

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: Mark

Last Name: Garner

Mailing Address: 5 St Wilfrid's Close

City: Kibworth

Country: United Kingdom

State or Province: Select One

ZIP/Postal Code: LE8 0PY

Email Address: mawkhf@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: Steve

Last Name: McDermott

Mailing Address: 620 Center Ave

City: Martinez

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 94553

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: Scott

Last Name: Pittman

Mailing Address: 101 Montauk Pr

City: Ottawa

Country: Canada

State or Province: Ontario

ZIP/Postal Code: k2c3l1

Email Address: phyrebird@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: Brian

Last Name: Address

Mailing Address: 110 Sabrina Lane

City: Severna Park

Country: United States

State or Province: MD

ZIP/Postal Code: 21146-1613

Email Address: brianpandress@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Dear Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

I write you today with great concern 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.

As an example, I purchased a laptop for work recently, and in my line of work, we use free software alternatives to common consumer software. The wireless card in this laptop did not have the necessary open source drivers to work with the software I was using, so I concluded that the easiest route to solve my problem was to install a new wireless card that I knew was properly supported. When I installed the new wireless card, I was completely locked out of my system at the bios level - I couldn't use ANY part of my computer due to the manufacturer's policy on wireless cards. When I contacted the manufacturer, half of the people I talked to didn't even know about this restriction, and the other half claimed that it was a good faith effort to comply with certain FCC restrictions. Should this latest proposal pass, scenarios like this will become increasingly more common and will affect researchers, hobbyists, and ultimately any end user who wants to have any level of control over the devices he or she purchases.

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: Steven

Last Name: Williams

Mailing Address: 4444 W. Jean Street

City: Alsip

Country: United States

State or Province: IL

ZIP/Postal Code: 60803

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

As a military member, 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: Leon

Last Name: Manley

Mailing Address: 710 peachtree st ne

City: atlanta

Country: United States

State or Province: GA

ZIP/Postal Code: 30308

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: Patrick

Last Name: Coyne

Mailing Address: 321 Waverley St.

City: Ottawa

Country: Canada

State or Province: Ontario

ZIP/Postal Code: K2P 0W2

Email Address: pcoyne_921@hotmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Hello FCC,

I am a concerned Canadian, who after learning about your recent proposition for Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices, decided to voice my opposition to such a restriction. PLEASE do not implement rules that take away the ability of users to install the software of their choosing on their computing devices.

Wireless networking research depends on the ability of researchers to investigate and modify their devices.

Americans need the ability to fix security holes in their devices when the manufacturer chooses to not do so.

Users have in the past fixed serious bugs in their wifi drivers, which would be banned under the NPRM.

Billions of dollars of commerce, such as secure wifi vendors, retail hotspot vendors, depends on the ability of users and companies to install the software of their choosing.

Mesh networking which helps first responders in emergencies, also helps provide anonymity, creates a backup/alternative communications network, will become more difficult than it needs to be with these new rules.

Users should be able to manipulate and control all aspects of their devices.

Manufactures will likely employ digital locks in the easiest manner they can rather than worrying about letting you still use your device fully to the extent of the law. This means you get locked out of other things, cannot check for back doors, etc... It's cheaper to implement a lock that encompasses the entire device rather than trying to individually lock or unlock each little line of code depending on the legalities.

Please consider what is best for the world of computing, not just what is best for corporate interests.

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: Cowan

Mailing Address: 12118 Walnut Park Xing #934

City: Austin

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 78753

Email Address: christopher.o.cowan@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: As an IT and networking professional with over 30 years of experience, I respectfully ask that the FCC not implement these rules.

