

RESET London 26 – Detailed Agenda

RESET London 26

The RealTime Executive Summit on Emerging Technologies

September 7–9, 2026 – Bentley Systems HQ, 43rd Floor, 8 Bishopsgate, London EC2N 4BQ, UK.

From AI Integration to Business Reinvention

How the Summit Is Designed

RESET London 26 is not a sequence of presentations. It is a deliberately structured executive working summit designed around a question that has become increasingly urgent:

We know the technology can change the work. What happens when it changes the business?

RESET London 25 identified the structural pressures reshaping creative and technical industries. RESET LA 26 moved the conversation from AI anxiety to adoption, hybrid workflows, production readiness and measurable outcomes.

London 26 starts from those conclusions.

We are not reopening the question of whether AI will become part of production. Nor are we gathering to compare tools or showcase experiments. The challenge now is to understand what happens when capabilities that were once scarce, slow, or technically difficult become broadly accessible — even as the true cost of deploying them at scale is still emerging.

RESET London 26 moves through five stages:

→ **Evidence** — What is actually changing already?

→ **Value** — When production economics change, where does competitive advantage move?

→ **Organization** — What must companies own, coordinate and become?

→ **Production Reality** — Which answers survive actual workflow, governance and economic constraints?

→ **Action** — Which shared problems are sufficiently important to act on together?

The objective is not consensus. It is to leave London with sharper decisions, testable propositions, and a small number of actions that can survive outside the room.

Program Overview

<3 tabs>

<tab1>

Monday, Sept. 7, 2026

RESET London 26 at a glance

Monday, Sept 7, 2026

ZHA Architects — 101 Goswell Road, London EC1V 7EZ

Opening Reception — Seeing Reinvention in Practice

RESET London 26 will open with an evening reception hosted at ZHA Architects. The gathering will include drinks, canapés, informal networking, and a short presentation and demonstration of ZHA's Robot Lab and digital fabrication environment, followed by a conversation designed to spark the discussions of the following two days. The evening will help frame how computational design, AI, automation, robotics, and digital fabrication are reshaping design practice, project delivery, and the future operating models of AECO firms. It will also open a broader RESET conversation on how similar forces are transforming creative, technological, and business practices across industries.

18:00–18:30 — Arrival & Welcome Drinks

18:30–18:40 — Welcome to RESET London 26

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

Patrik Schumacher — Principal, ZHA Architects | Chairman, ZHA Employee Benefit Trust

18:40–19:10 — Robot Lab & Digital Fabrication Demonstration

A concrete demonstration of computational design, robotics, automation and fabrication — not as a technology showcase, but as a provocation about what happens when design and execution begin to converge.

19:10–19:40 — Opening Conversation

Are We Using New Technology to Make the Old System Faster — or Redesigning the System Around What Is Now Possible?

Led by

Patrik Schumacher — Principal of ZHA and Chairman of the ZHA Employee Benefit Trust — ZHA Architects

Clemens Lindner — Senior Design & AI Researcher at ZHA and Trustee Director of the ZHA Employee Benefit Trust

Vishu Bhooshan — Senior Associate Computation and Design Group (CODE) — ZHA Architects

This introduces several questions that carry into Tuesday:

- What happens when design, engineering and fabrication become increasingly concurrent?
- What organizational structures are artifacts of sequential production?
- Where does human expertise move when execution becomes increasingly automated?
- What happens when AI moves from being a tool to becoming an actor within the workflow?

19:40–21:00 — Reception, Buffet & Informal Conversation

RESET London 26 at a glance

Tuesday, Sept 8, 2026

Bentley Systems HQ, 43rd Floor, 8 Bishopsgate, London EC2N 4BQ, UK.

MORNING PLENARY

From Capability to Business Reinvention

The morning explores what happens when AI moves beyond workflow improvement and begins to reshape accountability, business models and the enterprise itself.

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

Main Auditorium

08:45–09:00 — Opening Remarks

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

At RESET LA, we largely stopped asking whether AI would become part of production. The answer was yes — selectively, unevenly, and usually through hybrid workflows. We also agreed that the real test was no longer the demo, but measurable production value. So we are not going to reopen that discussion here.

The question for London is what happens next: if these technologies genuinely change the cost and structure of work, where does value move — and what must the organization become in order to capture it?

Then the killer question:

Are we optimizing an operating model that is disappearing?

9:00-9:10 Production Reality Check: What a Diff'rence a Year Makes

- **Christopher Hebert** — VP Strategic Partnerships — SideFX

Looking back at the questions SideFX was asking a year ago, Chris reflects on what has genuinely changed — and what has not — as AI moves from experimentation toward production. He invites participants to consider their own journey, and what those changes now imply for the workflows, organizations and decisions ahead.

From AI Integration to Business Reinvention

A deliberately provocative opening conversation about what happens when AI changes not only how work is executed, but how decisions are made, authority is distributed, expertise is organized and accountability is assigned.

