

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Aaron.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printers opens a whole new world of innovation, stuff that would take skilled model makers or craftsmen to make, suddenly just takes one person skilled enough to make the model, then distribute it to the rest of us. U

So what right? So just print in your PLA/ABS filament and be happy right? Did you know you can get filament that has bamboo in it? Or metal? Meaning, with some extra cleaning up when you're done... you've just 3d printed something partially out of wood (or metal) with all the advantages there-in (sand, paint, or custom jewelry or small machine parts). I don't trust these large manufactures to look out for the consumer by not enforcing vendor lock-in via printer-style ink drm, but I also don't trust them if they are granted that right to stay competitive and provide all the options that crazy guys are figuring out in their garage then turning into commercial options. Anyway, that's my 2 cents, thanks folks for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Adam Bancroft.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Why wouldn't we want to use other materials? Seems like a no brainer - and it could benefit everyone.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Adam Mills.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I believe that it is fundamental that when you purchase a tool, that you are able to use it in the manner in which you choose. That includes being able to feed a printer supplies that may not originate from the original manufacturer. Other sources may have more innovative, or less expensive feedstock, and being locked into using the feedstock approved by the manufacturer unnecessarily and harmfully limits what a person may do with a piece of equipment that they purchased and own. This is fundamental to the very idea of ownership and creativity. I urge the Office to deny Stratasys' objection to this.

Thank you for your consideration. I believe that the Office must stand for the rights of the citizens, rather than the whims of large, well-funded corporations, and will rule in accordance with the best benefits to the citizens as individuals.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Adrian Hood.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D Printing is the new frontier of experimentation and creation, and manufacturers are using coy marketing procedures to sell locked-down equipment to beginners so they're forced to use proprietary cartridges filled with common material. Often these cartridges are priced 5 or 6 times above the market value of these materials simply because you have no choice. This is extortion that suppresses consumer innovation.

If we suppress our ability to create, learn, and modify our own property then we will set in motion a world that fosters stupidity and dependence, not innovation and progress. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Alan Baribault.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

The corporate concept of ownership is fundamentally flawed. I am appalled by the DCMA and want to see it repealed. I also believe that patents should not be allowed on genetic material. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Alexander Miller.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printers are a perfect example of the potential of technology to unlock innovation. We should not bind that innovation to protect the market share of any one company. There is no reason that "intellectual property" protections should be an excuse to limit innovation in this arena. People want to use 3D printers and other similar technology to improve the world, make their ideas into reality, and improve the American economy. Let them do it freely. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Amos Blanton.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

The restrictions under discussion to prevent me, the customer, from using something I have purchased in a reasonable way are ludicrous, and clearly motivated by profiteering on the part of Stratasys and similar companies. They should not be permitted under US law to create such monopolies.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Anand Subbaraman.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

For the 3D printer technology to become widespread and useful, it is absolutely important that the owner of the printer be able to use his own printer filament. It is OK if usage of a filament that is not certified by the manufacturer voids the warranty on the printer, but the user should have the right to modify a printer for his own purposes without it being a criminal act! Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Anna Hagen.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

People use whatever ink they want in a printer. They should be able to use whatever filament they want in a 3d printer. Ú

Ú

I will only buy a 3d printer that allows me to use whatever filament I want. It will stagnate the industry if filaments are locked down.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Austin Gore.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

As a tinkerer, I should be free to use the devices that I own, including 3D printers, however I see fit. This improves my ability to innovate and create, activities which are both vital to our American economy.

The DMCA needs to be revised to promote consumer freedom, creativity and innovation. The three year exemption process is not enough to ensure this. The DMCA should not enforce issues where no copyright is at stake, nor should it infringe on my rights to break drm without the intention to violate copyright. Thank you.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, ben garcia.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Stratasys is only doing this to ensure a steady stream of revenue, with no benefit to the users who thought they OWNED their 3d printer.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Bill Kriegsman.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

There are a wide variety of 3d printer filaments available, many at lower cost than available from the printer manufacturers. I would like the freedom to purchase the filament from a company of my choice.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, bobee padilla.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

This type of thing is way companies like Stratasys need to be investigated by the DOJ for unfair business practices.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Boris Erickson.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

The cornerstone of owning and operating a 3D printer is the ability to experiment. Everything from how you construct your models, to how the model is prepped for print, to the type of filament used. Restricting my access to filament types unfairly constrains my ability to conduct these types of experiments and reduces the knowledge base of how various filaments behave and print. It should be up to the artist/engineer/educator to decide what filament to use, and where to source that filament, in order to experiment and learn as they see fit. Thank you for your consideration, and please help keep hardware open.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Brett Carter.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Can you imagine requiring by law that the components of a hardware store can only be used to build and repair approved items, devices, contraptions, etc. If the wright brothers could only use wrench to build a bicycle, we wouldn't have the airplane. A 3D printer is no less a tool than a wrench. It helps build things. The owner of a 3D printer should have all authority and power to utilize it in any legal way they see fit. Illegal activities facilitated through 3D printer should be enforced by the appropriate laws that make those things illegal, not through copyright law. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Brian Hardie.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

When consumers purchase a physical device, that device should belong to the consumer, not the manufacturer. Property and ownership rights are integral to our society and economy. I wholeheartedly believe that contracts should be honored. Thus, a consumer should not be able to move away from a contractual obligation to maintain service while paying off a phone subsidy. However, the physical device, once in the possession of the consumer should be in the consumers control. It shouldn't matter to the service provider what the consumer does with the device as long as the financial terms of the contract are met. If a consumer wants to modify a device they own, that is the consumer's privilege. If a manufacturer wants to sell their devices at a more affordable up-front price, they should provide an explicit contract spelling out the subsidy cost and the payment plan. This contract should be binding, and the consumer should be responsible for meeting their agreements. However, the manufacturer should no longer have any control over the physical device as long as the financial terms of the obligation are being met.Ú

