin

Last Name: Ross

Mailing Address: 2 crane street

City: Norton

Country: United States

State or Province: MA

ZIP/Postal Code: 02766

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: I beseech you to not pass the proposed rule, forcing technology producers to lock down devices to only have certain software. From a security perspective, this is a terrible idea. The nodding and hacking community is responsible for finding and closing many of the loopholes and bugs in software at speeds the companies producing these products cannot match. Between that, and the idea that if you buy a product, you should never be limited in your modification of it, besides in cases of malicious intent, I request that you reconsider this proposal.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Primm

Mailing Address: 9229 Waterford Centre Blvd

City: Austin

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 78758

Email Address: mprimm@rfcode.com

Organization Name: RF Code Inc

Comment: I am strongly against this requirement, as it will introduce significant encumbrances on small startup companies (like mine) that already struggle with the costs of regulatory conformance when producing wireless embedded systems - in particular, limiting our options with regard to reuse of off-the-shelf systems for special application purposes, as well as the additional support encumbrances of restricting firmware use on devices we engineer for ourselves. My company offers devices that customers can tailor for their needs, via customized firmware, and the requirement for us to be involved in validating and supporting such customization (as would be required to conform to this) creates significant cost and intellectual property concerns.

In addition, my company (and others) gain VERY significant advantages from the availability of high quality, free, and unencumbered open source firmware solutions for these devices - both for those provided by other vendors, but also as a quick path for devices engineered by ourselves. Specifically, this is a function of the fact that so many off-the-shelf devices sold through consumer and commercial channels are simple reference designs around a small population of embedded processors and radio designs: given this, it is often the case that custom, small volume devices can be built using those same common components, with the open source firmware enabling VERY rapid and inexpensive enabling of a viable (and tailorable) software stack for those devices.

In summary, I feel this restriction - besides being more than a bit problematic with traditional devices (such as laptops, smart phones, and tables) that contain wireless hardware and offer no practical option to restrict their software content without resulting in a useless device - would be disastrous for the wireless embedded systems industry, from an innovation and cost perspective. As a CTO in the product space in question, I feel more than adequately informed on the needs of the space in question, so please take this into consideration.

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: Rich

Last Name: Solo

Mailing Address: 1455 mohawk rd

City: Venice

Country: United States

State or Province: FL

ZIP/Postal Code: 34293

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: Jeff

Last Name: Goldblum

Mailing Address: 4402 Mentone St.

City: San Diego

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 92107

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Device owners should have the ability to modify and install any software of their choosing. Further, 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. Lastly, 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: matt

Last Name: bradford

Mailing Address: 26681 S kinzy rd

City: estacada

Country: United States

State or Province: OR

ZIP/Postal Code: 97023

Email Address: matthew_bradford2000@yahoo.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Allow open source. Let the market determine the technologies that dominate it based on their appeal to consumers. Do not stifle innovation for any reason.

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: Piers

Last Name: Morgans-Wicks

Mailing Address: Dracaena Cottage

City: Penryn

Country: United Kingdom

State or Province: Cornwall

ZIP/Postal Code: TR10 8LP

Email Address: biggles1000@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Restricting consumers from modifying and repairing their own hardware is not only a bad idea (when corporations neglect to patch their own bugs), but a dangerous precedent to set for the free world.

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: Erik

Last Name: Fox

Mailing Address: 10507 Walbrook Dr

City: Richmond

Country: United States

State or Province: VA

ZIP/Postal Code: 23238

Email Address: eriktfox@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Why are you trying to take away the right of individuals to choose what software they put on their device? Why am I not allowed, as a voter, to choose who comes up with these policies? I have never complained so frequently about any other part of our government.

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: Korman

Mailing Address: 1604 Highview St

City: Dearborn

Country: United States

State or Province: MI

ZIP/Postal Code: 48128

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Arcesilus on Voat wrote this incredibly good template to follow if you (alike me) don't have any idea how to write to FCC.

I'll paste it here too:

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: Max

Last Name: Sherbina

Mailing Address: 15 la pose ave. apt 1713

City: Toronto

Country: Canada

State or Province: Ontario

ZIP/Postal Code: M9P 1A7

Email Address: f1_Xella_93@hotmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Dear FCC,

I respectfully disagree with these proposed changes. The basis of my disagreement is simply thus; consumer choice. Consumers need to be able to support and upkeep their own products when manufacturers choose to no longer do it themselves. With these policies, the companies will not opt to provide the most security or benefits to the consumer despite their ownace to do so. There have been numerous cases when consumers took it upon themselves to fix the security faults and issues of drivers and software. These actions that have helped others would be illegal under the new rules.

Please consider against these actions.

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: Dorsey

Mailing Address: 107 Village Park Drive

City: Morgantown

Country: United States

State or Province: WV

ZIP/Postal Code: 26508

Email Address: adam.dorsey@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: This action would severely hurt the US customer without any benefit to anyone but large corporations. Many consumers use software like DD-WRT and OpenWRT to turn cheap consumer routers into full featured network equipment. This rule would make that impossible, forcing consumers to buy expensive enterprise networking equipment for the same features. There is no need for such a draconian law; there is no epidemic of spectrum issues caused by custom firmware on these 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: Bill

Last Name: Korb

Mailing Address: 43324 Gadsden Ave

City: Lancaster

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 93534

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: Charles

Last Name: Holliday

Mailing Address: 146 Lori Lane

City: Senatobia

Country: United States

State or Province: MS

ZIP/Postal Code: 38668

Email Address: Kg5iru@gmail.com

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.

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: Frank

Last Name: Morgan

Mailing Address: 48 Bow st

City: stoneham

Country: United States

State or Province: MA

ZIP/Postal Code: 02180

Email Address: frankmorgan2462@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment:

Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

I hope my words have not been met by deaf ears and the Federal Communications Commission takes seriously the implications of this very dangerous precedent being set should this regulatory measure come into effect. I am confident

in the FCC's ability to make the right choice by setting aside this regulatory measure and hanging it up in the "extremely bad" category of regulatory ideas.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Craig

Last Name: Williams

Mailing Address: PO BOX 342

City: Campo

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 91906-0342

Email Address: craigaw@yahoo.com

Organization Name: W6CAW

Comment: YOU CANNOT BE SERIOUS?

I am 73 years old and have been employed in the electronics industry since 1960. I have witnessed great changes in the industry. NONE of these changes were a result of an oppressive Federal Communications Commission.

I understand the current thinking in the Federal Government is to "protect" everyone from themselves from birth to death. Making it impossible, with this proposed rule, to modify or experiment with electronics devices fits this grand Nanny State plan but, at the FCC, YOU SHOULD KNOW BETTER

73 W6CAW