Core question:

If AI changes both the work and the decision chain, what must the organization itself become?

Additional provocations:

- What happens when AI becomes an actor inside the organization rather than simply a tool?
- If execution is increasingly automated, what is management for?
- If AI increasingly does the work, **what is the organization actually organizing?**
- Do we need a new target operating model — or an operating model designed to keep changing?

9:15-9:25 — From Brunelleschi to AI: When Tools Reshape Practice

- **Greg Demchak** — VP of Emerging Technologies — Bentley Systems

From Brunelleschi to AI, Greg Demchak traces how new tools have repeatedly transformed architectural practice — and asks what AI may reshape next.

9:30-9:40 — When Capability Outruns Accountability

- **David Ayeni** — Principal — Vistergy

As AI moves from experimentation into real-world operations, capability is advancing faster than the systems of accountability around it. Who signs off when the machine helped—and who carries the risk when it gets it wrong?

9:45-9:55 — AI Classification, Provenance and Acceptable Use

- **Sam Richards** — Co-Chair, Technology Committee — Visual Effects Society

As AI becomes embedded across production tools, broad policies such as “no AI use” or “declare any AI use” become increasingly difficult to apply. The VES Technology Committee’s Da-M-I-C-Us AI Classification Framework introduces a more practical vocabulary for discussing model origin, data provenance, acceptable use, internal versus final-pixel workflows, and the criteria studios, vendors, clients and legal teams need to align around—a truly exclusive first look at this initiative.

10:00-10:40 — Audience-Led Discussion — What must organizations become when AI changes not only how work is done, but who decides, who signs off and who carries the risk?

AI is entering organizations through workflows, tools and individual experimentation, but its consequences extend far beyond productivity.

As AI systems begin to recommend, generate, decide, prioritize and increasingly act inside production and business processes, established assumptions about authority, expertise, management and accountability begin to weaken.

The question is no longer simply **who uses AI?**

It is:

What happens when capability, decision-making and accountability no longer sit in the same place?

If an individual can now perform work that previously required a team, if an AI system makes recommendations that materially influence an outcome, or if decisions increasingly emerge from hybrid human-machine processes, organizations need to reconsider who has

authority, who is responsible, what expertise means, and how people are expected to change their behavior.

This discussion examines the organizational consequences before moving into the business-model and enterprise-architecture questions that follow.

Insight contributors:

Patrik Schumacher — ZHA Architects | **Lincoln Wallen** — Framestore Company 3 Group | **Peter Nofz** — RodeoFX | **Clemens Lindner** — Senior Design & AI Researcher at ZHA and Trustee Director of the ZHA Employee Benefit Trust | **Sam Richards** – Co-Chair, Technology Committee — Visual Effects Society | **Lisa Schulteis** — Founder, ElectraLime Marketing

Potential Angles for Insight Contributors

Patrik Schumacher — ZHA Architects

When Capability Changes, Should Authority Change With It?

If computational systems and AI allow individuals and smaller teams to act with far greater autonomy, does authority need to move closer to where capability now resides?

Lincoln Wallen — Framestore Company 3 Group

When Decision-Making Becomes Distributed

If expertise, technology and decision-making increasingly operate across people, systems and teams rather than through a traditional hierarchy, how must leadership and organizational design change?

Peter Nofz — RodeoFX

Don't Automate the Old Organization

If AI is inserted into existing workflows, approval structures and departmental boundaries without changing them, are companies creating transformation — or simply accelerating inherited inefficiencies?

Clemens Lindner — ZHA Architects

When Design, Decision and Execution Converge

If technology increasingly collapses the distance between thinking, designing, simulating and making, what happens to the organizational structures that were built around those separations?

Sam Richards — Visual Effects Society

Who Signs Off When the Process Is Hybrid?

As AI becomes embedded inside production decisions, what must remain attributable, traceable and subject to explicit human accountability?

Lisa Schulteis — ElectraLime Marketing

The Adoption Gap

Why do organizations understand intellectually that they need to change — yet continue behaving according to the old operating model? What creates the trust, confidence and behavioral change required for new ways of working to become actual operating practice?

Questions to Pressure-Test — London 26

Authority and decision-making

- If capability no longer follows hierarchy, should authority still follow hierarchy?
- When individuals and small teams can act with capabilities previously available only to departments or large organizations, who should be allowed to decide?
- Which decisions should remain explicitly human, even when AI can make them faster or potentially better?
- At what point does human approval cease to provide meaningful control and become procedural theatre?
- If AI recommends an action and a human routinely approves it, who is actually making the decision?
- Does increased individual capability require more autonomy — or stronger organizational constraints?

Accountability

- Who is accountable when an outcome emerges from a hybrid human-AI process?
- Who signs off when no single individual fully understands every component of the system producing the result?

