

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)
)
Request for the Allowance of Optional) RM No. 11673
Electronic Labeling for Wireless Devices)
)

COMMENTS OF MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC.

Motorola Solutions, Inc. (“MSI”) submits these comments in support of the Petition for Rulemaking filed by the Telecommunications Industry Association (“TIA”) in the above-captioned proceeding.¹ In its Petition, TIA urges the Federal Communications Commission (“Commission”) to permit equipment manufacturers to satisfy the Commission’s device identification requirements through the “*non-exclusive option* of electronic labeling.”² The Petition identifies several public interest benefits that consumers, mobile device manufacturers, and fixed equipment manufacturers will receive if electronic labeling is permitted as a substitute for physical labeling. As detailed below, MSI believes that these public interest benefits have merit and therefore urges the Commission to release a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in-line with the Petition.

First, MSI supports TIA’s assertion that, in some cases, electronic labeling will more effectively inform the public about their devices than physical labeling.³ As TIA explains, device users “pay little attention to the numbers etched onto the backs of their devices and even

¹ MSI offers an extensive portfolio of mobile devices for its enterprise and government customers.

² *See Petition for Rulemaking by the Telecommunications Industry Association*, RM No. 11673, 1 (Aug. 6, 2012) (emphasis added) (“*TIA Petition*”).

³ *See id.* at 10.

less attention to labels glued into their devices' battery compartment[s].”⁴ This is especially so with mobile devices enveloped in protective cases, which often obscure the FCC identification information. Electronic labels, however, will return device identification information to prominence as the identification information can be displayed front-and-center on a device's screen as often as each time the user turns on the device.⁵

TIA also observes that electronic labeling will better fit user expectations in this digital age. In this era of e-books and blogs, digital downloads and streaming, and online user manuals, “consumers are no longer accustomed to receiving information via physical formats.”⁶ Many consumers expect that important information will be available to them “digitally in an easy to read format along with additional helpful material.”⁷ By permitting electronic labeling, the FCC will enable manufacturers to satisfy this consumer preference. In fact, as TIA notes, some manufacturers that switch to electronic labeling might also voluntarily choose to include “additional information beyond the device's FCC identifier, such as device recycling and take-back programs, warranty information, device care instructions, and links or phone numbers for customer service websites and call centers.”⁸ MSI believes that these identified benefits have merit and therefore supports electronic labeling.

Second, electronic labeling will decrease manufacturing costs. As TIA explains, mobile device manufacturers are developing “devices that are thinner, sleeker, and more efficient” and

⁴ *See id.*

⁵ *See id.* at 3. The user should have the ability to prevent the electronic label from loading with each start-up after the user views it at least once.

⁶ *Id.* at 12.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.* at 10.

that incorporate “innovations such as non-removable batteries, single body enclosures, and the utilization of a wide variety of construction materials.”⁹ These innovations, however, have made physical labeling much more costly than in previous years (when manufacturers simply stuck labels inside of battery chambers). Specifically, manufacturers must now purchase sophisticated tools and machinery that can reliably etch or print on the limited free space available on modern devices. These tools must also be able to etch and print on the different construction materials—metals, plastics, and glass—used to construct modern devices. Manufacturers must also allocate factory space and personnel for physical labeling. In contrast, electronic labeling would be cheaper and would free up factory space and personnel for other important endeavors.¹⁰ MSI fully expects that manufacturers will develop low-cost, standardized electronic labeling protocols for downloading device identification information across all devices in a manufacturer’s portfolio.

Third, electronic labeling will provide manufacturers more flexibility in getting devices to market. As TIA explains, physical labeling is not only expensive, it also is highly susceptible to irreversible and costly errors.¹¹ And these errors “cause a loss of production output and a waste of device components.”¹² Often, devices “must be pulled off of shipping pallets, unwrapped, and changed to reflect” the correct regulatory information.¹³ This prevents

⁹ *Id.* at 14.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 15 (“If the Commission adopts electronic labeling as a valid option for mobile phones and other RF devices, manufacturers will be able to eliminate expensive physical labeling processes that will increase logistical flexibility, and free up valuable factory capacity that can be used to increase production levels.”).

¹¹ *See id.*

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Id.*

manufacturers from reacting to market demands for new devices and from getting devices to market as soon as possible.

Electronic labeling would mitigate these problems. MSI envisions that manufacturers will develop technologies that enable them to edit labels remotely and through automated computer programs, instead of relabeling each device by hand.¹⁴ This will give manufacturers the flexibility to correct labeling errors on devices already in the stream of commerce without having to recall such devices. Electronic labeling will also make it easier for manufacturers to respond to shifts in demand in the international market.¹⁵

Finally, MSI strongly supports TIA’s position that electronic labeling must be optional and that physical labeling still be permitted. MSI currently manufactures devices without electronic displays that are therefore incapable of supporting electronic labeling. Forcing MSI and other manufacturers to redesign such devices to accommodate electronic labeling would be overly burdensome and extremely costly. These costs would ultimately be borne by users.

* * *

In sum, MSI urges the Commission to release a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that seeks comments on the benefits of electronic labeling. MSI is confident that the evidence gathered in such a proceeding will show that the optional use of electronic labeling will benefit both consumers and manufacturers.

¹⁴ TIA explains that “manufacturers will be able to perform a simple memory wipe and reprogramming to apply a new electronic label.” *Id.* at 16.

¹⁵ *See id.* at 15-16 (With physical labeling, if a manufacturer decides to reroute devices from one country to another, the “[d]evices destined for one country must be pulled off of shipping pallets, unwrapped, and changed to reflect the necessary regulatory information” for the new destination. This process “consumes an unnecessary amount of labor, storage space, and production capacity and is therefore exceedingly wasteful and costly.”).

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Catherine Seidel

Catherine Seidel

Chief,

Global Spectrum and Regulatory Policy

Motorola Solutions, Inc.

1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20004

(202) 371-6900

October 5, 2012

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On October 5, 2012, I, Chuck Powers, served the attached comments of Motorola Solutions, Inc. on:

Danielle Coffey
Vice President, Government Affairs
Telecommunications Industry Association
10 G Street N.E.
Suite 550
Washington, D.C. 20002

/s/ Chuck Powers