Ú

Stratasys' argument is a logical fallacy. First of all, there is a lot of evidence online that users want to be able to use their own choice of materials in 3d printing. Second, an alleged lack of evidence Ú

is not a reasonable argument in favor of a restrictive law. That's like saying "no one online is expressing worry about the legality of replacing their own roof with a different brand of shingle," as an argument in favor of making it illegal to repair one's own roof.Ú

Ú

Restricting consumer rights to physical devices may help manufacturers in the short term, but

such restrictions will hurt us all in the long term.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Brian Spradlin.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printing, while existing for some time in the industrial realm, has most recently come to popularity through the "maker" society. These are people that strive to invent or improve on existing devices by testing what can be done. Being locked into using one "approved" material for a 3D printer feels like being told that you can only toast one brand and recipe of bread in your home toaster. If that sounds like a silly comparison, it's because being required to use only one input material in a 3D printer sounds just as silly to a maker.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Bruce Grant.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Copyright law should not stand in the way of using whatever material you choose in a 3D printer. The DMCA is supposed to protect artists' rights; restricting printer use does the opposite. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Carlos Fuentes.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

The potential of 3D printing in our economy is its ability to unlock creativity. A threat of lawsuit stifles creativity, and is a terrible misuse of the DMCA.

Ú

This is particularly true when you consider the novel materials being produced by a wide variety of third parties, such as conducting filaments, carbon fiber filaments, etc.

Ú

If I could not take advantage of the latest developments in the industry, I cannot be a participant on moving the industry forward.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Cary Allen.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Stratasys insisting that it controls what goop people put into machines it has sold is ridiculous. It is like an auto manufacturer forcing people to buy certain brands of gasoline, or tires after they have purchased the cars. Do sewing machine manufacturers monitor the thread people use in them, and claim a right to stop them if they use brands they don't approve of? Of course not, that would be insane. That is no different than what Stratasys is asking you to enable them to do. There is nothing new or special about a machine that melts plastic and converts it into desired shapes. The type of plastic, or whatever else a purchaser wants to put into a machine she owns is of no concern to the manufacturer. To suggest otherwise is to violate the most basic notions of personal property.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope you will rein in manufacturers who attempt to control people's behavior with products they have sold them.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Charles Haase.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Of course I want to use different materials in my printer! That's why I would never buy a printer that is locked into brand-specific filaments. The reason Stratasys, DaVinci, and others lock their printers down has to do with one thing: profits. It is the classic razor and blade (or printer and ink) business model. And it is silly, predatory, and monopolistic in that it allows those companies to set non-competitive pricing for their products. Imagine if you could only put "Ford gas" in your Ford car, and Ford decided that the price should be \$20 per gallon. Terrible idea. If they want to say that I void my warranty by using a brand other than their own... fine. But give me the choice!

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Chris Reyes.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I definitely want and do use 3rd party material in my 3D printers. Tethon3D is a classic example of using 3rdparty material and my company is dependent on the ability to further explore new and cheaper methods of material not originally designed our supported by the manufacturer of the original 3D printer. To accept Stratasys' claim is to stifle innovation and strangle small businesses like mine.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Colby Parsons.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

No 3d printer should be limited to proprietary filament. To do so provides no value to customers, and can only serve to inflate material prices, limit choice and innovation, and penalize newcomers to the field, who do not realize they are getting scammed. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Craig Schmidt.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

This is more of an attempt to lock the system and force buyers to buy filament from one source, rather than trying to improve the user experience. My MakerBot, for example, will not operate properly with MakerBot filament; it jams every two minutes with Makerbot filament. When using other brands, such as Octave, the printer has run for 20+ hours without jams. If I were forced to use MakerBot filament exclusively in my machine, it would be reduced to a large paperweight. Do we regulate ink in inkjet printers; toner in laser printers or thread in sewing machines? No. Regulating filament in 3D printers will also stifle development of new materials and processes. Each owner should have the right to use the machine how he/she sees fit, and with the material he/she prefers to use.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, cristin Winn Reyes.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

We should be allowed to void our warranties and to use our items in ways that weren't intended to best meet our needs.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Dale A von Ruden Jr..

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

OF COURSE I want to be able to experiment with new materials in my 3D printer! I also want to be able to use any gas in my car, any food in my microwave, and any software on my computer. Anyone who argues otherwise clearly just wants to stifle innovation and preserve the market share they have left. Ú

Ú

Stratasys is doomed anyway because everyone hates them, their bogus patent applications, and the way they treat their users. It would be a shame to allow them to influence the process in any way whatsoever.Ú

Ú

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Dale Porter.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Only being able to use a manufacturer supplied filament is like saying I can only use a standard printer or copier with paper provided by the manufacturer of the printer. I should be able to use any consumables in my 3D printer I want. After all, I own the printer, right?
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, dan gottlieb.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

This should be users choice!
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Daniel Nicolosi.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

A 3D printer is no different than any number of machines already in the manufacturing industry. If I buy a lathe or a mill, I can use any brand of cutting inserts or drills that I want. If I buy a die-grinder, I can load any grinding or cutting wheel onto it. I don't need proprietary wheels for my car. Nor am I restricted to using only the stock outboard motor on my boat. In this same way, if I want to use a new printhead in my 3D printer, I shouldn't be locked out of it. If I find a structural design flaw that's affecting my 3D print quality, I should be able to modify it to make it better. Ú

Ú

On the other note I do not have to use only certain 2x4s on my cut-off saw. I'm not restricted to only turning certain types of steel in a lathe because a specific company doesn't supply it. I should be allowed to print with any type of filament material on the market. Ú

Ú

If a company insists on not allowing their product to be modified and only using their proprietary filaments, then they're just going to be hurting their sales in the long run anyway. As consumers become more "tech savvy" they will naturally be drawn to companies that allow exemptions to a copyright law as the one proposed. Consider the company RepRap. They have built an entire business out of essentially giving away their own product. Open source designs and open source software have allowed the community to grow and expand in just a few short years. It promotes development and cooperation. If everyone just added product X to their online shopping cart from company X, then no one would collaborate. Additionally, everyone would hesitate to spend any money on a printer in the first place out of the fear of getting locked into buying filament X that may or may not be as good as filament Y for another printer.Ú

Ú

Lastly, consider all the small businesses and jobs created out of the ability to create 3rd party solutions. Companies like Ninjaflex exist solely as a supplier of flexible filament. If companies don't allow 3rd party filament to be used, this whole company would go out of business. Or the alternative being that they would have to market to the 3D printer manufacturers directly who would undoubtedly add their own markup to the price thus making it more prohibitive to buy. Again, this would stifle creativity and advancement of the technology.

