

08:00 – 08:45 – Registration & Welcome Coffee

08:45 – 09:00 — Opening Remarks

Jean-Michel Blotti re — Founder & CEO, RTC – The RealTime Community

Chris Edwards – Founder & CEO – The Third Floor

The AI Integration Battle Plan

Execution Phase 1: Constraints & Operating Reality

How the Summit Is Designed

RESET LA 26 is not a sequence of presentations.

It is a deliberately structured execution summit designed to prevent the most common failure mode of industry conversations: great ideas that never get adopted.

RESET LA is designed for people who already agree the old model is broken — and are now accountable for what replaces it.

RESET London 25 named the crisis.

RESET LA is where **execution begins** — with the discipline required to make it stick.

- **Monday, Feb. 23 is execution alignment.**

Not a rehash of problems, but a necessary phase to establish shared constraints, operating realities, and bridge points across silos (pipelines, people, economics, markets). Monday forces the room to eliminate ambiguity — the primary reason execution fails inside real organizations.

- **Tuesday, Feb. 24 is execution proper.**

Focused working groups convert aligned constraints into decisions, priorities, and a concrete 60–90 day follow-up plan that continues into RESET London 26.

The flow is intentional:

- Define the battlefield — what has changed, and which legacy assumptions can no longer be carried into execution
- Pressure-test assumptions — eliminate false confidence before resources are committed (through real-world constraint checks)
- Expose execution friction — where adoption actually breaks inside organizations
- Do the real work — align on priorities, sequencing, and first irreversible decisions

Each phase builds on the previous one.

Participants are expected to engage actively, speak from experience, and test ideas against the realities of implementation, economics, and organizational resistance.

This is execution — not inspiration, not speculation, and not theory.

The AI Integration Battle Plan

Execution Phase 1: Constraints & Operating Reality

09:00 – 09:45 - The Survivable Pipeline: An AI Integration Battle Plan

Chris Edwards – Founder & CEO – The Third Floor

Chris has lived the last two years from the inside: the cash-flow cliff, the disappearing safety nets, the “we could have gone out of business” moment — and the pivot that followed.

Instead of waiting for the old model to come back, The Third Floor rebuilt:

- **Real-time animation at a radically different cost curve (Predator: Killer of Killers)**
- **Deeper studio partnerships (when “one internal viz team can’t serve a whole studio”)**
- **Expansion into games and experiential (including the Sphere-scale arms race)**

At RESET LA 26, Chris will bring the real question many studios are still dodging:

If the industry’s “safe” path is just slow collapse... what does a survivable pipeline actually look like?

Chris Edwards then frames the discussion by defining the operating constraints teams now face: shrinking cash buffers, rising complexity, and no credible path back to the old production model. Having navigated this transition firsthand, he brings a practical lens on what must change when survival depends on leverage — fewer handoffs, faster iteration, and pipelines designed to absorb AI without breaking.

The Third Floor’s recent restructuring is not offered as a template to copy, but as evidence of a core principle: **AI does not fix inefficiency; it compounds it.** Integrated poorly, it accelerates failure. Integrated deliberately, it reshapes cost curves, roles, and decision velocity.

This opening statement sets the frame for a **three-hour, closed-door working conversation**, bringing additional participants into the room to examine where AI creates real leverage, where it introduces new risk, and which pipeline decisions must be made before productivity gains are possible. The objective is not inspiration, but alignment — on what to rebuild, what to abandon, and how to move decisively from experimentation to execution.

9:45 – 10:15 — Pressure-Testing the Survivable Pipeline

Collective discussion

10:15 – 10:45 Networking Break

10:45 – 11:00 – Conversation Igniter: From Literacy to Leverage: When AI Moves Faster Than the Organization

Rick Stringfellow - Fellow, Head of Visual Content (EA)

Following the opening frame, Rick Stringfellow (Electronic Arts) joins the conversation not as a presenter, but as a practitioner operating inside a large-scale, legacy production environment. His perspective highlights a growing execution gap: AI literacy is accelerating faster than pipelines, platforms, and governance can adapt.

Rick brings a grounded view on what happens when teams know what’s possible — but lack the time, structure, and permission to transform. From large-scale asset conversion to internal tool creation, his experience surfaces a central challenge for the room: **AI is already changing how people think and work — long before organizations are ready to support it.**

This intervention marks the transition from framing the problem to defining the battle plan, shifting the room from shared understanding to practical tension: how to redesign pipelines, roles, and decision-making so AI-driven change can actually happen— not just be recognized.

This is the first adoption condition: access + literacy + permission to change how work gets done.

11:00 – 12:30 — Open Conversation: From Constraints to First Decisions

Moderated working discussion with all participants

Building on the opening frame and conversation igniter, the room shifts into an open, facilitated discussion. Participants are invited to react, challenge assumptions, and surface where AI integration is already creating friction — or forcing decisions — inside their own organizations.

This session is designed to **lock constraints and adoption conditions** (technical, human, economic, governance) and identify early decision paths that will shape Tuesday's execution work.

