RTC RESET 2026
RealTime Executive Summit on Emerging Technologies
FEBRUARY 23–24, 2026 | LOS ANGELES

MONDAY, FEB. 23, 2026
The Third Floor — 5700 Wilshire Blvd,
Suite 650, Los Angeles, CA 90036
PROGRAM (DETAILED)

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

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.

RTC RESET 2026
RealTime Executive Summit on Emerging Technologies
FEBRUARY 23–24, 2026 | LOS ANGELES

MONDAY, FEB. 23, 2026
The Third Floor — 5700 Wilshire Blvd,
Suite 650, Los Angeles, CA 90036
PROGRAM (DETAILED)

The AI Integration Battle Plan

Execution Phase 1: Constraints & Operating Reality

09:00 – 09:30 – The Art of Embracing Change: Retooling for the Future of Content Creation
Chris Edwards – Founder & CEO – The Third Floor

Over the past several years, the entertainment industry has been stress-tested by forces creative companies were never designed to absorb, including pandemic shutdowns, strike paralysis, dramatic shifts in consumer behavior, and the introduction of radical, new technologies.

As a pioneer of Previsualization, Chris Edwards has always embraced rapid change and championed the early adoption of bleeding- edge technologies which had the potential to advance the creative process. Chris will open RESET LA 26 by describing how he navigated his company through the industry-wide downturn, which wouldn't have been possible without the rapid adoption of real-time technologies.

Now with generative AI calling into question the importance of human direction at every step in the creative process, Chris argues that professional creators have an opportunity to recommend how AI can and should be integrated. This call-to-action frames our current situation and cross-industry discussion about best practices for implementing sustainable AI pipelines that put human artists first.

9:30 – 10:15 — Pressure-Testing the Sustainable AI 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. The distribution of AI Literacy across a workforce is very uneven:

If you want a creative team to thrive and leverage any fast-moving new capability, the goal isn't to turn everyone into an **Ai Expert**.
It's to help everyone become **AI literate**—able to collaborate from a shared understanding, ask better questions, and make reliable decisions.

Start by defining what Ai literacy means for your studio: not tool tricks, but shared language around intent, quality, constraints, and review.
Then make the "good way" easy: a simple workflow, a few templates, a small library of examples that show what great looks like and why.

Create protected time for practice because literacy doesn't grow in spare minutes. Teach by pairing and critique—creatives learn fastest when they can see the work, hear the intent, and refine together.
And design the culture so knowledge travels: reward sharing, rotate champions, and document what works as lightweight "recipes," not rigid rules.

When you do this, you're not standardizing creativity—you're standardizing the **foundation**. The team spends less energy translating for each other and more energy making bolder, more coherent work.

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 vworking-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: The Operating Model for Sustainable Transformation: Restoring Agency Through Coherence and Repeatable Delivery

Kerenza Harris — Executive Leader | Design Technology & Practice Innovation (AECO) | Faculty, SCI-Arc

AI and real-time systems are accelerating pressure that was already building across practice. Even without them, many firms struggle with fragmentation: design, delivery operations, and digital infrastructure evolve in parallel, but not together. The result is familiar: strong local capability, uneven adoption, and initiatives that don't scale into stable workflows.

Kerenza reframes digital transformation as an operating model problem. She introduces coherence as the missing layer that restores agency, so design intent, performance, and execution hold together under complexity. Sustainability strengthens the case, not as a separate topic, but as a force that makes integration non-optional. Performance expectations now touch decisions, delivery strategy, and long-term value.

- What would change if we treated design, fabrication, and construction as one continuous workflow, and used that to restore agency and coherence?
- What changes if we treat OpenUSD or USD as a packaging logic for the built environment, so architecture curates meaning and intent instead of producing all data?
- What operating model makes sustainability and resilience repeatable, and enables firms to use AI to reduce friction rather than add complexity?

Purpose:
Reframe transformation as an operating model challenge, then outline what a flexible, scalable, and resilient framework requires to absorb what's next and move from pilots to repeatable, firmwide adoption.

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.

6:00 – 8:00 PM — Executive Dinner, with the support of AMD
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.

