

**Before the Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of Expanding Consumers’)	MB Docket No. 16-42
Video Navigation Choices and Commercial)	
Availability of Navigation Devices Notice)	
Of Proposed Rulemaking)	CS Docket No. 97-80

Reply Comments of Beyond Broadband Technology, LLC

May 20, 2016

To The Commission;

The Commission has received hundreds of detailed comments in this proceeding, most of them pointing out that this is an extraordinarily complex proposal, particularly as to its technical, engineering and security aspects as well as the many issues surrounding copyright, contracts, privacy, jurisdiction, industrial policy and the like.

This puts the Commission in a very difficult position, given that one Commissioner has already publicly stated that the “expert agency” is seriously understaffed regarding engineering experts (and, we might add, has virtually no expertise in security and encryption) and two other Commissioners have publicly stated that the “decision” has actually already essentially been written. They made clear that efforts to explain and navigate through the difficult issues raised by the “proposed” rules are a waste of time and effort. Those efforts have been, and will be ignored.

The Chairman, surprisingly, has gone on record roundly criticizing those opposed to his proposal, saying they are just making up excuses for their alleged total opposition and are not offering viable alternatives. This is particularly inapt because the Commission's own DSTAC report provides a major alternative, the "app" approach, which is already proving very popular in the competitive marketplace, and Beyond Broadband Technology (BBT) throughout the DSTAC process and in these proceedings has repeatedly pointed out that a "downloadable security" solution already exists, meets virtually all of the technical parameters of what the Commission says it wants, and that BBT is more than ready to share and provide the specifications of the system and explain its details to the Commission's engineers for review.

The Commission, not those opposed to the technical details of its NPRM, is the party refusing to seek viable solutions. It has studiously avoided engagement with information that might differ from its preconceived technical viewpoint. BBT sees no reason to belabor this proceeding. The Commission complains that those opposed to its proposal have not offered viable alternatives to make its articulated technical objective for an operational, platform agnostic MVPD retail set top box a reality. However one already exists. We have repeatedly offered to demonstrate it, and been rebuffed. We would also note that, unlike the proposed rules, it would not mire the Commission in the current easily foreseeable legal and standards-setting battles that will ensue for years to come should the current proposal be adopted.

The specifications and briefing are available should the Commission actually want them.

Respectfully submitted,

For Beyond Broadband Technology, LLC

/s/ **William D. Bauer**

Chief Executive Officer/Chief Technical Officer

/s/ **Stephen R. Effros**

Of Counsel, Director, Strategic Planning and Communications

Please refer all inquiries to;

Stephen R. Effros
Beyond Broadband Technology, LLC
PO Box 8
Clifton, VA 20124
info@bbtsolution.com
703-631-2099