Format note (how it will run):

At the start of the session, we will share a short set of guiding questions and desired outputs. A designated rapporteur will capture key constraints, decisions, and action candidates live, so the group can build on them in the afternoon and convert them into working-group priorities on Tuesday.

Champions Interventions

Throughout the morning and afternoon discussions, participants will be joined by practitioners actively implementing AI across creative and operational teams — without prepared talks or pre-packaged narratives.

Champion Interventions are not presentations. They are constraint-setting interruptions designed to redirect the conversation when abstraction creeps in.

Their job is to make sure proposals survive real production conditions — not the whiteboard.

The following Champion Interventions occur as structured interruptions within the open conversation window, not as standalone talks.

Champion Intervention: Implementation Reality Check — Live Integration Perspectives

Kim Adams — Vice President, Game Development, Scopely (Pokémon GO)

Kim contributes from the perspective of a studio leader currently deploying AI across multiple departments, including art, production, and operations. Her experience reflects a critical phase many organizations are entering now: moving beyond principles and experimentation into structured evaluation, training, and rollout.

Over the past year, Kim has focused on building AI literacy at scale — training artists and technical teams to use tools directly so they can assess value firsthand, while establishing clear internal guidelines around acceptable use. A central challenge she brings into the room is IP and partner constraint: how studios operating under licensed IP navigate tool adoption when data usage rules, provenance requirements, and partner policies differ widely.

Kim's contributions ground the conversation in the realities of implementation-in-progress:

- AI use is encouraged, but governed
- Exploration is mandatory; adoption is selective
- Leadership enthusiasm must be balanced with trust, clarity, and partner safety

Her perspective helps the group pressure-test proposed strategies against what adoption actually looks like inside a functioning studio today — before any transformation is considered “successful.”

Purpose:

Prevent the conversation from drifting into “theoretically viable” solutions by forcing ideas to survive real production conditions: licensed IP, partner constraints, governance requirements, and the operational reality of deploying AI at scale inside a live product ecosystem.

Champion Intervention: Creative Transformation Under AI Acceleration

Peter Nofz — VFX Supervisor, Rodeo FX

Peter joins the session not to present a formal talk, but to challenge a core assumption that quietly shapes every AI roadmap: that transformation is primarily a tooling problem. Drawing from studio practice, he reframes the battle plan around people and creative value—how roles, skill relevance, and decision-making change as technical barriers collapse.

Peter highlights a key pattern already emerging inside teams: AI will reshape how people work before pipelines and processes are ready to support it. Code generation and “artist-built tools” have become an unexpected on-ramp—liberating non-technical artists to create workflow improvements, accelerating iteration, and forcing organizations to adapt.

This intervention sets up the afternoon working sessions by sharpening the human questions behind every technical decision:

- What remains non-negotiable human judgment—and where should AI take over?
- How do we retrain teams for taste, direction, and evaluation rather than task execution?
- How do we embrace controlled chaos without breaking production reliability?

Purpose:

Convert morning insights into a practical, people-aware operating model for the workstreams that follow.

Champion Intervention: The Digital Actor Constraint — Guardrails for Performance, Rights & Vendor Accountability

Brett Ineson — President / CTO, Animatrik Film Design

Brett joins the conversation as a constraint-setter, not to deliver a formal talk. Drawing from decades of performance capture and virtual cinematography, he surfaces one of the least negotiable realities of AI integration: digital humans and performance cannot be treated as a purely technical or cost-optimization problem.

Brett challenges the room to confront where AI acceleration is acceptable — and where it becomes operationally, legally, or creatively dangerous. His intervention focuses on the real-world pressures studios face when working with distributed vendors, AI-enabled pipelines, and emerging digital actor capabilities:

- Where must performance remain human-authored and accountable?
- What guardrails must exist when AI is used for iteration, textures, or exploration?
- How do studios prevent “prompt-based black boxes” from entering production?
- What standards of provenance, auditability, and quality must vendors meet?

Purpose:

Translate abstract debates about AI and digital humans into deployable constraints — the non-negotiables that must be in place for adoption to survive creatively, contractually, and operationally.

12:30 – 2:00 PM Networking Lunch

This extended lunch is intentional, allowing informal continuation of morning debates before the economics reset in the afternoon.

2:00 – 2:15 PM – Conversation Igniter: The Adoption Trap — Why the Economics Don't Work (Yet)

Paul Salvini — CTO, DNEG (tbc)

Paul opens the conversation by surfacing the constraint that sits beneath every AI and real-time roadmap: economics, not technology, is the true blocker to adoption.

Drawing from studio leadership experience, Paul reframes the challenge facing the industry. The tools are increasingly clear. The productivity potential is visible. But adoption requires upfront investment at a moment when margins are razor-thin — and the first iteration of any new workflow is more likely to cost money than save it.

He highlights a structural paradox many studios face:

- Executives expect productivity to double over the next five years
- Yet remain hesitant to fund the very technology shifts required to get there
- Short-term labor arbitrage still feels safer than long-term transformation
- And companies with investor backing or IP ownership compete under entirely different rules

Paul challenges the room with a hard question:

If labor arbitrage is reaching diminishing returns, and complexity continues to rise, what credible path remains to achieving the productivity gains the industry implicitly expects?