Thank you for your consideration and taking the time out of your schedule to read this.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Daryl LaFoya.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printing has a vibrant, open source community. Ideas are sourced from all around. Just because a company says that no one would want to use a material does not make it so. The company has not figured out a way to produce the material for the public and gain a profit more than likely. If they want to void a warranty on a printer, fine, but making it illegal to attempt to use a material that they cannot profit from is crazy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Davey Rance.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

The biggest benefit of having a 3d printer at home is that i can try new things when they come out. Some times the new materials that come out are not made by the existing printer manufactures.Ú

Ú

It is fair for the printer manufacturer to say that if you choose to use filament from me then you void your warranty but not making it so if i use a different filament it is not legal.Ú

Ú

This would be like the manufacturer of your washing machine saying that is not legal for you to use washing power that is not approved by the manufacturer

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, David Ham.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printing is a technology that I use almost everyday and the biggest factor when using it is the ability to cheaply and quickly prototype pieces to any project that I'm working on. One of the best ways for me to keep those costs down is to use 3rd party filament from 3rd parties that I trust. Without this cost factor, I fear 3D printing would be significantly more expensive and the price of 'proprietary' filament would increase further as each device would have it's own monopoly for the filament delivery system.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, David Hyland-Wood.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I own a 3D printer from MakerBot, a company purchased by Stratasys, and use third-party printing filament constantly. The third party filament is typically cheaper, and often better quality.Ú

I have recently been involved in opening a community Makerspace in Fredericksburg, VA. Our students, parents, and other members of the community routinely use our 3D printers with third-party filament. Enforcing DRM-like restrictions will only raise costs and reduce opportunities for experimentation for our young people, experimenters and entrepreneurs.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Drew Nevins.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

This is ridiculous. Why can't I use whatever filament I want in my 3D printer? How many materials did Edison go through before he settled on the right one for a lightbulb? What if I want to use materials that no one has thought of before, just to see what happens? Like frosting filament, for edible 3D objects? This is absolutely the stupidest argument I have ever heard, and it isn't even based on factual evidence.

Please take a moment to consider how you would feel in this situation, as a private citizen who isn't attempting to break the law, but merely wants to enjoy a product they already purchased outside of what the sales and marketing team sold you the product to do.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Dustin Jamner.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

When copyright law dictates the use of personal, private property in cases unrelated to the sharing of proprietary knowledge and ideas or their presentations it has clearly overstepped its bounds. If a consumer owns a device, that consumer has the right to use it incorrectly. While a cup may be sold as a drinking device, no reasonable person or company would object to its use as a receptacle for paint. What legal footing then is there for the manufacturers of 3D printers to regulate the materials inserted into their customers' devices?

The purpose of copyright law is to protect the ideas of individuals and companies as well as the presentation of those ideas. This enables the monetization of creation and creates a safe environment in which creators can market their work. However, when companies can use copyright law to criminalize the use of personal property in instances where the illegitimate distribution of those ideas is not a concern it has clearly overstepped its bounds.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Edward Lemon.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Copyright law is intended to prevent people from copying protected works. Using copyright law as a way to prevent people from using products that they have purchased is clearly out of the scope of the constitutional authority for copyright, and as a practical matter simply serves to stifle competition in the feedstock marketplace. As a long-time technologist, the idea that copyright could be used in this way is very frustrating: its only purpose will be to unjustly enrich a few already wealthy individuals at the expense of U.S. citizens and others who stand to benefit from 3d printing technology.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Eric Ferguson III TSGT, USAF (Ret).

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Guess what - there IS more than a single person and Stratasys is LYING.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Erik Brewster.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I use a personal 3d printer on a regular basis. I use it to make parts for my radio controlled car that I race for a hobby. As I crash it often, I'm very interested in making strong parts.Ú

Ú
The material science involved in 3D printing strong parts is evolving rapidly and there are materials available today that my 3D printer's manufacturer never imagined. If I were to wait for my manufacturer to approve these new, advanced materials, I would never get to use them. In addition, I would be subject to the whims of the sales department to set terms on use of these new, advanced materials, even though they had never imagined them when I purchased the printer.Ú

Ú
To allow printer manufacturers to hold hostage the printers regarding use of new materials makes the printer a disposable item.Ú

Ú
If we look at the motivation behind locking a printer to approved materials, we can see it is a purely holding the customer hostage. The manufacturer holds the printer hostage, demanding that the printer never is used without approved material. In exchange for this demand, the customer must pay for the approved consumable material. I use strong language like "holding hostage" because this cost / demand is not in exchange for the material (though that is included in the cost), but is really a cost / demand for the right to use the material. The manufacturer hold monopoly on approval of the material.Ú

Ú
To put it in perspective, let's say I buy a printer today and the manufacturer insists on only using

their material. In one year, new materials are developed by another company. The printer was not developed specifically with these materials in mind, as they did not exist when the printer was developed. The manufacturer can private label this material and demand a large price mark up for "approved" material, that they did not add any value to.Ú

Ú

In addition, manufacturers are not motivated by small markets -- they don't bring in enough revenue. If a new material was developed and the 3d printer manufacturer did not think it was a large enough market (happens a lot already), what would their motivation be to search for all new materials and take the effort to "approve" it? There is essentially no motivation. As a result, I get locked out of using a new material because it isn't commercially attractive to the printer manufacturer.Ú

Ú

Please do not allow 3d printer companies to restrict use of their 3d printers to solely "approved" filaments.