- 1) Wireless networking research depends on the ability of researchers to investigate and modify their devices.
- 2) Americans need the ability to fix security holes in their devices when the manufacturer chooses to not do so.
- 3) Users have in the past fixed serious bugs in their wifi drivers, which would be banned under the NPRM.
- 4) 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.
- 5) Lost economic opportunities, because Entrepreneurs would no longer be able to prototype and configure new software services and products utilizing 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: Jeremiah

Last Name: Patrick

Mailing Address: 410 15th Ave N

City: Hopkins

Country: United States

State or Province: MN

ZIP/Postal Code: 55343

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Blocking Open Source firmware on devices prevents credible and legitimate responses to commercial products which are either perceived or actually inferior to the alternatives. There is no reason that this should be allowed.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Steve

Last Name: Aycock

Mailing Address: 3489 oswald st

City: charleston

Country: United States

State or Province: SC

ZIP/Postal Code: 29455

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Consumers, the users must be able to modify and or install software that WE choose for the computing devices in our homes and businesses. Companies without the intervention of the FCC are already eroding our choices, in favor of their agendas. We are losing control of our security, our privacy, and otherwise control in general...because it suits those same companies ideas for future monetization over the user experience.

The manufacturers, consistently over time, have done a bad job of maintaining updates, and or methods of security in these devices. In instances, even where the device is out of date, so to speak, the user needs the capability to maintain the device themselves.

Open capability for these types of electronics spurs ingenuity and gives individuals the ability to research and understand, to learn the technology and improve on it, outside of giant RD and departments...anything less stifles both the people themselves and future tech.

These things belong to the people... not the people that made them. We purchased these devices, it is unethical, wrong to rest our control of them, and worse to put that control into hands who do not have our interests at heart.

It is an absolute MUST for the future. Do NOT take the control from the individuals. It's as Anti-American as anything I can think of, in favor of corporate control. We all know that's the wrong thing to do.

Thanks for your consideration of my words.

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: Boutcher

Mailing Address: 2905 Aspen circle

City: Blue bell

Country: United States

State or Province: PA

ZIP/Postal Code: 19422

Email Address: Tboutcher@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: Jeremy

Last Name: Beck

Mailing Address: 4512 Cape Sable Ct

City: Jacksonville

Country: United States

State or Province: FL

ZIP/Postal Code: 32277

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: I'd like to respectfully ask the FCC to 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. This research makes the internet safer for everyone.

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 Wi-Fi drivers, which would be banned under the NPRM.

Billions of dollars of commerce, such as secure Wi-Fi vendors, retail hotspot vendors, depends on the ability of users and companies to install the software of their choosing.

In a free country, people should be free to use their devices as they wish, much as they are free to install the operating system of their choice on their personal computers. It is my sincere hope that rules curtailing such freedom are not implemented.

Thank you.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Reid

Last Name: KenKnight

Mailing Address: 2929 Chicago Ave S

City: Minneapolis

Country: United States

State or Province: MN

ZIP/Postal Code: 55407

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: NO NO NO do not pass this bill open source is an incredibly important aspect of our internet freedom.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Ciara

Last Name: Covey

Mailing Address: 12269 Carmel Vista Rd. #165

City: San Diego

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 92130

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Hi FCC,

I understand that you are trying to prevent people from putting open source software onto WIFI devices, including routers and phones. Could this also include Internet of Things enabled devices like Raspberry Pi with WIFI that hobbyists program and tinker with?

I do not agree with your ruling. If I have a device, I want to have control over my device, and be able to use open source software of my choice, not the bloatware many corporations install. There is also much concern about security holes, corporations collecting too much personal data, and the government creating backdoors in such hardware and software. As a hobbyist, I want to be able to tinker with devices like Raspberry Pi connected to WIFI, within the limits of FCC specifications.

The open source software available also takes these standard specifications into account. Its the same code. Its the same device. Banning all open source software, in fear of it violating FCC regulations, is wrong.

Banning open source will not prevent people from hacking, which is the real problem. Currently, there exists some hacks that can be installed on routers that break FCC regulations, but the authors say not to use the hack because it grossly violates the airwaves. People know that using the hack is wrong. I just do not understand what this has to do with open source software on WIFI devices as a whole.

Please put let citizens be in control of their devices. Currently, corporations and certain government agencies have too much control over citizens' data and devices, and the overreach must be stopped. Leave open source software alone.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Seth

Last Name: Esterline

Mailing Address: 225 George St

City: Flushing

Country: United States

State or Province: MI

ZIP/Postal Code: 48433

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: Making the change to require that only "approved" firmware can run on a wifi device is a bad idea. Often times the official firmware will have security defects that can be remedied by switching a device to a 3rd party firmware. I would draw your attention to an example with the WPS security issues that many devices suffered from with manufacturer's firmware; with 3rd party issues that vulnerability did not exist.