This intervention reframes AI integration as a **capital allocation and leadership problem**, not an innovation problem — setting the stage for the afternoon working groups to focus not only on what should change, but how studios can justify, sequence, and survive the transition.

Purpose:

Ground the following day work in financial reality, executive incentives, and adoption risk — before proposing solutions and to define what “financially survivable adoption” means over the next 12–24 months.

2:15 – 3:30 PM — Open Conversation: From Constraints to Adoption Paths

Moderated working discussion with all participants

Building on the opening morning frame and conversation igniter, the room shifts into an open, facilitated discussion. Participants are invited to react, challenge assumptions, and surface where AI integration is already creating friction — or forcing decisions — inside their own organizations.

This session is designed to move beyond diagnosis and begin identifying **shared pressure points, non-negotiables, and early decision paths** that will shape the rest of the Summit.

This second plenary is designed to pressure-test the morning insights, resolve contradictions, and identify the few decision paths that are ready to become working sessions on Tuesday.

Additional Champions Interventions

Throughout the afternoon discussion, participants will be joined by practitioners actively implementing AI across creative and operational teams — without prepared talks or pre-packaged narratives.

Champion Intervention: Cloud-Native Reality Check — Scalability, Deployment & Production Readiness

Pierre-Adrien Forestier — Co-Founder & CEO, 3dverse

Pierre-Adrien joins the conversation as a constraint-setter on an issue that consistently derails AI, real-time, and digital twin initiatives across Media & Entertainment, AECO, and manufacturing: most projects fail not at the prototype stage, but at deployment.

Rather than presenting a solution, Pierre-Adrien opens a structured discussion on the realities of production readiness — why so many promising real-time initiatives stall at proof-of-concept, what actually blocks deployment at scale (architecture, cost, integration, governance), and what “production-ready” truly means in cloud-native environments.

Drawing from cross-industry experience — including large-scale manufacturing, digital twin programs, and enterprise deployments — his intervention reframes the problem away from tools and toward systems thinking:

- The gap between “it works in a demo” and “it survives in production”
- Why scalability and deployment economics invalidate many otherwise compelling prototypes
- Why architecture — not features — determines whether real-time and AI workflows can scale
- The conditions under which cloud-native 3D becomes operationally and economically viable
- Why many Unreal- or Omniverse-based initiatives succeed technically but fail to reach production

Purpose:

Prevent the conversation from drifting toward technically impressive but non-deployable solutions by forcing ideas to pass a single test: can this be deployed, operated, governed, and sustained at scale — under real budgets and real constraints?

Champion Intervention: Beyond the Six Clients — Breaking the Dependency Trap

Javier Romero — Founder, STARFRAME FILMWORKS

Javier joins the conversation to surface a structural fragility that sits underneath every AI, real-time, and pipeline strategy: an industry of global scale has normalized dependency on a handful of buyers.

Drawing from 25+ years supervising tier-one animation and VFX productions — and now building a next-generation hybrid studio in Spain focused on modern production models — Javier reframes the crisis as a customer-base problem as much as a workflow problem. His intervention challenges the room with hard questions:

- Why has the industry accepted that three to six clients effectively define the market?
- Why do so many “diversification” attempts collapse back into shot production?
- Can AI and real-time do more than accelerate delivery — can they unlock new **clients, new markets, and new value chains** (AECO, industrial digital twins, robotics, retail, training, etc.)?

Purpose:

Expand the battle plan beyond internal adoption — and confront whether the underlying business model must evolve to survive.

Champion Intervention: No Buckets — Building Bridges Across BIM, AI, and Operations

Kerenza Harris — Executive Leader | Design Technology & Practice Innovation (AECO)

Kerenza reframes AI adoption in AECO as an organizational integration problem, not a tool problem. Most firms are running “pilot projects” in disconnected buckets — BIM here, AI there, operations somewhere else — and calling it progress. That structure guarantees drift: fragmented adoption, duplicated effort, and no scalable transformation.

Drawing from real-world shifts already happening in AECO — including additive/robotic construction models that remix architecture, engineering, fabrication, and robotics into one continuous digital pipeline, and digital-twin programs that persist beyond handover — Kerenza surfaces a practical question for the room:

What would it take to redesign firm infrastructure so that experimentation becomes repeatable adoption — without reinventing the organization every time the tech landscape changes?

Purpose:

Set the criteria for Tuesday’s work: bridge models, connected workflows, and pilots that survive reality.

Champion Intervention: The New Fundamentals — Education as the Integration Engine

Kevin Leeper — Technical Lead, Regional Virtual Production Academy; Associate Professor, Diablo Valley College

Kevin joins to ground the conversation in real training conditions and workforce demands preparing artists and technologists while tools, workflows, and expectations shift faster than curricula and budgets can keep up. His intervention reframes “fundamentals” as a moving target—not because craft no longer matters, but because access, evaluation, and integration have become fundamentals in their own right.

Kevin brings a practical lens shaped by teaching 3D animation, modeling, VFX, game design, and virtual production, and by working directly with industry-aligned programs. He surfaces a core adoption challenge that often goes unspoken: transformation fails when teams cannot evaluate outputs, maintain quality, and integrate new systems fast enough—especially under uneven access to compute and rapidly rising tool costs. The gap is not only skill—it is survivable workflow understanding, taste, and repeatable integration under constraint.