- Can responsibility be delegated to a process, platform or model — or must it always resolve to a person?
- What must remain traceable, explainable or reproducible before an AI-enabled process can become operational?
- When does governance protect the organization, and when does it merely create the appearance of control?
- If accountability remains centralized while capability becomes distributed, does the organization become structurally unstable?

Expertise and judgment

- What counts as expertise when people can produce sophisticated outputs without mastering every underlying skill?
- Does AI reduce the need for expertise — or make expert judgment more important because execution becomes easier?
- If AI can generate options faster than humans can evaluate them, does judgment become the new bottleneck?
- Who is qualified to override an AI-supported decision?
- What happens when senior expertise resides with people who understand the old workflow while junior people understand the new tools?
- How do organizations distinguish apparent capability from genuine judgment?

Management and leadership

- If AI increasingly performs coordination, analysis, scheduling, reporting and even parts of decision-making, what is management for?
- Does management shift from directing execution toward defining intent, constraints and accountability?
- What happens to middle management if information and capability flow more directly across the organization?
- Should leaders focus less on controlling how work gets done and more on defining what outcomes, boundaries and values matter?
- What new leadership capabilities become necessary when the operating model itself is continuously changing?

Adoption and behavior change

- Why do organizations continue using old processes even after better tools are available?
- What creates resistance when people intellectually understand the rationale for change?
- Is resistance primarily fear of technology — or fear of what the technology changes about identity, expertise, authority and status?
- What makes people trust a new AI-enabled workflow enough to rely on it?

- How much cognitive friction can an organization introduce before people revert to familiar behavior?
- When does mandating adoption create compliance rather than genuine behavioral change?
- What does leadership need to do differently when technological change happens faster than organizational adaptation?

Organizational boundaries

- If AI allows people to move across traditional disciplinary boundaries, do departments still make sense in their current form?
- Which boundaries exist because expertise once had to be concentrated in specialized teams?
- Which boundaries remain essential for accountability, quality or risk?
- What happens when the person closest to the problem can increasingly build or modify the solution themselves?
- Should organizations organize around functions, capabilities, outcomes, products — or something else entirely?
- If collaboration between disciplines becomes more continuous, what organizational structures built around handoffs should disappear?

Human + AI operating model

- Is AI still a tool inside the organization — or is it becoming an actor within the organization?
- If AI agents can initiate actions, coordinate tasks and interact with other systems, what organizational role are they effectively performing?
- Who defines the limits of that authority?
- What must remain deterministic, reviewable or reversible?
- Do organizations need policies governing tools — or an architecture governing human and machine decision rights?
- Could the future operating model be defined less by job descriptions and more by distributions of human judgment, machine capability and explicit accountability?

Core Questions

1. **If capability no longer follows hierarchy, where should authority sit?**
2. **When decisions emerge from human-AI systems, who signs off and who carries the risk?**
3. **If execution becomes easier, does expertise disappear — or does judgment become more valuable?**

4. **Why do organizations understand the need to change but fail to change how people actually behave?**
5. **If AI increasingly coordinates, recommends and acts, what is management for?**
6. **Which organizational boundaries still create value — and which exist only because previous technology required them?**
7. **What must remain explicitly human, attributable and accountable as AI becomes embedded in the operating model?**

10:45–11:15 — Networking Break

11:15–11:20 — Key Takeaways from the Previous Session & Introduction to the Next Conversation

Synthesis contributors:

- **Edward White** - Technical Director & Practice Builder · Independent
- **TBA**

11:20–12:00 — Audience-Led Discussion — Part 1 – The Business — What business model survives?

When Efficiency Is No Longer Enough: What Must the Business Reinvent?

If AI makes existing work faster but also resets prices, expectations and competition, where must companies find new sources of growth and differentiation? What happens if successful AI transformation shrinks the business you currently know?

Insight contributors:

John Canning — AMD | **Toby Hyder** — XO Link | **Andy Mc Namara** — Cinesite | **David Gillespie** — Foster + Partners | **Tony Prosser** — RealTime | **Joseph Bell** — AWS | **José Frederick San Román** — Adelfas Capital Partners | **Joël Maguet** — The Third Floor

Potential Angles for Insight Contributors

John Canning — AMD

When Creation Becomes Cheap, What Becomes Valuable?

If software and creative capability become abundant, does infrastructure become the new scarcity — and who captures that value?

Joël Maguet — The Third Floor

When Visualization Becomes a Business Capability

If execution becomes faster and more accessible, where does a visualization company create differentiated value?

Joseph Bell — AWS

When AI Becomes Infrastructure

The economics of an AI experiment and the economics of an AI operating model are not the same. What happens when AI has to run every day, at scale?

David Gillespie — Foster + Partners

When Production Capability Becomes Commodity

If everyone can generate compelling imagery and iterate quickly, where does architectural value move?

Andy McNamara — Cinesite

Does AI create one new production model — or split the market between cheap “good enough” production and premium controllable production?