RTC RESET2026
RealTime Executive Summit on Emerging Technologies
FEBRUARY 23–24, 2026 | LOS ANGELES

TUESDAY, FEB. 24, 2026
The Third Floor — 5700 Wilshire Blvd,
Suite 650, Los Angeles, CA 90036
PROGRAM (DETAILED)

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 Playbook: Sustainable, AI-Ready Operating Model for Repeatable Adoption**
Convener: Kerenza Harris — Executive Leader | Design Technology & Practice Innovation (AECO) | Faculty, SCI-Arc
Focuses on sustainability and AI as guiding forces that make integration non-optional. The group will unify design, delivery, and construction workflows into one workable framework and produce a playbook with a pilot template that can be tested, measured, and scaled.

- **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 — Hybrid Workflows & Production-Ready AI Integration

Convener: Judith Crow — VP Strategic Partnerships, SideFX
Co-convener: Danilo Papić — CEO and Co-Founder, Netfork

With decades invested in mature pipelines and artist skill sets, existing studios face a challenge to rapidly, but responsibly, integrate AI workflows into production scenarios.
Judith convenes a cross-industry working group bringing together VFX studios, software vendors, and AI developers to examine how mature production pipelines intersect with emerging AI tools — where integration works, where it breaks, and where expectations are misaligned.

Core question
What do we actually mean by hybrid workflows, and what qualifies as production-ready AI inside a mature pipeline?

Focus
- Align on a shared definition of hybrid (right now it means different things depending on who you ask)
- Where should AI accelerate workflows — and where must human control remain non-negotiable?
- Separate studio-specific needs from requirements that could be shared across the industry
- What governance signals do studios need to be able to deploy AI tools at scale over the next 12–24 months?

Expected outputs
- A practical baseline definition of production-ready AI for VFX/animation contexts
- A short list of integration requirements and red flags
- 3–5 evaluation scenarios studios and vendors can use immediately for AI tool evaluation

---

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 AECO Playbook: A Sustainable, AI-Ready Operating Model for Repeatable Adoption

Convener: Kerenza Harris — Executive Leader | Design Technology & Practice Innovation (AECO) | Faculty, SCI-Arc

Purpose
This group focuses on one problem: pilots that don't scale. In AECO, AI, BIM, digital twins, and operations often advance in parallel, owned by different teams, with uneven adoption. Sustainability and resilience make this integration non-optional because performance expectations now shape decisions, specifications, delivery strategy, and long-term value.
This is not a tool-evaluation group. It is a working session to define a cohesive operating model and a playbook that supports short-, mid-, and full-term adoption.

Core Focus Areas

1. From fragmentation to coherence
Where adoption breaks across design, delivery, and construction, and why "successful pilots" stay one-offs.

Key question:
What prevents a pilot from becoming normal practice?

2 Continuous workflow model
A unified design-to-making-to-delivery workflow that keeps intent, performance, and accountability connected across handoffs.

Key question:
What must remain coherent from early decisions to what gets built?

3. AI-ready information structure
Minimum structure and semantics needed so teams can absorb and leverage information (not produce it all), and AI reduces friction rather than adding complexity.

Key question:
What minimum data and governance make AI usable beyond demos?

4. Governance that scales
Decision gates, ownership, and proof points that drive adoption without constant re-orgs.

Key question:
What gets standardized, what stays flexible, and who owns it?

Working Group Questions (Explicit)

- What has to connect so sustainability and resilience become repeatable outcomes, not late patches?
- What does "production-ready" mean in AECO, and what evidence proves it?
- What changes when adoption becomes the metric, not pilot quality?
- What is the smallest bridge model that can scale across teams and projects?

Intended Outputs

- By the end of the session, the group aims to produce:
- AECO Playbook (v1): a staged guide for near-term alignment, mid-term implementation, and full-term practice-wide adoption, defining the operating model, roles, decision gates, and handoffs to unify design, delivery, and construction.
- Pilot Template + Scorecard: success measures for adoption and performance under real constraints (budget, schedule, risk).

Scale Criteria: what must be true to move from pilot to repeatable, firmwide implementation.

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.

RTC: RESET 2026
RealTime Executive Summit on Emerging Technologies
FEBRUARY 23–24, 2026 | LOS ANGELES

TUESDAY, FEB. 24, 2026
The Third Floor — 5700 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 650, Los Angeles, CA 90036
PROGRAM (DETAILED)

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.