

Beyond BYOD:

When AI Glasses Force
a Governance Decision

By
Dr. Aleksandra Aytova
and
Georgia Voudoulaki

3rd March, 2026
Alpine Privacy Days, Zuoz, Switzerland



Introduction

Why we are here...

AI glasses are no longer theoretical.
They are:

- Affordable
- Consumer-grade
- AI-enabled
- Already entering workplaces

Today's session is not about technology hype.
It is about what happens when governance meets reality.

Presentation

overview



The Case: When AI Glasses Enter the Workplace



Information Security Exposure



The Escalation



Understanding the Technology (AI & Capabilities)



The Legal Evaluation



Privacy & AI Governance Risks



Strategic Options and Q&A

The Escalation

The Case – Part I

An employee arrives wearing Ray-Ban Meta AI glasses and demos the device:

Photos/video, audio recording,
voice commands,
companion app / AI assistant
Colleagues worry about covert recording
and confidential meetings

Now the escalation is:

Employee →
HR →
Privacy →
Draft Ban →
External Legal Review →
Back to HR



Governance Fracture

The Case - **Part II**

1

HR refuses to implement the ban.

2

The employee provides medical documentation stating that the AI glasses are prescribed as an assistive device.

3

The matter is escalated to the Chief Privacy Officer.

4

The matter is escalated to the Chief Privacy Officer.

UNDERSTAND THE DEVICE - I

What Do AI Glasses Actually Do?



AI glasses may include:

- Camera + microphones (hands-free capture)
- Voice assistant (commands, Q&A)
- Image/text recognition; text-to-speech
- Cloud sync via companion app
- Bottom line: wearable recording + AI inference endpoint

This is not just eyewear.
It is a wearable AI-enabled recording system.

MEDICAL NECESSITY - II

For What Conditions
Could They Be Prescribed?

- Possible use cases: visual impairment (object/scene reading), cognitive support (prompts/navigation)
- Key question:
is the AI function necessary for equal participation,
or would other aids suffice?

Key question:
Are prescription lenses alone sufficient?
Or is the AI functionality necessary
for participation?

EMPLOYMENT LAW

- Medical info rules vary; often the focus is functional limitation, not diagnosis
- Non-discrimination: blanket bans may be discriminatory; accommodation is case-by-case
- Restrictions can be proportionate: least intrusive option; undue hardship limits

PRIVACY LAYER

Personal Data Exposure



AI glasses may process:

- Video of colleagues
- Audio recordings
- Biometric identifiers
- Special category data
- Contextual information

Key issues:

- Lawful basis
- Transparency
- Controller roles
- Workplace power imbalance

AI GOVERNANCE

What Kind of AI Is This?

- Provider/model: on-device vs cloud?
- What data is sent where?
- Data minimisation, retention, logging, and vendor terms
- Unintended inferences (profiling), bias, and accuracy
- AI Act classification and obligations (if applicable)



INFORMATION SECURITY

Operational Risk



- Capture of confidential meetings and trade secrets
- Consumer cloud sync and cross-border transfers
- Outside corporate MDM and monitoring controls
- Medical legitimacy does not remove security risk

Medical legitimacy does not eliminate security exposure.

THE BALANCING DECISION

Strategic Options

1

Options: (1) Ban (2) Allow (3) Conditional framework

2

Proportionality: suitable, necessary,
least intrusive, balanced

3

CPO role: reconcile competing rights
and set a workable governance mode

Thank you!



Aleksandra Aytova
aleksandra.aytova@applegreen.com

Let's connect!



Q&A



Georgia Voudoulaki
georgia.voudoulaki@gmail.com

Let's connect!