Questions to pressure-test — London 26

Business model

- If efficiency becomes widely available, what must companies change beyond efficiency to remain differentiated?
- Which parts of the current business model are becoming structurally weaker — even if the underlying workflow improves?
- At what point does improving the existing model become less rational than building a new one?

Growth

- If productivity gains are absorbed by lower prices or higher client expectations, where does future growth come from?
- Which new markets, customers or services become viable because production economics have changed?
- Does AI create one new market — or split existing markets into radically different value tiers?

Enterprise structure

- If smaller teams and individuals can now do work that once required large organizations, what does scale still uniquely provide?
- Does scale remain an advantage — or become coordination cost, latency and overhead?
- Which capabilities should companies bring back in-house, which should they stop owning, and which should become shared infrastructure?

Commercial model

- If traditional fee-for-service models come under pressure, do suppliers need to become partners, co-investors or participants in downstream value?
- Who should capture the economic upside when technology changes the cost structure of delivery?
- What forms of risk-sharing make sense when clients, suppliers and technology providers all contribute differently to the outcome?

Defensible advantage

- If technology itself is no longer the moat, what becomes defensible: IP, audience, data, trust, domain knowledge, distribution, relationships, control?
- What remains worth paying a premium for when execution becomes easier?
- Which advantages become more valuable precisely because AI cannot commoditize them easily?

12:10 – 12:55 — Audience-Led Discussion

Part II — The Enterprise — What organization is needed to operate the business model Part I describes?

If Everyone Can Build, What Must the Enterprise Own?

As AI gives individuals and small teams capabilities that once belonged to large organizations, what should companies still own, control and standardize — and what should they buy, rent or build collectively?

Insight contributors:

Peter Nofz — RodeoFX | **Lincoln Wallen** — Framestore Company 3 Group | **Sol Rogers** — Magnopus | **David Morin** — Academy Software Foundation | **Neil Trevett** — Khronos |

Elena Garcés — Senior Research Scientist, Adobe Research | **Joël Maguet** — The Third Floor | **Alain Waha** — Buto Happold

Potential Angles for Insight Contributors

Peter Nofz — Rodeo FX

Don't Confuse Adoption with Reinvention

If every department integrates AI but the organization itself remains fundamentally unchanged, has the business actually transformed?

Lincoln Wallen — Framestore Company 3 Group

From Workflow Improvement to Structural Transformation

At what point does enough workflow improvement require redesigning the department — or the organization itself?

Joël Maguet — The Third Floor

Global Scale, Local Intelligence

If production capability becomes increasingly distributed, what should a global creative organization centralize — and what still needs to remain local?

Sol Rogers — Magnopus

Designing for Permanent Reinvention

Should companies build the next pipeline — or build organizations capable of continually replacing their pipelines?

David Morin — Academy Software Foundation

What Should We Stop Building Alone?

If every company is spending engineering talent rebuilding the same underlying capabilities, what should become shared industry infrastructure instead?

Alain Waha — Buro Happold

What Should the Enterprise Open Up?

If computational design increasingly depends on shared knowledge, open-source tools and common foundations, where does openness create more value than proprietary ownership — and what should enterprises contribute back to the ecosystem?

Neil Trevett — Khronos Group

What Must Remain Interoperable?

If tools, models and platforms keep changing, which interfaces and standards must remain stable so enterprises can innovate without becoming locked into any one technology stack?

Elena Garcés — Adobe Research

When the Frontier Moves Outside the Enterprise

If the frontier of technical capability increasingly originates in research communities, startups and very small teams, what is the role of the large enterprise?

Questions to pressure-test — London 26

Organizational architecture

- If capability no longer follows the organizational chart, what should the organizational chart be designed around?
- What should remain centralized, and what should move closer to the people actually doing the work?
- At what point does the existing organizational structure become part of the problem rather than the solution?
- If AI increasingly does the work, **what is the organization actually for?**

Autonomy vs control

- If everyone can build, how do companies capture bottom-up innovation without inheriting enterprise-wide chaos?
- Where should individual and team autonomy stop and enterprise standards begin?
- How do you prevent local productivity gains from becoming downstream technical debt?
- When people closest to the problem can increasingly build the solution themselves, what is the role of centralized technology teams?

What must the enterprise own?

- Should companies own tools — or the architecture that allows tools to be replaced?
- Which capabilities are genuinely strategic enough to keep in-house?
- Which should be bought as services?
- Which should the enterprise deliberately stop owning?
- Which interfaces, data and institutional knowledge must the enterprise control even when the tools themselves are external?
- What becomes too important to outsource even if outsourcing is cheaper?

What should be shared?

- What should companies stop building independently?
- Which capabilities are common infrastructure rather than competitive differentiation?
- What should become an open standard, what should become shared open-source infrastructure, and what should remain proprietary?
- If enterprises depend on shared technology, who should fund and govern it?
- How do open standards and open source reduce dependency without simply creating a different kind of dependency?
- When does an individual company problem become an industry-level problem?
- Could shared infrastructure allow companies to concentrate scarce engineering talent on what actually differentiates them?