I feel it is important that the public is allowed to repair and be in control of maintenance of the products they purchase. Whether it is the right to repair a product they way they see fit, or to renew the consumable materials that their product consumes, it is important to leave customers options in the use of the products they purchase and rely on.

To limit repair and replacement of consumables to only those methods endorsed by the manufacturers is endorsing unfair monopolies in particular areas of a products needs. It would be ridiculous to imagine a hammer that has electronics in it, solely to ensure that the user only buys a certain brand of nail or return it to the factory to get the handle cleaned. The big difference between repairing a car or using new materials in a 3d printer is an argument of the complexity of the product, not the core argument.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, erin.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printers know that their products are still in the early stages of development and know users are tinkering with their products, which frankly need it. right now the entire industry is still working out the kinks and allowing users the freedom to play with their products and provide feedback. please support the further development of the 3d printing community and stop these copyright law that would limit that.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Frank Luongo.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I wish to be able to utilize my 3d printer with whatever available media it can handle. I do not want any restrictions whatsoever imposed on my creative use of the printer. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Gary Buchholz.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printer companies should not be able to make themselves the sole vendor for materials. Why be afraid of a little competition?

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Gay Gordon-Byrne.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Consumables, such as ink, window washer fluid, oil, toner, or feedstock for anything should not be monopolized by the manufacturer. If 3D printing is going to flourish, which it has the potential to do, it cannot be thwarted by manufacturers seeking to protect their profit motive in providing consumables or repair or support. Ú

Ú

Imagine if manufacturers of microwave ovens were to dictate the consumer only use manufacturer-provided dishes in the machine. Microwave ovens have digital electronic chips inside too. It is technically feasible to insert a sensor in "authorized" dishes that would link to the on/off switch on the appliance. Ú

Ú

Whatever IP the manufacturer seeks to protect is impossible to compromise by consumables. The machine might not work correctly, but that is up to the printer owner. The owner has control over the use of their property - not the manufacturer.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Glenn Berden.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

If I can't have control of my printer and filament, then the companies need to provide the Printer and filament for free. If I pay for it, then I should have the right to do what ever I want to with it. Thank you for doing the right thing.

If we pay for it we should own it, I really find it hard to believe that this is even a discussion.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Greg Howley.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printers are an up-and-coming technology, and forcing consumers to use proprietary materials would be a real block to innovation by making use of 3D printing prohibitively expensive for many purposes. It would artificially inflate prices by eliminating all competition via a government-enforced monopoly. My hope is that the government can help people by busting monopolies and allowing a free market rather than creating monopolies. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, gregory cohen.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I have made my one filament that I have used in a commercial 3d printer. There was none made to the spec I need. It seems counter intuitive to have a machine used to creating and to limit what goes in it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Gzim Derti.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

If 3D printing becomes main stream, the ability to print new/repair parts for an old car, tractor, or anything else I own should be legal...
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, H. Kenny.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

we paid for the item we did not rent it. we can do what we want with them.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Heath Hales.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

As a hobbyist looking at rapid prototyping and distributed manufacturing as the current forefront of manufacturing evolution, it is important that we maintain the ability to try new things and improve upon old techniques. This technology is still new and maturing and there remains a need for continued innovations many technological fields. Certainly bio-medical engineering, biology, and could be benefited from new materials being made for 3D printers, but that innovation is stifled when the ability to do so is limited.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Henry Biglin.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

This goes to the same fundamental issues as inkjet, laser printers, etc. I am not asking for the manufacture to warranty my equipment if I break it by using an alternative. But by not allowing me to use an alternative, what happen when the manufacturer decides to stop supporting this product. Then any useful remaining life is lost.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Isaac Hayes.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printing is a passion of mine and has enabled my hobbies and side projects to reach a new level of design and iteration through its use. One of the limiting factors in 3D printing can be the choice of materials to be used. Large companies that lock their printers to their own printing materials often charge 100-300% more money for the same and often lesser grade materials that are readily available from 3rd party vendors. This stifles my ability to innovate through excessive cost and also can lead to a disadvantage in entrepreneurship through limited choice of materials. Many new materials are coming out that offer advantages in categories ranging from eco-friendly biodegradability, rigidity, durability, friction coefficient, to look and feel for fashion. The first party offerings often pale in comparison to the many 3rd party vendors and without unlocked printers I as a consumer am not able to take advantage of this. Unlocking 3D printing material choice is essential to small business growth and modern manufacturing jobs as well as to hobbyists. All of my engineering friends with their own 3D printers use materials from third parties. Many of us have chosen open source printers that do not have the material choice locked but in this we are often made to do without several of the features from large corporations that are currently under patent (such as heated build chambers). Those who have chosen locked printers find themselves without the material choice and cost effectiveness that have led to successful designs from those of us without locked printers. This is a key issue in the advancement of technology and future innovation and jobs in this country. We NEED unlocked 3D printers and material choice.

Thank you for your consideration in this issue. Empowered consumers lead to great advancements and economic stability for all.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, j.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

freedom to use any materials always

Thank you for your consideration. keep competition and innovation alive

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, James Pikul.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

As a Ph.D. student in mechanical engineering I am very excited about the future that 3D manufacturing will allow us to create. There are 2 current limitation in 3D manufacturing: 1. the time it takes 2. the number and quality of materials that can be used. 3D manufacturing will only make a long term real impact in peoples lives if these things can be made better and to do that we as innovators and engineers need to be able to use current 3D printing machines with whatever materials we can engineer into it. In this way we can not only create new materials that allow other users to do more with their machines, but also make more useful things than just plastic 3D sculptures.

Thank you for your consideration.

Please think about the engineers and innovators in America who want to use the tools around us to make a better world. Limiting our ability to use these tools without the permission of corporate lawyers will allow other engineers in the world to outpace and out innovate us.