This will not protect consumers, if anything it will leave the savvier consumer at greater risk of security vulnerabilities.

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: Josiah

Last Name: Goeman

Mailing Address: jjamesgoeman@gmail.com

City: Indianapolis

Country: United States

State or Province: IN

ZIP/Postal Code: 46032

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: Hamish

Last Name: Edmondson

Mailing Address: 91 Lewin Road

City: London

Country: United Kingdom

State or Province: London

ZIP/Postal Code: SW166JX

Email Address: hamishedmondson@gmail.com

Organization Name: HamishEd

Comment: Dear FCC,

Please do not implement restrictions such as this. WiFi is too ubiquitous a technology for these restrictions to be workable, or fair to the consumer/end user. The ability to modify the software on one's own device is a key part of ownership, and the range of products this would affect is huge, and only going to increase. Not only would restrictions like this impact upon a consumer's right to use a device they have purchased in a fair way, but they would also lay the groundwork for monumental abuse by hardware/software manufacturers to leverage an effective monopoly by eliminating the potential for user loaded alternatives, which drive progress and innovation in the software space.

This move would be a damning blow to the consumer electronics market, not just in the US but worldwide due to America's place in the technological world. And it would be thoroughly out of line with the FCC's recent and progressive moves go reempower consumers. It is, in many key ways, a terrible idea.

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: Kettle

Mailing Address: 1430 Xanthia

City: Denver

Country: United States

State or Province: CO

ZIP/Postal Code: 80220

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: I can understand the FCC concerns over people modifying equipment that uses radio equipment to facilitate communication, but making it harder to use is the wrong move.

The modern computing paradigm seen all around us would not have been possible without the public's freedom to alter the hardware that they owned. Over 99% of people who modify, let's say a WiFi router, aren't aiming to be a nuisance or to disrupt official channels; they want to secure their own network and digital life. There are already countless examples of hardware manufacturers leaving consumers in the cold, with blatant security holes in their products. It's the open source community who finds, and files these holes.

There are already ways to deal with someone who's modified equipment interferes with important infrastructure or emergency channels. If the FCC approves this rule change, before there has even been any major/widespread incident caused by these types of modifications, you're asking the public to trust the corporate world to look after us. Just don't forget that none of this stuff is manufactured in the US, and Samsung recently shipped a WiFi refrigerator with a virus on it. It was modders who found and fixed the public's refrigerator, not Samsung or the 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: William

Last Name: Mengon

Mailing Address: 88 Lincolnshire Ln

City: Phenix City

Country: United States

State or Province: AL

ZIP/Postal Code: 36870

Email Address: styles662@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: David

Last Name: schAAF

Mailing Address: 826A Alabama St

City: San Francisco

Country: United States

State or Province: CA

ZIP/Postal Code: 94110

Email Address: davidpschAAF@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: Eric

Last Name: Burton

Mailing Address: 1213 Ironwood Drive

City: Fairborn

Country: United States

State or Province: OH

ZIP/Postal Code: 45324

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: Philip

Last Name: Wesley

Mailing Address: 107 Old Shirley Rd.