Designing for continuous change

- How do you replace the operating system of a company while the company is still running?
- How much of the organization should maintain today's business — and how much should be building its replacement?
- If models, platforms and tools keep changing, what must remain durable — architecture, standards, interfaces, data, or institutional knowledge?
- Should the goal be a new target operating model — or an organization capable of continually changing its operating model?

Governance and accountability

- What changes when AI becomes an actor inside the organization rather than simply a tool?
- Who has authority to approve, stop or override an AI-enabled process?
- Can governance move at the speed of the technology without becoming either meaningless or obstructive?
- What must remain traceable and accountable even when the underlying technology keeps changing?

Core Questions

1. **If capability no longer follows the organizational chart, what should the organization be designed around?**
2. **If everyone can build, how do you capture innovation without inheriting chaos?**
3. **What should the enterprise own, what should it rent, what should it build collectively — and what should remain an open standard or commons?**
4. **How do you replace the operating system of a company while the company is still running?**

5. If AI increasingly does the work, what is the organization actually for?

12:55–1:00 PM — Main Takeaways

Synthesis contributors:

- **Edward White** — Technical Director & Practice Builder · Independent
 - **TBA**
-

1:00-2:00 PM — Networking Lunch

WORKING SESSIONS

From Conversation to Production Reality

The morning asks what business models and organizations need to change. The afternoon pressure-tests those ideas against real workflows, economics, governance, talent and implementation constraints.

2:00–4:30 PM — Parallel Working Sessions

Each group will take breaks as needed.

Each Working Session should leave the room with:

- one clearly defined problem;
- what is already established;
- what remains unresolved;
- 3–5 propositions or decisions;
- one concrete test, pilot or action;
- the evidence that would prove or disprove it.

Kind reminder:

Do not ask whether the idea is interesting. Ask whether it survives technology, economics, organization and human reality.

WORKING SESSION 1 — PRODUCTION WORKFLOWS IN TRANSITION: WHAT'S NEXT?

From Claims to Evidence

At RESET London 2025, and again at RESET Los Angeles 2026, much of the discussion about production-readiness was framed by the proposition that hybrid AI workflows need to be anchored in mature, deterministic production tools.

How has this conversation evolved? Are there new considerations for the why, where and how of production-ready workflows?

This session will explore what works, what doesn't, and what's next for hybrid workflows. It will open with each participant sharing one action taken this year, one success, and one failure.

The session will produce a summary of real-world examples shared by the group, along with a set of criteria by which the projects' relative success/failure can be understood.

Working Session leads:

Judith Crow — SideFX | **Danilo Papic** — Netfork | **John Canning** — AMD

Contributors:

Joseph Bell — AWS | **Gary Mundell** — Tippett Studio | **Ava Oppenheimer** — Trylto | **Rich Welsh** — SMPTE | **Lincoln Wallen** — Framestore Company 3 Group | **Peter Nofz** — RodeoFX | **Rick Stringfellow** — Fellow, Head of Visual Content — EA | **Sam Richards** — Co-Chair, Technology Committee — Visual Effects Society | **Elena Garcés** — Senior Research Scientist, Adobe Research | **Lisa Schulteis** — Founder, ElectraLime Marketing

Potential Angles

What architecture are we actually building?

Judith Crow — SideFX

What Must Remain Deterministic?

Should AI become the workflow — or one replaceable capability inside a production architecture designed to survive changing models?

Ava Oppenheimer — Trylto

From AI Capability to Useful Systems

Are we choosing AI because it is the right architecture for the production problem — or redesigning the problem around what the technology can currently do?

Sam Richards — Visual Effects Society

AI Classification, Provenance and Acceptable Use

When is an AI Workflow acceptable, auditable and production-ready?

Elena Garcés — Senior Research Scientist, Adobe Research

From Research Possibility to Production Reality

How do we connect people who know what is becoming technically possible with the teams that actually need to turn it into reliable products and workflows?

What evidence proves it works?

Danilo Papic — Netfork

From AI Claims to Production Evidence

What evidence is strong enough to justify redesigning a workflow — and when does a problem shared by several companies become worth solving collectively?

Can it scale?

John Canning — AMD

When Experimentation Becomes Infrastructure

What changes when an AI workflow has to be repeatable, affordable and scalable rather than impressive once?

Joseph Bell — AWS

When AI Becomes Production Infrastructure

What changes when an AI workflow has to move from a successful experiment to something hundreds of artists can use reliably, securely and economically every day?

Rich Welsh

Standards, Trust and Production Scale

What common rules, interfaces and governance are needed for AI-enabled workflows to scale across teams and companies without sacrificing speed, control or trust?

What should disappear/change?

Gary Mundell — Tippett Studio

What If the Pipeline Itself Is the Problem?

Why assume the answer is always a hybrid workflow? At what point should an obsolete stage simply disappear?