To keep the fundamentals conversation actionable, Kevin and the Education SIG will introduce a collaborative model designed to capture real-world problems and turn them into pilot-ready projects. Using open-source behaviors—modular tasking, transparent documentation, iterative integration, and shared improvement—the group will collect challenges in a simple format (problem + deliverable), cluster them into themes, and build module maps that define how teams contribute and integrate.

This structure also helps identify the “new fundamentals” we need to deliver to students.

By converting industry challenges into modular work, measurable outputs, and shared documentation, we can see which skills consistently appear across problem areas—evaluation habits, workflow literacy, integration thinking, and cost-aware access strategies—and translate those into teachable learning units, templates, and repeatable assignments that stay current as tools evolve.

- Key tensions he brings into the room:
- Fundamentals still matter—but what counts as “fundamental” is shifting
- Students face real constraints: compute, access, and tool cost are now part of the learning problem
- AI can accelerate output while weakening judgment and design literacy without evaluation skills
- The real risk is integration without trust: “slop,” brittle pipelines, and unclear validation
- Education must produce repeatable workflows and learning assets—not one-off projects

Purpose:

Define the “new fundamentals” that make AI adoption survivable—and establish a practical collaboration pipeline that captures real challenges, builds modular project maps, and enables a short (6–9 week) unfunded pilot producing open, non-IP learning deliverables maintained and reported out by the Education SIG.

Pipeline + module map

Problem → Project Pipeline

1. **Capture problems**
2. **Convert top themes into pilot candidates**
3. **Define module map**
4. **Education SIG proposes 1 pilot + timeline + next steps**
5. **Report out** and invite low-stakes involvement

Key commitments:

1. **Unfunded deliverable is open + not owned by industry**
 - Shared and maintained by the Education SIG
 - Cost is covered through existing courses, internships, apprenticeships
 - The work is exploratory R&D + documented learning assets, not contract production
2. **Open-source collaboration, but no IP / no client proprietary input**
 - The pilot uses no company IP and avoids NDA complexity
3. **Education SIG maintains stewardship**
 - Education SIG “owns the output” in the sense of maintenance + report-out, not exclusive rights
4. **Pilot duration = 6–9 weeks**
 - Short, survivable, evidence-driven
5. **Low-stakes mentorship**
 - No formal mentorship burden
 - Encourage involvement only if someone is genuinely interested (light touch, optional)
6. **Compute + access AND evaluation skill are constraints**
 - Students face rising AI costs + GPU limits
 - They also need taste, judgment, and workflow understanding

3:30 – 4:00 PM Networking Break

An intentional pause to decompress, continue informal exchanges, and allow ideas from the afternoon sessions to settle before committing to execution paths.

4:00 – 5:00 PM Workshop Alignment & Commitment Session

From options to ownership

This session formally closes the alignment phase of RESET LA.

Each Working Group is briefly framed by its convener to clarify:

- the specific execution problem it addresses
- the concrete outputs expected by the end of Tuesday
- the type of contribution needed from participants
- the key support conditions (training / governance / budget / tooling dependencies)

Participants then self-select into the Working Group where they can contribute most directly — based on expertise, responsibility, and capacity to follow through beyond the Summit.

Where needed, Working Group scope or composition may be refined in real time to ensure:

- critical mass and relevance
- balanced perspectives (technical, human, economic)
- clear ownership and survivable execution paths

This is not a popularity exercise.

It is a commitment moment — ensuring that Tuesday's work is focused, staffed, and capable of producing outcomes that survive beyond the room and carry forward into RESET London 26.

If a working group is in the middle of a critical discussion, we will prioritize momentum over timing and adjust breaks accordingly. The goal is to protect depth, not force artificial stops.

This session ends with named conveners, a draft owner map, and a clear definition of what “proof of progress” will look like at the first checkpoint.

5:00 – 6:00 PM — Networking Dinner Cocktail

Informal continuation of the day's conversations

This networking cocktail is designed as a continuation of the alignment work — not a break from it.

Participants are encouraged to deepen discussions initiated during the day, pressure-test working group directions, and explore cross-group connections before formal execution begins on Tuesday.

No programming. No speeches.

Just informed, candid exchange among people who will be working together

6:30 – 8:30 PM — Executive Dinner

Closed-door dinner conversation (All RESET LA participants)

The executive dinner provides a quieter setting for deeper, trust-based discussion among participants.

This is an opportunity to:

- reflect on the day's alignment outcomes,
- surface remaining tensions or blind spots,
- and build the interpersonal trust required for sustained collaboration beyond the Summit.

The dinner intentionally avoids formal agendas or presentations.

It exists to strengthen the human layer of execution — the relationships that make follow-through possible once the room disperses.

The AI Integration Battle Plan - Execution

How the Day Is Designed

Tuesday is where RESET moves from aligned reality to owned execution.

Following Monday's alignment around reality, constraints, and failure modes, the purpose of Tuesday is execution: converting pressure into decisions, and decisions into survivable next steps.