-James Pikul

Department of Energy Office of Science Graduate Research Fellow
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Jason Cantarella.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Dear Copyright Office,Ú
Ú

I'm a scientist who uses a MakerBot (now owned by Stratasys!) 3d printer to make robot parts. It would benefit me immensely to have a robust aftermarket in printer filament; what if I need a filament in a color not sold by MakerBot? Or something with a material property other than PLA? My use of the printer at my university is governed by both federal grant rules and university regulations; I literally can't buy filament which might be in violation of the law. Ú
Ú

Sure, doing science might involve taking some risks; it might even void my warranty. But it shouldn't be illegal.Ú

Ú
Sincerely, Ú

Ú
Dr. Jason CantarellaÚ
University of Georgia

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Jesse Selvin.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printers should be a force for liberation, not a force for increased control. Innovation will come from 3D printers that anyone can use for any purpose, NOT from one company telling people what materials they can and cannot use.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Jim Shealy.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printing by nature is about process, not materials. As an employee who spends day in and day out 3D printing in Metal, plastic, and other materials, the key to 3d printing's success and utility is the ability to change materials. A printer should be able to accept any filament or material it is fed. Ú

Ú

I personally use many different "unapproved" materials in my 3D printers. The only reason for the explosion in 3D printing is indeed this rapidly developing material sciences field where users can input any desired filament and give it a shot. If it doesn't work, it fades out of popularity. I have used the "required" filaments that companies like stratasys or 3DS require. While I would like to use better filaments that I know will perform properly, it adds significant uncertainty and frustration trying to use an expensive machine that I purchased without being able, or being uncertain if there will be legal ramifications if I was to use the "unapproved" filament, even if I know it will perform better for my needs than that which Stratasys or 3DS deems a best fit for me.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Joanne Merriam.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Copyright is meant to encourage invention, not protect corporate interests. Voiding a warranty shouldn't be illegal. I should be able to use my own property with whatever accessories I like without prior restraint. That encourages invention. Thank you.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Joe Ambrosino.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

This is like saying I have to use a manufacturer's brand of toothpaste with their toothbrush. Once I have purchased a piece of equipment, it should be mine to use as I please.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Joel Finkle.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

It should be possible to use commodity materials in 3D printers, so that they are not locked in to manufacturer-only filaments, toners, etc. Similar DRM has left inkjet printer ink more expensive than pharmaceuticals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, john bebee.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Not being able to use my own material in the product that I buy is like not being able to refill a bottle of Coke with water after I finished it. I own the bottle I should be able to put whatever I want in it.

Thank you

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Jon Matchi.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printing is evolving quickly. There is no value to the consumer that would prevent the use of new and improved filaments. Ú

Ú

Like thread in a sewing machine!

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Joseph Towery.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Alliw me to use my material I choosein my 3d printer.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Josh Burkner.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

As the owner of a second generation 3D printer whose manufacturer no longer produces filament for this particular printer, I am very concerned about applying the DCMA to 3D printers. My printer functions perfectly well with third party filament, just as well as with the stock of filament I stockpiled before the printer manufacturer discontinued production. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Joshua Coke.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Do not stop me from choosing my own filament.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Justin Burr.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

What if I bought a toaster from Black and Decker and it only worked with bread sold by Black and Decker? Sounds rather silly. I see little difference between a toaster and a 3D printer. A 3D printer manufacture should not be expected to provide support for the use of third party filament in their hardware. It would also be reasonable to expect that use of unauthorized material would void the manufacturer's warranty. However, the end user should be able to legally choose how the 3D printer is used. I list below two reasons:Ú

1) There may not be a large enough market force to warrant the manufacturer selling every material. However, niche applications may require a specific material. If the material is not being marketed by the printer manufacture, what is the individual to do?Ú

2) Business models should be dependent upon having a superior technological advantage. Models which rely on limiting market competition by hiding behind copyright law are not good for the American consumer. They also are not good for the American economy where competition spurs innovation and advancement.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Kelsey Higham.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Official materials for 3D printing are prohibitively expensive. I use the cheapest filament available, just like I use the cheapest acrylic paint available, because I want to make lots of art. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Ken Peterson.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I object to the idea that the manufacturer can decide or even prevent me from using any material I choose to 3D print with, that is outrageous.Ú

Ú

Its my printer it was sold to me as my property so let me use it as I see fit.Ú

Ú

Ken Peterson

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Kevin A. Freitas.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Choosing the type or brand of filament that I use in my* 3D printer is akin to choosing what songs I load onto my MP3 player. The manufacturer of the MP3 player doesn't get to dictate the artists or studios who's music I can listen to and, by the same token, I can choose the material I extrude through my 3D printer. Void the warranty, take away support -- by all means. But the * above denotes the printer belongs to me once I purchase it. Aside from this, embrace a diverse community of hackers and makers who may use your device instead of being their adversary. The rewards will be far greater than any imaginary drawbacks. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Lawrence Evans.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Don't make the public a slave to private companies that manufacture a tool. they want it to be a law that a person bound for the life to stay with a company. It erodes the whole American concept of a free market makes for success. If I buy a tool out right, not rented or leased, it should be mine to use any way I chose to use it. If that business wants me to keep buying their products they need to do it the true American way. Provide a equal or superior product at the best price the free market allows and retain my loyalty and business. They sold a 3D printer and it was bought because it was the best choice of all on the market. That company had success. do the same with the refill products. Every time an American makes a purchasing choice they should not have their hands tied by law to only have one source to buy materials from. Let the free market sort it all out and people free to go where it is in their best interest to buy. If that makes the Printers initial cost go up that is good the transaction is kept honest and mis-leading because of hidden expectations of secondary sales. If I sell a hammer can I have a law that says buyer can only use nails bought from me for the life of the hammer?