What does this do to the organization?

Lincoln Wallen — Framestore Company 3 Group

When Workflow Change Becomes Structural Change

At what point does improving the workflow stop being enough — and require redesigning the team, department or production organization around it?

Peter Nofz — Rodeo FX

Don't Confuse Adoption with Reinvention

If AI is added to every department but the underlying production model stays the same, are we transforming the workflow — or just making the old one faster?

Lisa Schulteis — ElectraLime Marketing

When Technical Success Isn't Adoption

What makes a new workflow move from successful experiment to sustained operating practice?

Questions to pressure-test

Evidence

- Are we measuring time-to-first-result or time-to-approved-result?
- What evidence proves that the new workflow is better?
- Can the result be repeated across artists, projects and clients?

Economics

- What is the **total** operating cost once compute, supervision, cleanup, integration and rework are included?
- Are costs actually being removed — or simply relocated?
- At what scale does an apparently inexpensive experiment become expensive infrastructure?

Control

- Which parts of the workflow can remain probabilistic?
- Which must remain deterministic, controllable and revisionable?
- When does the last 10% of control erase the apparent 90% productivity gain?

Architecture

- What part of the workflow should remain durable even if the underlying model changes every six months?
- How much should be built internally versus consumed as infrastructure?
- When should the correct decision be **not to use AI at all**?

What the session should produce

A Production-Ready AI Evaluation Framework

A practical test for deciding whether a new workflow should be:

adopted | hybridized | further tested | rejected

against criteria such as:

- approved-result time;
- total cost;
- control;
- repeatability;
- revisionability;
- integration;
- scalability;
- provenance / legal risk;
- human supervision.

WORKING SESSION 2 — VOLUMETRIC CAPTURE: PRESERVING THE PERFORMER

When Appearance Becomes Abundant, What Remains Uniquely Human?

As generative systems become increasingly capable of reproducing appearance from widely available imagery, controlled capture needs a clearer value proposition. Is the scarce asset appearance, authentic performance, identity, consent, provenance — or the ability to reuse a performer reliably over time?

Potential leads / contributors:

Toby Hyder — XO Link | **Addie Reiss** — Digital Nation Entertainment | **Brett Ineson** — Animatrik | **Joe Steel** — Visual Skies |

Potential Angles

Toby Hyder — XO Link

When Appearance Becomes Abundant

If convincing appearance becomes inexpensive to reproduce, does authentic performance become the scarce asset?

Addie Reiss

What Must Remain Human?

Which elements of identity, performance and charisma cannot simply become probabilistic outputs?

Brett Ineson — Animatrik

From Capture Session to Reusable Asset

If a performer becomes a reusable digital capability, what business model allows the performer, producer and capture company to share future value?

Joe Steel — Visual Skies

From Capture to Production Asset

What does a captured human need to preserve — performance, identity, fidelity and control — to remain genuinely useful and reusable in production?

Questions to pressure-test

Value

- What exactly are we capturing: appearance, motion, performance, identity, authorship or a reusable economic asset?
- What additional value does controlled capture provide when appearance can increasingly be synthesized?
- What is sufficiently valuable that a producer will actually pay for it?

Control and authenticity

- When is “looks like the performer” insufficient?
- What does controlled capture preserve that generative reconstruction cannot?
- Does provenance itself become part of the product?

Ownership

- Who owns the resulting digital asset?
- Who controls reuse?
- How should consent persist across future uses that may not have existed when capture occurred?
- Can performers participate economically in reuse rather than only being paid for the original session?

Business model

- Is volumetric capture a production service, an infrastructure layer, an IP asset, or some combination?
- What kinds of recurring revenue or licensing models become possible?

What the session should produce

A Human Digital Asset Value Framework

A shared definition of:

- what is being captured;
- what makes it valuable;
- who owns and controls it;
- when capture is economically justified;
- what a viable reuse / licensing model might look like.

WORKING SESSION 3 — AI ECONOMICS & VALUE CAPTURE

Who Will Capture the Value of AI Transformation?

Productivity does not automatically translate into enterprise value. If technology changes the cost structure of production, the economic gain can flow to the producer, the client, the technology provider, the infrastructure layer — or disappear through lower prices and higher expectations.

Potential contributors:

José Frederick San Román — Adelfas Capital Partners | **Andy McNamara** — Cinesite | | selected studio / technology / finance participants

Potential Angles

José Frederick San Román — Adelfas Capital Partners

What Remains Investable When the Economics Change?

If AI changes margins, company size, capital requirements and defensibility, what kinds of businesses become more — or less — investable?

Andy McNamara — Cinesite

When the Market Splits

Does AI create one new production model — or separate the market into inexpensive “good enough” output and premium controllable production?

Questions to pressure-test

Value capture

- Who actually keeps the productivity gain?
- What prevents the entire gain from being transferred to the client through lower prices?
- Where can new margins genuinely be defended?