This is not a brainstorming day.

It is a working day.

Participants move into focused working groups designed to:

- translate shared constraints into concrete choices,
- define low-regret actions that survive real budgets, real teams, and real timelines,
- and lock ownership, sequencing, support conditions (training / governance / budget), and proof thresholds beyond the room.

The objective is explicit:

By the end of the day, each working group must produce outputs that can be acted on within the next 60–90 days — and carried forward into RESET London 26 as evidence of progress, not intent.

Tuesday answers one question only:

What gets built — by whom — under what conditions — and what proof will be shown in London?

08:00 – 08:45 – Registration & Welcome Coffee

08:45–09:00 — Opening Remarks

Jean-Michel Blottière — Founder & CEO, RTC – The RealTime Community

Chris Edwards — Founder & CEO – The Third Floor

9:00 – 12:00 - Morning Working Sessions (Parallel Working Groups)

From discussion to actionable strategies

Following the Monday plenary, participants break into focused working groups to translate shared challenges into concrete, actionable directions. Each group is convened by a practitioner with direct responsibility for implementation and is designed to surface practical constraints, alignment gaps, and low-regret next steps.

The morning working sessions are designed not only to define what must change — but to lock adoption paths and support conditions that are economically survivable inside real organizations, across technical, human, structural, governance, and financial realities.

• Working Group 1 — Hybrid Workflows & Production-Ready AI Integration

Convener: Judith Crow — VP Strategic Partnerships, SideFX

Focuses on pipeline integration, production readiness, governance, and interoperability — defining what “production-ready AI” actually means inside mature VFX and animation environments.

• Working Group 2 — Creative Roles, Skills & Operating Models in an AI-Accelerated Studio

Convener: Peter Nofz — VFX Supervisor, Rodeo FX

Focuses on how creative roles, decision-making, and studio operating models must evolve as AI and real-time technologies compress traditional production steps.

• Working Group 3 — Economics, ROI & Executive Decision Models

Convener: Paul Salvini — CTO, DNEG

Examines how transformation decisions are made under margin pressure, risk, and asymmetric competition — reframing ROI, sequencing, and executive trust in an AI-accelerated industry.

• Working Group 4 — AECO Bridges: From “Buckets” to a Connected Digital Delivery Stack

Convener: Kerenza Harris — Executive Leader, Design Technology & Practice Innovation, Morphosis

Focuses on replacing fragmented pilots with connected, production-ready delivery stacks linking BIM, AI, digital twins, and operations across the AECO lifecycle.

• Working Group 5 — The New Fundamentals: Education, Training & Enablement for AI-Accelerated Production

Convener: Kevin Leeper — Technical Lead, Regional Virtual Production Academy; Associate Professor, Diablo Valley College

Focuses on defining the “new fundamentals” required for adoption — evaluation skills, judgment, workflow literacy, and enablement models that survive real production constraints.

Participants are encouraged to select the working group where they can contribute most directly — based on expertise, responsibility, and capacity to support follow-through beyond the Summit. Several champions — including Brett Ineson and Javier Romero — will actively move between groups to ensure proposals remain grounded in (1) performance integrity, rights management, and vendor accountability, and (2) market reality: client diversification, cross-industry transfer, and economically viable paths beyond the “few-buyers” dependency model.

Cross-Group Strategic Contributor (Floating)

Javier Romero — Founder, STARFRAME FILMWORKS — will act as a cross-group catalyst, pressure-testing outputs against one core question: does this path expand adoption inside the existing system — and/or expand the system itself by enabling new clients, new markets, and new value chains?

Working Group 1 — Building Hybrid Workflows That Actually Work

Convener: Judith Crow — VP Strategic Partnerships, SideFX

Judith leads a cross-industry conversation on how mature VFX and animation pipelines can most effectively integrate with emerging AI tools, where real technical and cultural gaps remain, and how to ensure AI developers understand the needs of production artists. She also touches on how studios are navigating the ethical grey zones of AI use—provenance, acceptable models, and internal policies—in as much as these evolving positions impact the choices vendors can realistically make.

The group focuses on defining what “production-ready AI” actually means in practice, including technical requirements (determinism, reproducibility, auditability, asset lineage), acceptable failure modes, and interoperability with existing pipeline standards (USD, caching, versioning, render logic).

Rather than treating ethics as an abstract topic, the discussion centers on **operational risk, compliance, and trust** — how studio policies, contracts, and governance realities shape what vendors and AI developers can responsibly build and ship.

Key questions include:

- Where should AI accelerate workflows — and where must human control remain non-negotiable?
- Which integration problems are studio-specific, and which require shared definitions or test cases?
- How do we bridge the cultural gap between AI engineers and production artists?
- What governance signals do studios need to trust AI tools at scale over the next 12–24 months?