Thank you for your consideration. Please ask the question of what it means to be an American and what was the ideals this country founded from. Them make the policy you put us all under mirror that answer

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Luke Bockman.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

This one is completely ridiculous.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Luke Brane.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I am a maker and a medical student. I intend to go into rehabilitation medicine and study the application and improvement of prosthetics. For the last two years I have been a part of the volunteer group e-NABLE, a global collection of makers, designers, medical professionals, and enthusiasts who have freely given their time and energy into crowd sourcing the design of a low cost mechanical prosthetic hand. We have printed and given away thousands of these devices and continue to improve the design and work around limitations to reach an ever widening user population. This whole effort, and especially the work of research and development, would not have been possible if we were required to only use the filament provided by the manufacturer of the printer. This is because, unlike the ink in a 2D paper printer, 3D filament feedstock can have many different properties once it is printed. It is the possibility of using so many different materials that has allowed the crowd-sourced innovation we have seen with e-NABLE, but most of these materials that pushed the boundaries and allowed us to improve the design, aren't even sold by the manufacturers. By making it illegal to use a 3rd party filament for a 3D printer, you are drastically decreasing the utility and ultimately the potential, of one of the most powerful technologies that has ever been invented. You must ask yourself, why am I doing this; why would I hobble a whole technological platform of innovation? Who benefits in the end? Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Mac castaldini.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

To whom it may concern , I reserve the right to use whatever materials i chose and the right to repair my own equipment...and auhrhorize my self to do so....
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Marc Mohon.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Its crazy that they would try to lock you into using a specific brand of filament, the only reason that i've never said anything is that it seemed insane that anyone would consider it.Ú

Ú

I paid thousands for my 3d printer, i'm not expecting them to honor the warranty if i mess up but, i should be able to put whatever filament i want into my printer without worrying about legal repercussions. Its my printer, i didn't lease the printer from someone, i bought it, i own it. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Margaret Monahan.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I am about to purchase a 3D printer, and one of the biggest things that excites me about such a thing is the upcoming possibility of creating my own filament from recycled plastics. So for me, it is absolutely necessary that copyright law not be a barrier to this use. Please let me use my own 3D printer filament.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Margaret Monahan.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I am about to purchase a 3D printer, and one of the biggest things that excites me about such a thing is the upcoming possibility of creating my own filament from recycled plastics. So for me, it is absolutely necessary that copyright law not be a barrier to this use. Please let me use my own 3D printer filament.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Mark Grigsby.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

One of the beauties of 3d printers is that they are open source. This industry has sparked a creativity in people around the world. There is no need for a monopoly in something this progressive.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Mark Meszar.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

As an educational institution we routinely like to experiment with new and different technologies and being limited to one kind of material stifles innovation both for us and for the students we are preparing to serve in the future.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Mark Smith.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Why does the government want to be in the way of everything? I should be able to use whatever material for a 3D printer that I choose.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Mark Winney.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I wish to use whatever material i wish in my 3D printer.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Matt Cushman.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I run a small 3D printing business. Trying to process enough print jobs to pay the rent, the printer payment, and the material bill every month is difficult. When you can only buy high priced materials from an artificially created monopoly, it only makes it worse. If I own the machine, I should be able to feed the machine with whatever I want. Any law that prevents that goes against the values of free enterprise and shouldn't exist.

As a small business owner, sometimes it is difficult to get my voice heard, so I truly appreciate your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Matthew Rossing.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I don't own a 3d printer yet, but I should be able to use it however I want.Ú
Ú

"Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Michael Brown.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I'm currently in the process of purchasing a 3D printer with the intent to at some point use custom made filament to produce unique, one-off, patent worthy items. I would expect and accept that use of filament not approved by the manufacturer of the printer would void a warranty but this is NOT the concern of copyright law.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Michael Horton.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Barring a copyright exemption for 3D printer filament would have drastic implications for the future of entry level 3D printing. It would disincentivize the creation of new 3D printer filaments and filament formulas by third parties, which could provide alternatives to proprietary 3D filaments that can only be used on specific 3D printer models or printer series. Also, new 3D printer filament formulas could be created to extend the usable lifespan of older 3D printers by providing improved strength, lightness, etc... while conforming to the safe melting points of 3D printer filaments that have been officially approved. This adds value to older hardware and prevents companies from exploiting consumers through planned printer obsolescence and expensive proprietary filaments, which would fragment the 3D printer hobbyist community and add excessive barriers to entry for organizations or individuals seeking to enter the 3D printing field.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Michael J. Welch.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

A rational person would never assume that there is a restriction on the printer that can use a particular filament. They will check the physical requirements, but certainly not the legal requirements.

The right of a corporation to make money should not trump my right to use what I have purchased.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Michael LeSavage.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

The printer would be my equipment and has been artificially locked, preventing me from using other materials. This is anti-competitive and an undue restriction on my own goods. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Michael Stewart.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I think I should be allowed to use any filament from any third-party source in any 3D printer I have purchased. Proprietary consumables starve innovation and inflate prices. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Mike Reynolds.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I should be able to use my own consumables in my devices, whether it is filament in a 3D printer or toner in a traditional printer. Doing so should be legal, although I am okay with manufacturers terminating warranties if I chose to use a competitor's consumable. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Miles.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Why should a company whose only interest is to maximize their own profits have any say in the manner of use that I employ with items that are under PRIVATE POSSESSION?
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Minna Bruna.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

The same argument regarding other equipment also applies to 3D printers. I purchased my printer and the manufacturer willingly sold it to me. I did not purchase it with a contract requiring that I only ever do business with the manufacturer forever more. I should be able to do whatever I wish with my property that I legally own, and use whatever supplies are best for me and my business.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, mitch edgar.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

As a user of 3D printing technologies I find the inability to use materials that I purchase from somewhere else or possibly make myself very limiting. In my mind this would be the same as a car manufacturer only allowing you to use gasoline that they produce. Once I own a physical product how I use that product should be my choice. This issue seems quite disconnected from the spirit of these types of laws.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, m.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