New revenue

- Which markets become economically possible that were previously inaccessible?
- What products or services become viable only because production economics have changed?
- Are companies spending too much effort shrinking cost and too little creating revenue?

Commercial relationships

- Does fee-for-service remain viable?
- When should suppliers share risk and upside?
- Could production partners become investors or co-owners rather than vendors?

Capital

- What becomes investable in a world of rapidly commoditizing capabilities?
- Which businesses still have defensible assets?
- Which shared problems are commercially attractive enough for a company to solve, and which require collective funding?

What the session should produce

A Value-Capture Map

Identify where economic value can realistically accrue across:

creator / studio / client / supplier / technology provider / infrastructure / IP owner / audience

and identify **1–2 alternative commercial models worth testing.**

WORKING SESSION 4 — AECO

From Project Data to Enterprise Intelligence

AECO firms already have BIM, reality capture, simulation, computational design, AI tools, proprietary knowledge and enormous volumes of project data. The problem is increasingly how to connect them into a durable operating architecture that supports decisions across design, engineering, construction and operation.

Potential leads / contributors:

David Ayeni — Vistergy | **Greg Demchak** — Bentley Systems | **Austin Reed** — HNTB | **Reeti Gupta** — Newcomb & Boyd | **Mark Kauffman** — WSP | **Mateusz Gawad** — Jacobs | **Kerenza Harris** — SCI-Arc / Morphosis | **David Gillespie** — Foster + Partners | **Clemens Lindner** — ZHA Architects | **Vishu Bhooshan** — ZHA Architects

Potential Angles

David Ayeni — Vistergy

Accountability as Architecture

If AI participates in design and engineering decisions, how must sign-off, evidence and responsibility be built into the operating system rather than added afterward?

Greg Demchak — Bentley Systems

From Tools to Connected Intelligence

What changes when digital tools stop being isolated instruments and become participants in a continuously connected design and delivery environment?

Austin Reed — HNTB

From Innovation to Repeatable Practice

What has to change for promising technologies to move from isolated experiments into reliable methods that teams can use across real projects?

Priam Givord — Priam Givord Studio

Beyond the Engineering GUI

How should human interfaces evolve as simulation, digital twins, AI and physical fabrication become increasingly connected, interactive and real-time?

Reeti Gupta — Newcomb & Boyd

Making Intelligence Useful Across Disciplines

How do we connect engineering knowledge, project data and AI so that intelligence can move across disciplines without losing context, intent or accountability?

Mark Kauffman — WSP

When Everyone Can Build, How Do We Avoid Fragmentation?

If teams can increasingly create their own tools and AI-enabled workflows, what common architecture and governance are needed to keep enterprise innovation from becoming enterprise chaos?

Mateusz Gawad — Jacobs

From Project-Level AI to Enterprise Capability

How do successful experiments become reusable organizational capability rather than remaining isolated within individual projects, teams or champions?

Kerenza Harris — SCI-Arc / Morphosis

Beyond BIM: From Data to Meaning

AECO has spent years digitizing buildings as data. How do we make that information meaningful enough for machines and organizations to reason with?

David Gillespie — Foster + Partners

When Technology Becomes Abundant, What Still Differentiates the Practice?

As visualization, simulation and AI become easier to access, how does a design practice turn its accumulated knowledge, data and domain expertise into durable competitive advantage?

Clemens Lindner — ZHA Architects

When Design and Making Converge

What happens to the traditional design process when computation, robotics and fabrication allow design intent and physical execution to interact continuously rather than sequentially?

Vishu Bhooshan — ZHA Architects

From Computational Design to Organizational Intelligence

If design logic can increasingly be encoded, automated and shared, how does computational expertise move from specialist teams into the operating fabric of the practice?

Edward White — Independent

Beyond Provenance: When Can an Image Be Trusted?

Provenance can establish how an image was made—but what standards, calibration and validation are needed to prove that generated, captured or real-time imagery faithfully represents a real place?

Alain Waha — Buro Happold

What Should AECO Stop Keeping Proprietary?

If computational design increasingly depends on shared methods, open-source tools and common foundations, where does openness create more value than ownership — and what should firms contribute back to the wider industry?

Questions to pressure-test

Enterprise intelligence

- Are AECO firms short of data — or short of meaning?
- How do project-level experiments become enterprise-level knowledge?
- What knowledge must survive from one project into the next?

Interoperability

- What is the minimum common information layer that allows tools, agents and disciplines to collaborate without forcing everyone onto one platform?
- If no single representation — BIM, mesh, point cloud, splat, sensor stream — is sufficient, what must remain stable beneath them?

Operating model

- If design, engineering and production become increasingly concurrent, does a phased organization still make sense?
- If every handoff loses information, intent or accountability, should the future operating model continue to be organized around handoffs?

Reality and feedback

- What changes when reality capture becomes continuous rather than occasional?
- Could the digital twin become the mechanism through which knowledge from the built asset flows back into the next design?

