1. As a developer at SFPO, additional proposals for policy verification would be as follows:
   1. I would propose pressuring Airbnb to implement a live authentication process that links to our database for registered properties within our jurisdiction. This authentication process would check the address of the rental property from the listing with our database which would then check to see if there is a policy number registered to the address through a conditional. If there is, it would then compare our policy number information with what was supplied by the rental owners to verify whether the information provided by them could be substantiated. If not, we would flag that property as operating illegally. If there is no policy number provided by the rental owners, we would then investigate to see whether the property is exempt, in a pending state, or providing false information and proceed with legal action if necessary.
      1. A possible reason for pushback for this plan from SFPO could be that implementing it would require tech infrastructure that is not currently established such as an API to access our data, or an ITS service that maintains this data base and retrieval process. Implementing these measures may not currently be within the scope of our budget for our department.
      2. An additional reason if an API was established, is that the API could pose additional concerns for our security and data integrity. We would need to implement an API in a way where it was not public and had a highly secure retrieval protocol to protect the citizens of San Francisco.
2. While the created database cannot answer this question by itself, I think it offers up the opportunity to explore how listings like these drive-up housing costs in their respective neighborhoods. These properties are clearly being offered on a per night basis that is much higher than their market-rate monthly rent costs which I could see causing a dramatic increase in housing costs.
3. From my perspective, the most important factor for web scraping is the notion proposed by the legal Issues section of the web scraping page on Wikipedia, that web scraping can be considered a form of trespassing. I don’t agree with this idea because scrapable web content is public facing and accessible just by using the inspect feature of any browser. However, it’s important to keep in mind that courts have deemed in favor of corporations when a firm was found to be using web scraping against them. The broadness and ambiguity presented by the CFAA is the main issue here, as it doesn’t strictly define what is and what should not be considered malicious computer activity.

Another important factor to keep in mind, is that corporations will do everything in their power to protect their bottom line. If a firm uses web scraping as a third party to affect the mode of profit, the corporation will threaten or take legal action as a method of discouraging such behavior. In some cases, this may happen without a substantiated crime being committed and the entity with the largest bankroll will come out as the victor in many cases.

1. I think the main consideration for using/not using public data is how that data is going to be treated at the end of our use case. For many tech companies, the end use case is to sell data to other companies. This is something that I find ethically egregious, and more power should be given to the people over their data portfolio. It took a long time for me to understand why Facebook claimed ownership over every little thing you say, post, or interact with on their platform. Now, understanding the gravity of that claim is sickening.  
     
   I think another major consideration is whether minors’ data will be affected by our process and possibly exposed to those who could do harm to them. To expand on that, protecting vulnerable demographics from exploitation and discrimination should be at the forefront of these decisions.