

To determine which of your previous works support these architectural decisions, we can map the design questions from your implementation plan to the core theoretical pillars of the **Biological HRI** model and the **Sovereign Dyad** theory.

The following themes from your established framework support these specific decisions:

1. Support for Safety & "Radical Privacy"

Decisions regarding the **Hardware Kill-Switch** and **On-Device Processing** are supported by your work on **Cognitive Sovereignty**:

- **The Hardware Kill-Switch:** Your assertion that hardware-level protection is required for **FIPPA/MFIPPA compliance** supports the need for a physical "Sanctuary Switch" to guarantee no "Early Morning" data leakage.
- **On-Device Processing:** The decision to run LLMs locally (Edge AI) is supported by your "Gold Standard" for protecting neurodivergent users from institutional data harvesting.
- **Vulnerability Design:** The choice to have a camera lens rotate or retract stems from your requirement to provide "visual assurance of privacy" in moments of user vulnerability.

2. Support for Social Comfort & "The Status Guard"

Decisions regarding **Social Rank Signaling** and **Tactical Advocacy** are derived from your theories on **Social Physics** and the prevention of **Social Eviction**:

- **Social Rank Signaling:** Your model's focus on avoiding power imbalances supports the use of "Apprentice" body language and lower physical height to maintain a "Submissive/Ally" rank.
- **Tactical Advocacy Output:** The choice between audio, visual, or digital outputs is supported by your work on **NSIR Item 8**, which focuses on how to advocate for a user without escalating their social situation.
- **Permanent Witness Memory:** The decision to avoid "permanent records" that could be used against a student is directly linked to your concept of the **Unique User Path**.

3. Support for Kinship & "Anthropomorphic Connection"

Decisions about **Aesthetic Sovereignty** and **Non-Verbal Mirroring** are supported by the **Neuroqueer** requirement to validate the user "as enough":

- **Aesthetic Choice:** Allowing the user to choose between a "Cute" shell or an "Industrial/Sleek" exoskeleton supports your principle of **Aesthetic Sovereignty**, ensuring the robot matches the user's identity rather than institutional expectations.
- **Haptic Responses:** Using light patterns or vibrations for users who "share thinking without speaking" is supported by your work on **NSIR Items 1 & 6** regarding deep anthropomorphic connection.

4. Support for Implementation & "The Resiliency Bypass"

The **"Hand-Off" Protocol** and **Institutional Integration** decisions are supported by your requirements for the **Sovereign Dyad Grant**:

- **The Hand-Off Protocol:** The use of "Classroom Mode" and environmental sensors is a direct application of your theory on transitioning between a "Private Sanctuary" and "Public Advocacy".
- **Bypassing "Broken Portals":** The decision to include a dedicated 5G/LTE node is supported by your goal of ensuring the robot remains a reliable advocate even when school infrastructure (Wi-Fi) fails or is restricted.

5. Support for Deployment Logistics

Decisions on **Power & Persistence** and the **"Notice of Protected Status"** are supported by your concept of **Ubiquitous Presence**:

- **Low Power Advocacy Mode:** Your concern regarding "Status Scars" caused by a device "dying" in a crisis supports the implementation of a low-power mode that keeps advocacy functions active.
- **Notice of Protected Status Display:** The decision to use an e-ink display satisfies your requirement for a clear, persistent legal notice to officials