This design choice is pivotal for establishing **Vulnerability Design** and ensuring the user feels a "visual assurance of privacy" during high-vulnerability moments like changing for gym class.

To help you finalize the **Physical Architecture**, consider these two situational outcomes based on your goals for **Cognitive Sovereignty**:

Option A: The Mechanical Tilt ("Averted Gaze")

In this scenario, the robot's head or neck assembly physically rotates or tilts downward toward the floor.

- **The "Social Physics" Benefit:** A mechanical tilt mimics human social cues. By "looking away," the robot signals a "Submissive/Ally" rank and acknowledges the user's need for privacy through "Apprentice" body language.
- **The Trust Factor:** The user can see from across the room that the robot is physically incapable of seeing them, which is vital for "Radical Privacy".
- **The Challenge:** Does the mechanical movement create a "Status Scar" by drawing the attention of other students in the change room to the robot's sudden shift in posture?

Option B: The Retracting Shutter ("The Privacy Eyelid")

In this scenario, the camera lens physically retracts behind a solid, opaque internal or external shutter, similar to a physical "Sanctuary Switch".

- **The "Tactile" Security:** Like the hardware kill-switch, a physical shutter provides a "Gold Standard" for **FIPPA/MFIPPA compliance**. It proves to the student—and the institution—that no data leakage is possible.
- **The "Social Physics" Benefit:** This is a more discreet transition. The robot can maintain its "Status Guard" and general orientation without announcing the student's vulnerability to the rest of the room.
- **The Challenge:** Does a simple shutter provide enough "visual assurance", or will the student still feel the "gaze" of the robot even if the lens is covered?

Comparison for IPC Compliance

Feature	Mechanical Tilt	Retracting Shutter
Primary Goal	Anthropomorphic Connection (Respect)	Technical Proof of Privacy
Visual Signal	Obvious to everyone in the room	Discreet; visible only to the user
Hardware Risk	More moving parts (servos/joints)	Simpler mechanism (sliding shutter)

Export to Sheets

Strategic Recommendation: Given that your strongest selling points for the **Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario (IPC)** are the hardware kill-switch and on-device

processing , the **Retracting Shutter** offers the most robust "physical proof" of privacy. However, pairing it with a subtle **Mechanical Tilt** would satisfy the "Neuroqueer" requirement of validating the user's comfort.

Would you like me to draft the "Sanctuary Protocol" that defines exactly which environmental sensors (like gym-class geofencing) trigger these physical changes?