It's just plastic wire.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Nathaniel L Berger.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I regularly use 3D printers, and 3D tools to help university students produce academic work, conduct creative research, and explore entrepreneurial ideas. If I am beholden to only use 'approved' materials provide by the manufacturer of my machines, I would be artificially limiting what novel, inventive, and interesting works for future students. The use of 'unapproved' materials has enabled my students to explore new materials, investigate properties of said materials, and apply interdisciplinary knowledge bases to move beyond the 'approved' for the good of themselves, and others.Ú

Ú

Please reconsider the use of 'unapproved' 3D printing materials. To limit materials usage is to limit exploration and learning itself.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Nathan True.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

The freedom to choose the input material is essential for continued innovation in 3D printing. Ú

Ú
Copyright was designed to protect artists and creators, not corporations who wish to stifle creativity for their own profit.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Nicholas Zinser.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

US Copyright Law should help protect intellectual property and not the ability to use cheaper parts or materials in normal daily use of equipment. In the case of a 3D printer, replacement material should be able to be procured by the consumer and used with a printer, without the printer checking to make sure it "belongs" to the company in question. This is a ridiculous use of the DMCA and Copyright Law in general.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Nick B..

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

What happened to freedom? Instead of disallowing me to use something in my 3d printer why not just void a warranty?

Please do the right thing. Copyright time and time again has shown to stifle innovation. Creation is an art and should be torn apart and built upon to progress.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Paul Jaye.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D printing is one of the most innovative and exciting technologies I've seen in several years. Selecting my own printing materials is not a moving saving tactic. Rather it allows me the flexibility to produce what I want to produce with the technical specifications that I desire. Ú Ú

3D printing is too important a technology to allow manufacturers to use the DMCA to restrict printing materials for their own profit. It's still nascent, and the innovation that makers will bring to 3D printing will hasten its advancement in exciting ways.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Paul Rothrock.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

3D filament is a generic consumable and should not be restricted by any printer manufacturer. Ú Just as Ford can't tell me where to buy gas or Whirlpool can't tell me which flour to use to bake my bread, 3D Systems et. al. have no business telling me where to source my filament. They are free to tell me that off spec filament may violate my warranty but they have no business in a preemptive DRM based restriction.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Pete Nelson.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

One of the main abilities I looked for when evaluating which 3D printer to buy is flexibility. If I want to use a different type of plastic, or even experiment with extruded food, wood, or other materials, I want to be able to tinker with the equipment I bought and try to get it working. Those types of activities are central to innovation and the technology's progression. I do not expect a law such as the DMCA to be abused in such a way to prohibit my own experimentation. Of course, I don't expect official support from a company when I exceed their normal use scenarios either, but voiding warranties are a small price innovators are used to paying.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, P Guncheon.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

It's MY machine and if I wish to use any material I choose, I should be able to without manufacturer restriction.Ú

Ú

Period.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Rhett.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Material is material- I should be free to run whatever I want through my printer, even if it doesn't work or even breaks it. That's my prerogative, not yours.
Hands off the merchandise.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Ricardo.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

What at use my printer or how I use my printer is my decision, and my own risk
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, richard hagen.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Absurd to lock in filament. That's like saying I cannot use any brand of Gasoline in my car. That's like saying I cannot use generic paper in my Xerox-brand printer. That's like saying I cannot use a Seagate-brand hard drive in my Dell-brand computer.Ú

Ú

If the manufacturer wants to keep me from using third-party materials in their printer, then they can reserve the right to revoke my warranty. However, to make it illegal to use material of MY CHOOSING in a device that I OWN is patently absurd. If I want to use my own filament that I made myself then I should be allowed to - if it destroys the warranty on the machine, then so it shall be... but to make me a criminal for exercising my RIGHT to use a device that I OWN in a manner that I find acceptable? That's just plainly ridiculous. Ú

Ú

Thank you for your consideration. I know you will come to the same conclusions that I have.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Robert Jordan.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I would ****ONLY**** be interested in 3-d printers if I could make my own filaments from bulk beads or -preferably- recycling consumer plastic such as HDPE or ABS. I've been keenly watching Filabot.com and other recycling tech for years now, waiting for them to mature. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Robert Leider.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

People do 3D printing to experiment building new things. Find it odd a 3D printer company would oppose their clients wanting to try something new.

America has a long history of innovation by individuals working with and manipulating items they have purchased. This innovation has been very important to the economic improvement of the country and its citizens. Without ownership being meaningful to the individual, America would be a poorer and less interesting place today.

Please keep ownership intact, and thank you for your consideration,

Robert Leider

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Rob Giseburt.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

The reason for the recent popularity in 3D printing, along with a huge boom in innovation and price reduction, has to do with open-source technology. This includes great strides in materials science. Ú

Ú

By restricting the usage of these 3D printers with experimental and third-party filaments, powders, etc., we only slow the rate of innovation, and artificially restrict the sales of a consumable in order to protect the profit margins of a few companies. Ú

Ú

In the long run this is neither good for the industry, the country, or those companies. The companies and industry as a whole is harmed because a few companies are allowed to innovate at a much slower pace, while those that would innovate quickly are prevented from doing so. Ú

Ú

This then harms the country, because those innovators would then have no choice but to either act as criminals or in other countries that allow such practices. To compound the issue, 3D printing technology is one of a handful of technologies that aid in innovation of other technologies, from industrial machines to household items to medical devices. With 3D printing you have the ability to rapidly create a prototype, and the more innovation there is in creating better and better prototypes, the less work there is in getting a product to market. Standing in the way of that harms everyone. Ú

Ú

I actively work in open source projects as well as corporate environments. I understand the

interests that the corporations are trying to protect, but I ask that you look past their single-minded attempts to protect their profit margins in the short term and see that allowing tinkering, healthy competition, and introspection into the devices we own helps everyone, even those companies seeking to prevent it.

Thank you for your consideration.

