

Siting the School

Where a child-safe environment is built, and who may occupy it

Working note · August 2026

Three questions, not one

A school has a registrar, an address, and staff who have been checked. Enrollment asks who may enter; siting asks what a child crosses to get there; fitness asks who may work inside. Most attention goes to the first. This note concerns the second, and points to a companion on the third.

The walk, not the door

Age assurance is the registrar, and it says nothing about the environment a child crosses. A rigorous registrar in a building sited beside a motorway satisfies its regulator and does nothing about the walk. Admission asks the other question — not who is entering, but what may be present at all. Where content was never admitted there is nothing inside to circumvent: a property of construction, not a claim about detection accuracy.

Joining is not exclusive

Nothing here asks an organisation to move, to submit an estate to classification, or to choose between the open web and the district. It keeps everything it has and adds a separately addressed presence inside. You do not give up the open web to join. Inside the namespace, different rules apply — which is the whole of what a zone is. English law already knows the structure as a scheme of development: entry voluntary, area defined, rules published in advance, and holdings elsewhere untouched.

What tenancy returns

For the family, one election instead of configuring child settings service by service. For the child, a bounded route rather than a safer destination — the exposure lives in the walk, not at the address. For the organisation, known neighbours, an address that carries information about the rules governing them, and a single conformance target rather than an independent reading of every jurisdiction. For the regulator, published criteria and an auditable record: evidence of structural due diligence, not a waiver of any duty.

Where the argument stops

Admission cannot govern the output of a generative tutor, because that content does not exist until a child calls it into being. For such systems it governs declared properties, and runtime detection remains the primary defence — the companion note takes that up. Coverage is not complete either: the claim is that content was never admitted within the district, not that a child cannot leave it.

What is not known

No write-gated child namespace has been operated at scale. Admission and error rates, cost, latency, and whether such an environment is substantively sufficient are unmeasured. That is an argument for a trial, not for a claim, and the note makes none.

The full note sets out eleven candidate trial questions, several capable of producing a negative answer.

To request the full paper, write to shknudson@ifcsis.org.

Read this note online at ifcsis.org/papers/siting-the-school/ · The classification schema is published, versioned and open to review at standard.ifcsis.org.