

From: []@wrf.com  
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2002 2:44 PM  
To: []; bpdg-tech@list.lmicp.com  
Subject: RE: BPDG: Additional MPAA comments on Report/Requirements drafts

Philips Electronics joins with Zenith in support of Sharp's comment below.

Sincerely,

[]

-----Original Message-----

From: []@sharplabs.com  
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2002 10:55 AM  
To: 'bpdg-tech@list.lmicp.com'  
Subject: RE: BPDG: Additional MPAA comments on Report/Requirements drafts

One of the edits made here concerns me somewhat:

3.1 The BPDG recognized the need for requirements defining how compliant systems should implement the proposal on an architectural level, and how the implementation of such systems could be made robust against CONSUMER hacking.

In the MPAA comments, 'consumer' is deleted.

In my view, this is a significant change from what I signed up for in BPDG participation. It was not clear to me that the intent was to describe a technical means that is robust against professional hacking (though to the extent that it is that robust is fine). Such protection against a determined, well-funded, professional attack is much harder, and much more complex. Furthermore, ill-advised given that the over-the-air content is not protected by any cryptographic means.

In my view, the protection against professional copyright infringement is rightly in the hands of lawyers and law enforcement -- not the sort of technology we should be discussing.

Regards,

[]

Manager, Standards  
Sharp Laboratories of America