City: Harvard

Country: United States

State or Province: MA

ZIP/Postal Code: 01451

Email Address: phly95@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: I think your banning of Open Source wifi firmware is a dangerous slope for companies to lock down abilities on their routers and can only hurt consumers. It could mean severely under-powered routers and allows for the ability for router makers to implement spyware that can't be removed. This can mean man-in-the-middle based advertising on the web, which in turn could severely impact customer security. How can you expect doctors to follow HIPPA when their home is infecting their machines. Just bringing a work computer home would allow the infection. Having open source firmware allows consumers to protect themselves. If this prevents Cyanogenmod, that makes it even worse. It forces us to keep the crap that carriers put on our phones. Essentially, if we don't like Verizon's complete lockdown on an OS, we can't do anything about it. I urge you to think about the damage you will cause with the new law linked to here http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2015/db0722/FCC-15-92A1.pdf
"Manufacturers must implement security features in any digitally modulated devices capable of operating in any of the U-NII bands, so that third parties are not able to reprogram the device to operate outside the parameters for which the device was certified. The software must prevent the user from operating the transmitter with operating frequencies, output power, modulation types or other radio frequency parameters outside those that were approved for the device. Manufacturers may use means including, but not limited to the use of a private network that allows only authenticated users to download software, electronic signatures in software or coding in hardware that is decoded by software to verify that new software can be legally loaded into a device to meet these requirements and must describe the methods in their application for equipment authorization." Please reconsider your proposal for the good of the United States in the global technology economy. A US router that's locked down would never be bought anywhere and people will actively avoid something like Cisco routers and instead go for Huwawei. The American tech market could collapse. There is no reason to make this law, since you can simply send a police to a house that is causing interference. We don't need more wifi regulation.

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: Jon

Last Name: Allen

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 52

City: Fargo

Country: United States

State or Province: ND

ZIP/Postal Code: 58107

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: These rules will cause more problems than they could solve. This will cost hardware manufacturers more money and restrict consumers choice. And more than likely the outcome will have the opposite of the desired effect. The reason these firmwares exist to begin with is because of the unwillingness of hardware manufacturers to invest in hardware that no longer provides a revenue stream. This will not solve the problem, which is bad for the consumers of these devices and their neighbors. Further, people will still modify these devices. However, these rules will only allow people with much more specific skills to modify them. Do we really want to only allow people whose speciality is breaking secure systems to modify all our radios?

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: Bailey

Mailing Address: 5332 Salem Church Rd.

City: Knoxville

Country: United States

State or Province: TN

ZIP/Postal Code: 37938

Email Address: lbaile200@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Please do not take away my ability to install the software of my choice on my own computer. Security requires the participation of many in-order to be truly secure. By removing this ability you create a vacuum, wherein the only people willing to test securities are those who would do so maliciously.

Consider, too, that if American equipment were locked down in such a way, many foreign purchasers of American hardware would be unlikely to purchase it, as it would not fit in their use-case, this could hurt american trade.

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: Hunt

Mailing Address: 17 Johnston Ave.

City: Kingston

Country: United States

State or Province: NY

ZIP/Postal Code: 12401

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: I am against these new rules. Users should have the full ability to control their own devices in their own home.

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: Zachary

Last Name: O'Brien

Mailing Address: 12009 coit rd apt 4123

City: Dallas

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 75251

Email Address: Zachary.a.ob@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment:

Public servants of the Federal Communications Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Andrew

Last Name: Heston

Mailing Address: 10223 Remuda Briar St

City: San Antonio

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 78254

Email Address: generalvostok@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: Firstly, thank you taking the time to read my comment.

The current proposed rule is simply unacceptable in our current society. It's the equivalent of requiring auto manufacturers to install locks on the hood of every car they produce and not give the key to the car's owner. It would prevent end users from fixing serious security flaws in their wifi devices in a timely manner, instead requiring them to wait for the slow turning gears of corporate responsibility to come up with a solution to their problem, an option completely unavailable to users with devices no longer supported by the manufacturer. It will prevent the emergence of ad hoc mesh networks, essential tools in the response to any modern disaster, and something that may very well cost lives. It will also destroy whole sectors of commerce, as commercial hotspot businesses will no longer be able to install the software they use to charge customers for using their wifi. It stifles innovation, which is driven not solely by commercial actors, but also by the individual tinkerer, working alone to solve a problem or take advantage of an opportunity that no one else has yet seen. Finally, it interferes with the property rights of the individual. If we can no longer modify our wifi capable devices, if they remain black boxes dependent solely on the goodwill of their manufacturers to remain functional, do we really own any of them. Thank you again for taking the time to read this comment.

