

1. **Q1: List one section of the code that is relevant to you as a CS student (rather than as a professional), and briefly explain why.**

As a CS student, my personal favorite section is 1.5 [Respect the work required to produce new ideas, inventions, creative works, and computing artifacts]. Towards the end of our degree, I have to complete a capstone project/course where I have to create a new idea and apply all of the CS principles I have learned during my university journey. It will be important to me to make sure the basis of this capstone idea is under the notion of public good where society is portrayed in a positive manner. Whether I make my capstone project an open source for the CS community to see and learn, such as on GitHub, or make it a pet project to take to make money later, I will require my fellow peers in the field to contribute time and energy for me to be successful in many principles of CS, such as software engineering, database, algorithms, security, etc.

2. **Q2: The code is somewhat aspirational. Very briefly, give a scenario in which a private company's goals might be reasonable yet may conflict with some part of the code.**

In today's fast-paced technological markets, time is at the essence and thus I presumed that section 2.9 [Design and implement systems that are robustly and useably secure] from the code, may be the last thing in any company's mind. Robust systems and security are usually an afterthought or the last step to the any system production. Due diligence may start in good faith in the beginning of system design, but can be very hard to implement when pushed against various timelines, such as first-to-market and competitors. The prime examples of not so robust systems and security issues are, Boeing's financial interest over 737 MAX airplanes security, Wells Fargo data breach on stolen clients' data by fraudsters, hackers stealing 57 million drivers' data within Uber before IPO, and Facebook charged \$5bn by FTC on user's privacy. All of these companies had good governance that oversaw, had strong charter, great leadership principles, and compliance departments, but still stayed behind against accidental and intentional misuse. These companies could have not implemented their systems as a best scenario, if misuses or harms were predictable or unavoidable.