Intended outputs:

- A baseline definition of production-ready AI for VFX/animation contexts
- A short list of shared integration requirements and red flags
- Candidate use cases and test scenarios for vendor and AI tool evaluation
- Early recommendations for cross-industry alignment going into RESET London 26

Working Group 2 — Creative Roles, Skills & Operating Models in an AI-Accelerated Studio

Convener: Peter Nofz — VFX Supervisor, Rodeo FX

(Co-conveners optional: studio leadership / production ops)

Peter convenes a working group focused on the **human side of the AI integration battle plan**: how creative roles, skill relevance, and studio operating models must evolve as AI and real-time technologies collapse traditional production steps.

Rather than debating whether AI will change creative work, the group starts from a shared premise: **technical execution is becoming cheaper and faster, while judgment, taste, and direction become the true bottlenecks**. The challenge is no longer how to produce assets, but how to organize teams, incentives, and workflows around decision-making at speed.

The discussion explores how studios are already experimenting—often informally—with new ways of working: artists generating tools via code-generation, teams embracing controlled chaos to gain velocity, and leadership learning to trade predictability for iteration.

Key questions

- Which traditional roles lose relevance—and which new roles emerge—in AI-accelerated pipelines?
- How do we retrain artists away from task execution toward evaluation, direction, and synthesis?
- Where is “controlled chaos” productive—and where does it become operational risk?
- How do real-time and AI together reshape creative iteration loops and approval processes?
- What changes are required in production management, scheduling, and staffing models?
- How do leaders bring teams along without triggering fear, paralysis, or backlash?

- **Intended outputs**
- A short map of evolving creative roles (what declines, what grows, what's new)
- Practical examples of low-risk experiments studios can run in the next 3–6 months
- Early guidance on training, reskilling, and internal enablement
- Signals leadership should watch to know whether transformation is working—or stalling
- Inputs to a shared 12–24 month outlook on how creative work itself is changing

This group is explicitly not about tools or ethics frameworks. It is about how studios remain creatively excellent while radically changing how work gets done.

Working Group 3 — Economics, ROI & Executive Decision Models

Convener: Paul Salvini — CTO, DNEG

(Co-conveners optional: studio finance / strategy / operations leadership)

Purpose

This working group tackles the hardest, least discussed dimension of AI and real-time transformation: how studios actually decide to invest under margin pressure, uncertainty, and asymmetric competition.

Rather than debating technology capability, the group focuses on the decision mechanics that determine whether transformation happens at all — how ROI is evaluated, how risk is absorbed, and how executives justify investment when short-term costs are certain but long-term gains are probabilistic.

The premise is explicit:

If adoption requires upfront loss before downstream gain, the industry needs better decision frameworks — not just better tools.

Core Focus Areas

1. The Adoption Paradox

- Why new workflows almost always cost more before they save money
- Why this clashes with razor-thin margins and project-based accounting
- How studios rationalize “one step back to go two steps forward” — or avoid it entirely

Key question:

What makes an executive say “yes” to transformation when the first project is likely to fail financially?

2. ROI Models That Actually Reflect Reality

- Why traditional ROI calculations break down for AI and real-time
- Distinguishing project ROI from capability ROI
- Measuring productivity gains when complexity keeps rising
- Separating cost reduction from value creation

Key question:

How should studios measure ROI when productivity gains are reinvested into higher ambition, not lower cost?

3. Labor Arbitrage vs. Technology Investment

- Why offshoring and tax incentives have delayed, not solved, the productivity problem
- Where diminishing returns are already visible
- When labor scaling stops being a viable strategy

Key question:

At what point does labor arbitrage stop working — and how do executives recognize that moment?

4. Asymmetric Competition & Capital Pressure

- Competing with AI-first or investor-backed entities that don't need to be profitable
- The impact of Big Tech producing content as “tool demos”
- Uneven risk tolerance across service studios, IP holders, and platform players

Key question:

How do conventional studios compete when others are not playing by the same economic rules?

5. Executive Trust & Internal Alignment

- Why executives often outsource strategy to consultants
- The trust gap between leadership and technical teams
- How internal champions can present transformation plans that survive board scrutiny

Key question:

What decision frameworks allow executives to trust internal teams enough to fund transformation from within?

Working Group Questions (Explicit)

- What are low-regret investments in AI and real-time over the next 12–24 months?
 - How should transformation be phased to limit financial exposure?
 - What failure modes are acceptable — and which are existential?
 - How do studios protect optionality while committing enough to make progress?
 - How do you communicate “productive risk” to boards, owners, and investors?
-

Intended Outputs

By the end of the session, the group aims to produce:

- A short set of executive decision heuristics (e.g. “If X conditions are met, invest; if not, pause”)
- A reframing of ROI for creative technology adoption (capability ROI vs. project ROI)
- A practical adoption sequencing model (what to fund first, what to defer, what not to attempt yet)
- Talking points for internal alignment helping technical leaders make the economic case to executives
- Inputs to a shared RESET 12–24 month economic outlook on where investment is unavoidable — and where hype exceeds return

These outputs are designed to feed directly into RESET London 26, enabling continuity from discussion to evidence-based strategy.

Who This Group Is For

- Studio CTOs, heads of engineering, pipeline and production leaders
 - Executives responsible for signing off on transformation budgets
 - Finance-adjacent leaders grappling with margin and risk
 - Strategic thinkers frustrated by “obvious tech, impossible adoption”
-

Explicit Non-Goals

- This is not a vendor pitch session
- Not a technology comparison forum
- Not a speculative AI future discussion

This group exists to answer one question only:

How do studios make economically survivable decisions in an AI-accelerated industry?