-Rob Giseburt

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Ron A Goldberg.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Once I've purchased product I should have the right to do with what I like. Customize my car, upgrade my computer or use my own filament in a 3d printer. Even if it voids the warranty. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Ron Robinson.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

It would be wasteful and rediculouse to limit the materials that may be used in a 3D printer due to copyright.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Rudy RH.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Using different materials on fuels in any hardware or product should not be restricted or made illegal. People should have the right to find lower cost supplies and companies should not be able to force consumers to use their supplies.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Sam Atwood.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I own a 3D printer. I have built 3D printers. When I purchase such a device, or build parts for one, I am modifying parts and devices I own. I should be able to test new ideas, including using any type of plastic or other material I choose as a filament, without worrying about an outside company taking legal action against me should I choose to share my findings with others online or in a public forum.

I appreciate you taking the time to review my concerns. Individuals need to have protections from ridiculous and protectionist charges companies and their legal departments hide behind. When people like us test new ideas, and share our findings with others, we contribute to innovation and help society to progress. We need regulations that supports our efforts.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Samuel Seide.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

If I bought the printer and don't care about using the warranty from the manufacturer, I should be allowed to hack, modify, or use it in any way I see fit, and that includes using other filaments in it other than the one's supplied by just one company.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Sandra Kindred.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

It 's ours! Why can't we do what we want? We're free adults! Why can't we use unfold our imaginations to create?

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Saul Halfon.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Why in the world should I be prevented from using any filament I want in a printer that I OWN. I am not renting or leasing this. It's mine, to do with as I wish.
Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Scott Altemus.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I plan to use retail filament but I also plan to recycle my own (for a multitude of reasons). If I want to risk the damage to the print head, that should be my risk to take as the product owner. It is time now to put your foot down for the American people. It is absurd for innovative, independent Americans to have their hands tied by government overreach. When people own things, they own them. Not own to copy and distribute but own to use, modify, destroy, repair, whatever they want. Anything short of that enters a very slippery slope of government overreach vs. personal liberty. Don't be henchmen for shortsighted corporations, strike down these absurd violations of what makes America great.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Shawn Johnson.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I want to use the best materials in my 3d printer that won't always come from the original manufacturer. If I buy a pen I should be able to write on any brand of paper I like. Even if the pen manufacturer doesn't make the paper. They certainly don't have the right to force my decision.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, shel.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

We need 3rd party vendors to hold down prices.
Thank you for your consideration. Stop giving money to big business.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Stephanie Liebold.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

People with 3D printers are makers. We should be free to create, experiment, explore what our 3D printers can do. This includes trying new materials and uses the manufacturers didn't plan on.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Steve Moore.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I want the freedom to choose a 3d print filament from a marketplace of vendors. Allow a 3d printer manufacturer to lock down the consumable market for their particular printer, but allow open source alternatives to exist without restrictions for those that use open standard printers. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Thomas Pell.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

I want the flexibility to use whatever raw materials i need to feed the printer I own outright to make what I choose. This is why I bought a printer, to make things, not to lease a closed system from a controlling entity.

Please preserve our right to repair and to use products we have rightfully purchased. Corporate greed is not sufficient reason to control property rights and American ingenuity. Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Tim.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Why should I only be able to build with materials approved by a company? Where would our previous builders (hobbyists, do-it-yourself-ers, small businesses, and corporations) be if they could only use "approved" wood with their tools?

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Timothy Ayres.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

It is vitally important to me personally that I am able to use the devices I legally purchase in any manner I choose. This includes using whatever materials I want in my 3D printer, or for that matter whatever inks I choose in my 2D printer (such as specific inks for printing on t-shirts or other materials), regardless of whether or not it helps the original manufacturers' bottom line. Creativity and innovation thrive when people use devices in ways the original manufacturer never intended or even thought of. This ends up benefiting everyone, including the original manufacturer.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Timothy Chapman.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

The purchase of the 3D printer should not lock the owner into using only the manufacturer's or their approved materials. While the manufacturer's have legitimate reasons for voiding warranties when such materials are used, there is no reason other than financial for the manufacturers to object. The restriction of using manufacturer's filament is little different than an inkjet or laser printer manufacturer implement controls to allow only their approved cartridges to be used. Further this restriction limits the owner's ability to "tinker" and use their property for innovative purposes that the manufacturer does not approve, whether it be for commercial or other reasons.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Tom Maloney.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

Businesses do not all fail, but many do. A consumer purchase, even under specific terms of agreement, is a contract. Copyright can not prevent the entire scope of potential consumer values in a validly contracted purchase of a good to expire solely due to the seller's wishes or certainty that they will provide services that provide only a portion of the contracted purchase. When I buy a printer or other functional device, I should not lose the ability to use it due to business adjustments of no concern to me. Printer locks-to- services deprive me of the use of the physical object and components that I lawfully purchased. This is unjust and a violation of the essence of the concept of 'ownership'.

Thank you for your consideration. You are wrestling with the very fundamentals of the concept of ownership. Copyright needs to protect its holders. It cannot be used to obligate consumers to maintain a relationship with them. To do so makes clear ownership impossible.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, Ty Nighswonger.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

People have 3D printers that use plastics, fibers, chocolate, pancake batter and anything else that you can think of. These sort of experiments and innovation would hampered by this move. I have been considering how to use recycled materials from my home in my 3D printer. Luckily, I still have the ability to do so.

What we buy should be ours to use as we wish. If this is not the case, these companies should be entering rental or lease agreements.

Thank you for your consideration.

Short Comment Regarding a Proposed Exemption Under 17 U.S.C. 1201

Item 1. Commenter Information

I am providing comments on behalf of myself, William Shipitalo.

Item 2. Proposed Class Addressed

Proposed Class 26: Software – 3D printers

Item 3. Statement Regarding Proposed Exemption

It is absurd to believe that users do not have ownership after purchase. Companies should not have the force of law to prohibit the user from using the product in any manner after purchase. Use and ownership rights needs to belong to the end user.
Thank you for your consideration.