This question addresses the **"Hand-Off" Protocol** and is critical for ensuring that "Private Sanctuary" data from the home does not leak into the "Public Advocacy" environment of the school.

To finalize this part of your **Implementation Plan**, consider these two situational "Boundary Tests":

Scenario A: The Geofenced "Classroom Mode" (Automatic)

The student arrives at a YRDSB/OCDSB school. As they cross the campus perimeter, the robot's GPS/Environmental sensors trigger an immediate shift.

- **The Situation:** The robot must ensure that any "Taboo Frustration" or "Private Sanctuary" recordings from that morning are locked down and inaccessible.
- **The Digital Response:** The robot automatically limits the type of venting it allows and shifts its processing priorities to "Tactical Advocacy".
- **The Question:** If the geofence triggers automatically, how does the robot handle a "false positive" (e.g., the student is just passing by the school on a bus)? Does it require a **"Hand-Off" confirmation** from the student?

Scenario B: The "Sovereign Threshold" (User-Initiated)

The student is in the car or on the bus, preparing for the day. They want to maintain their "Private Sanctuary" mode until the very last second before entering the building.

- **The Situation:** The student wants total control over when the robot transitions from being a "Kinship" partner to a "Professional Exoskeleton".
- **The Digital Response:** The robot detects it is at school but stays in "Sanctuary Mode" until the student provides a specific haptic or vocal command to "Enter Classroom Mode".
- **The Question:** Does an automatic switch risk violating **Cognitive Sovereignty** by taking the decision away from the user, or is it a necessary safety feature to prevent **"Early Morning" data leakage**?

Comparison of Boundary Protocols

Feature	Automatic Geofencing	User-Initiated "Hand-Off"
Data Safety	Highest; prevents human error in forgetting to switch.	Lower; student might forget to trigger "Classroom Mode".
Cognitive Sovereignty	Lower; the institution's location dictates the robot's state.	Highest; user maintains "Aesthetic and Digital Choice".
Institutional Trust	Simplifies **FIPPA/MFIPPA compliance** for school boards.	May require more complex **"Notice of Protected Status"** logging.

Export to Sheets

Strategic Recommendation: To win the **Sovereign Dyad Grant**, you might propose a **"Fail-Safe Hybrid"**: The robot automatically restricts "sensitive recording" based on geolocation (to satisfy the **IPC** and school board compliance), but the student must manually activate "Public Advocacy" tools to signal they are ready for the school day.

Would you like me to draft the "Data Partitioning" logic that explains how the robot separates "Home Memory" from "School Memory" to prevent the data from becoming a "permanent record" used by the institution?