Working Group 4 — AECO Bridges: From “Buckets” to a Connected Digital Delivery Stack

Convener: Kerenza Harris — Executive Leader | Design Technology & Practice Innovation (AECO)

Purpose

This working group addresses a failure mode that mirrors — and increasingly intersects with — Media & Entertainment: fragmented adoption disguised as progress.

Across AECO, AI, BIM, digital twins, operations, and data governance are typically advanced through disconnected pilots and isolated teams (“buckets”). While each initiative may show promise, the absence of structural integration guarantees stalled adoption, duplicated effort, and fragile transformation.

This group is not about evaluating tools.

It is about **designing an internal bridge model** that allows experimentation to become repeatable, scalable adoption — without forcing organizations to reinvent themselves every 12 months.

Core Focus Areas

1. The Bucket Problem

- Why BIM teams, AI initiatives, and operations rarely converge
- How “pilot culture” unintentionally prevents scaling
- Where ownership, incentives, and governance break down

Key question:

What organizational structures cause promising pilots to die quietly

2. Bridge Models in Practice

- Case patterns from additive / robotic construction workflows
- Continuous digital pipelines that span design → fabrication → delivery → operations
- Digital twin programs that persist beyond handover instead of collapsing post-construction

Key question:

What does a connected delivery stack actually look like inside a functioning firm?

3. Data Continuity & Governance

- BIM as an incomplete backbone
- AI layered on top vs AI integrated into workflows
- Digital twins as operational assets, not visualization artifacts
- Ownership, versioning, provenance, and trust

Key question:

How do firms design data continuity without locking themselves into brittle stacks?

4. Organizational Design Under Acceleration

- Why firms cannot afford constant structural resets
- Designing flexibility without chaos
- Where leadership must intervene — and where it must step back

Key question:

How do firms stay adaptive without destabilizing their core operations?

Working Group Questions (Explicit)

- What internal “bridges” must exist for AI adoption to survive past pilots?
- Where should firms standardize — and where must they remain deliberately loose?
- How do AECO organizations avoid repeating M&E’s fragmentation mistakes?
- What does “production-ready” mean in AECO contexts, not just VFX?
- How can cross-industry lessons (USD, real-time, simulation) transfer without forcing cultural mismatch?

Intended Outputs

By the end of the session, the group aims to produce:

- A concise “Bridge Blueprint”
A practical model showing how BIM, AI, operations, and digital twins connect across the project lifecycle.
- 1–2 candidate pilot frameworks
Designed to survive internal politics, budget cycles, and leadership turnover.
- A short checklist for leadership
Signals that indicate whether adoption is compounding — or quietly stalling.
- Inputs to RESET London 26
Enabling cross-industry comparison between AECO, VFX, and other production ecosystems.

Who This Group Is For

- AECO design technology leaders
- Architects and engineers involved in digital delivery
- Operations and data governance stakeholders
- Cross-industry participants seeking transferable adoption models

Explicit Non-Goals

- Not a software comparison
- Not a future-vision exercise
- Not a marketing forum

This group exists to answer one question only:

How do firms replace disconnected “buckets” with a delivery stack that actually holds together under real pressure?

Working Group 5 — The New Fundamentals: Education, Training & Enablement for AI-Accelerated Production

Convener: Kevin Leeper — Technical Lead, Regional Virtual Production Academy; Associate Professor, Diablo Valley College

Purpose

This working group addresses a hidden execution constraint underneath every AI and real-time transformation effort: adoption fails when teams cannot evaluate, adapt, and integrate fast enough. “Fundamentals” still matter — but in an AI-accelerated environment, fundamentals must also include judgment, evaluation, workflow literacy, and rapid tool adaptability.

This group is not about debating education theory.

It is about defining a practical, executive-relevant framework for how education and training can support real transformation — without becoming a lagging indicator.

Core Focus Areas

1. The New Fundamentals Problem

- Why “fundamentals” has become a moving target
- What remains non-negotiable craft (story, design judgment, taste, intent)
- What has become newly fundamental (evaluation skills, prompt literacy, workflow thinking, model awareness)
- Where AI shortcuts are eroding judgment and quality

Key question:

What should leaders mean when they say “we need stronger fundamentals” in 2026?

2. Workforce Readiness vs. Workflow Reality

- The mismatch between academic outputs and studio onboarding needs
- What studios need from entry-level hires vs. what they need from upskilling current teams
- The emerging requirement: practitioners who can integrate AI/ML into established pipelines responsibly

Key question:

Which capabilities reduce friction on day one — and which are currently missing?

3. Internal Enablement as an Adoption Mechanism

- Why executives rarely fund training proactively — and how enablement budgets actually get approved
- How internal champions build adoption without waiting for top-down mandates
- Training as risk reduction (governance, IP constraints, safety) — not as “nice to have”

Key question:

How do you make training and enablement a board-survivable investment?