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

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

Title: Equipment Authorization and Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices

FR Document Number: 2015-18402

RIN:

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

Submitter Info:

First Name: Marshall

Last Name: Neill

Mailing Address: PO Box 923

City: Maysville

Country: United States

State or Province: OK

ZIP/Postal Code: 73057

Email Address: ramien43@windstream.net

Organization Name: Retired

Comment: Are you really considering this? This should be a no-brainer. "No you cannot lock down a router, phone, pc or anything. Stand with the people, not the corporations.

If you think about this, "When was the last time a corporation did something for the people?"

Never comes to mind. It's always about them. I'm all for a corporation making money/profit, but come on, locking down devices.

Please, just throw this out without a 2nd thought.

Regards,

Marshall Neill

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: Warner

Mailing Address: 7150 Lennon rd

City: Swartz Creek

Country: United States

State or Province: MI

ZIP/Postal Code: 48473

Email Address: Thomaswarner@charter.net

Organization Name:

Comment: I do not support the proposal to disallow alternate firmware on routers. I am just a home user, and I have DD-WRT installed for the sole reason that I find the GUI easier to navigate. However, other people use alternate firmware for more important reasons: research, patching security holes, or repairing problems for which no official firmware update exists. Implementing this policy will make the internet less secure and slow technological advancement.

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: Conway

Mailing Address: 3245 Hugo Pl

City: Dallas

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 75204

Email Address: isOtope@yahoo.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: Mateusz

Last Name: Bieniek

Mailing Address: 67 William Smith Close

City: Cambridge

Country: United Kingdom

State or Province: CAMBS

ZIP/Postal Code: CB1 3QE

Email Address: bieniekmat@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: Scott

Last Name: Perry

Mailing Address: 1 Village Green

City: Patchogue

Country: United States

State or Province: NY

ZIP/Postal Code: 11772

Email Address: Nebulious@gmail.com

Organization Name:

Comment: To the employees of the Federal Communications Commission,

I am gravely concerned about the latest proposal to restrict free use and research by private citizens of alternative wireless and computing systems.

As an individual who works in a research environment, I cannot understate the importance of being able to modify our own equipment. This is necessary for both direct research and developing safe and proper laboratory tools. Devices are modified globally (and historically) by people with diverse motivations and needs. Restricting our ability to modify our own property will only serve to cripple our nation's competitive edge against international innovators.

Like biodiversity, a diversity in available information systems increases everyone's cyber security. We now run on our information and its security; please do not let one corporation's vulnerability endanger a corralled and unchallenged market share. Even worse, it puts our data security solely in the hands of major corporations who have demonstrated little regard for the sanctity of their users' privacy.

I urge you to reconsider these measures. As a free society, our use of technology should not be dependent upon federal approval that locks out all but established incorporated entities. 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. It is a monopoly that hurts the tinkerer and the inventor. In time it can threaten the common user's freedom of expression when the nature of software cannot be challenged.

The Federal Communications Commission presides in an era of increasing importance in our society. Your recent landmark decisions have been able to resist the powerful interests of established entities that have no interest in innovation or competition. I sincerely thank you for your informed rulings. Please continue this trend and toss these unlawful restrictions to the curb. Keep being a shining example of government that strives for its people and preserve our right to control our 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: Ryan

Last Name: Olson

Mailing Address: N. 3639 US Highway 2

City: Iron Mountain

Country: United States

State or Province: MI

ZIP/Postal Code: 49801

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: Bob

Last Name: Sireno

Mailing Address: 109 Agnes St.

City: Port Byron

Country: United States

State or Province: IL

ZIP/Postal Code: 61275

Email Address:

Organization Name:

Comment: The proposed rule must be rejected as it disallows the installation of safe firmware onto privately owned wi-fi routers. Third party firmware is more secure than the mass produced products that have been shown to easily be infected and become a part of a botnet. I cannot believe that the FCC is proposing action that will result in more spam, more computer infections and possibly a way for foreign governments to more easily penetrate American corporate and government networks. Kindly do not implement the dangerous 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: Jonathan

Last Name: Martin

Mailing Address: 12010 Anchick STreet

City: Houston

Country: United States

State or Province: TX

ZIP/Postal Code: 77076

Email Address: jonmartin721@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