4. Proof That Executives Trust

- What “show the work” looks like without violating IP
- Case-study formats that demonstrate time saved, quality preserved, and risk controlled
- How to create repeatable proof points that survive skepticism and budget scrutiny

Key question:

What evidence convinces leadership that enablement is real leverage — not another initiative?

Working Group Questions (Explicit)

- What are the “new fundamentals” that directly support AI adoption and production reliability?
 - What should studios demand from education partners and training programs over the next 12–24 months?
 - How do we train for evaluation, taste, and judgment when execution becomes cheaper and faster?
 - What does a practical upskilling path look like for working professionals under real time constraints?
 - How do we produce proof points that executives will fund — and teams will actually use?
-

Intended Outputs

By the end of the session, the group aims to produce:

- A concise definition of “The New Fundamentals”
A clear framework separating timeless craft from newly required adoption skills.
- A 60–90 day enablement outline
Concrete next steps studios can run internally (training pilots, evaluation checklists, safe experimentation lanes).
- A repeatable “proof format” for leadership
A template for case studies that show time saved, quality preserved, and risk controlled (without IP exposure).
- Inputs to RESET London 26
A continuation plan: what will be validated, tested, and reported in London as evidence of progress.

Who This Group Is For

- Studio leaders responsible for capability building and workflow adoption
- Education and training leaders aligning curricula with production needs
- Pipeline / production leaders who need teams to be execution-ready
- Executives who require measurable, defensible enablement visibility.

Explicit Non-Goals

- Not a debate about degrees vs. bootcamps
- Not an abstract education policy session
- Not a tool training showcase
- This group exists to answer one question only:
- How do we rebuild skills and enablement fast enough for AI adoption to become real execution — not wishful thinking?

12:00 – 1:30 PM — Working Lunch

An extended lunch designed to maintain momentum while giving working groups time to consolidate outputs, resolve disagreements, and prepare a clear, execution-ready report-out that can survive outside the room.

The AI Integration Battle Plan

Execution (Phase 2: Commitments & Runway)

Tuesday afternoon is where RESET moves from aligned intent to owned execution.

Following the morning working sessions, the focus shifts from what should change to what will actually be built, tested, and proven.

Working group outputs are consolidated, pressure-tested across technical, human, economic, and organizational domains, and translated into a shared execution runway leading to **RESET London 26 (September 7–9, 2026)**.

This phase is designed to avoid the most common post-workshop failure mode: multiple good plans with no integration, no ownership, and no proof threshold. Instead, the afternoon establishes sequencing, dependencies, and named responsibility — defining what must be demonstrably true in the next 60–90 days, and what evidence will be required in London to prove that progress has occurred.

The objective is not consensus.

It is commitment.

By the end of Tuesday, RESET LA participants leave with a clear roadmap, concrete next steps, and a shared understanding of what survives outside the room — and what does not.

Execution Phase 2: Commitments & Roadmap (LA → London)

1:30 – 2:45 PM — Working Group Readouts: What We're Building

Each working group presents a concise, execution-ready summary focused on decisions and next steps — not discussion highlights.

Format (per working group: 12–15 minutes + 5 minutes Q&A):

- The execution problem the group is solving (1 sentence)
- Key constraints uncovered (what cannot be ignored)
- Decisions made (what the group is committing to)
- 60–90 day plan (first actions, owners, and sequencing)
- Proof of progress (what will be demonstrably true by the next checkpoint)

Purpose:

Convert parallel work into shared alignment, expose overlaps, and pressure-test whether outputs are actionable under real budgets, governance constraints, and organizational resistance.

2:45 – 3:15 PM — Cross-Group Integration: Dependencies & Collision Checks

A facilitated synthesis to resolve conflicts and connect the workstreams.

Focus:

- Where groups depend on each other (economics • enablement • pipeline • governance)
- Where incompatible assumptions emerged — and which assumption wins
- What must be standardized vs intentionally flexible
- What must be sequenced before anything else can succeed

Purpose:

Prevent “five good plans that don’t connect” — the most common failure mode after workshops.

3:15 – 3:30 PM — Networking Break

A short reset before committing the roadmap and ownership model.

3:30 – 4:45 PM — The Runway to RESET London 26: Roadmap, Checkpoints & Ownership

This session converts workshop outputs into a single, shared execution runway through September 7–9, 2026.

- Deliverables created in the room:
- A shared execution agenda (what will advance between LA and London)
- A checkpoint cadence (e.g., 30 / 60 / 90 days + quarterly)
- Named owners / champions for each workstream
- Minimum proof requirements for London (what must be shown, not said)
- A short list of blockers to remove (decisions required from leadership, governance, budget, or partners)
- Support conditions required for each workstream (training, governance, budget, vendor/tool dependencies)

Purpose:

Ensure continuity and follow-through — so London is a report of progress, not a reset of the conversation.

4:45 – 5:00 PM — Closing Remarks: What Survives Outside the Room

A brief close focused on commitments, next checkpoints, and what will be carried forward into RESET London 26.

5:00 – 6:00 PM — Closing Cocktail

Informal continuation of cross-group conversations, designed to solidify relationships and remove friction before participants leave.
No programming. No speeches.
Just execution-minded connection.