Governance

- Who signs off on AI-assisted decisions?
- What evidence needs to exist two years later?
- When is a visual representation adequate for communication but inadequate for an engineering, contractual or construction decision?

What the session should produce

An AECO Enterprise Intelligence Reference Architecture

Not a technology stack, but the minimum layers required for:

**capture → semantics → interoperability → intelligence / agents → governance →
accountability → simulation → feedback**

And ideally identify **one shared pilot or standards problem** the participating firms could pursue after RESET.

WORKING SESSION 5 — TALENT & EXPERTISE

Talent Without the Ladder: How Will the Next Generation Become Expert?

Much of the work AI can automate first is also the work through which people traditionally learned their craft. If junior tasks disappear faster than new development pathways emerge, today's productivity gain could become tomorrow's expertise shortage.

Potential leads / contributors:

Nandhini Giri — Purdue University | **Thibaut Delahaye** — Ecole des Nouvelles Images | education representatives | selected studio / AECO / technology leaders | **Terrence Masson** — Creative Technology & Media Executive | **Habib Zargarpour** — USC School of Cinematic Arts | **Glenn Goldman** — School of Art + Design | **Rochele Gloor** — rgloorLab / Natural Realities | **Terrence Masson** — Creative Technology & Media Executive

Potential Angles

Nandhini Giri

If We Reinvent the Work, Who Reinvents the Learning?

Who becomes responsible for developing future expertise when the traditional career ladder begins to disappear?

Thibaut Delahaye

The Apprenticeship Gap

If AI eliminates the tasks through which junior people learned the craft, how do they acquire judgment?

Terrence Masson

Rebuilding the Path to Expertise

If entry-level tasks are disappearing, how must educators and employers work together to create new pathways through which emerging talent can develop judgment, craft and professional confidence?

Glenn Goldman

Education Disrupted: What Must Endure—and What Must Be Reinvented?

What can previous technological disruptions—and today's educational experiments—teach us about what must endure and what must change?

Rochele Gloor

Keep Learning, Human

When tools and required skills won't stand still, learning must become an ongoing form of self-development—helping people build the literacy, judgment and agency to question AI, adapt intentionally and remain relevant.

Industry contributors

Productivity Today, Expertise Tomorrow

Are companies removing expensive inefficiencies — or accidentally removing the mechanisms through which experts were created?

Questions to pressure-test

The disappearing ladder

- Which entry-level tasks are most likely to disappear?
- Which of those tasks were actually important learning mechanisms?
- What does a career path look like when people can skip much of the traditional execution layer?

Judgment

- If execution becomes cheap but judgment remains difficult, how is judgment learned?
- Can someone become expert without first doing the work AI now performs?
- Which experiences cannot be simulated or automated away?

Responsibility

- Who should pay for developing future expertise: companies, schools, individuals, industry collectively?
- If employers stop hiring juniors because AI is cheaper, where will their future senior talent come from?

New apprenticeship

- Could AI accelerate apprenticeship rather than eliminate it?
- What must remain human-to-human?
- How do we expose learners to real consequences, trade-offs, clients and production constraints?

What the session should produce

A New Apprenticeship Model

Define:

- what future practitioners still need to learn;
- which experiences must remain hands-on;
- where AI can accelerate development;
- what industry must provide that education alone cannot;
- one practical pilot involving employers and educators.

4:30–5:00 PM — Working Session Capture

Each group uses the final 30 minutes to prepare Wednesday morning's plenary readout: problem, conclusions, disagreements, next steps, required participants and proof.

They must answer:

1. What problem are we solving?
2. What did we conclude?
3. Where did we disagree?
4. What should happen next?
5. Who needs to be involved?
6. What would constitute proof?

5:00–5:30 PM — Networking Break

5:30–6:25 PM — From Reset to Rebuild: Reinventing the Business While It Is Still Running

Rick Stringfellow — Fellow, Head of Visual Content — EA |

Conversation with Jean-Michel Blottière and RESET London 26 participants

How do you transform an organization while the existing business still has to deliver, generate revenue and meet today's expectations? Rick Stringfellow opens a candid conversation with the room around the tension between optimizing what already works and building what may ultimately replace it. Rather than trying to predict an end state that remains unclear, the discussion will focus on what leaders can do now: where to place bets, what to preserve, what to stop doing, and how to create room for a fundamentally different operating model.

• **How do you rebuild the plane while you're still flying it?**

You have an existing organization, operating model, and content pipeline that still needs to

deliver quality, revenue, and predictability. At the same time, you can see a very different model emerging. How do you decide what to keep optimizing versus what you need to actively disrupt or replace?

· **If the economics of content creation are fundamentally changing, what does the organization on the other side actually look like?**

As AI becomes something artists build into their own workflows—not simply a tool handed down to them—where do you see the biggest structural changes? Is it team composition, specialization, iteration speed, the role of leadership, or even how we define creative work?

· **We’ve talked a lot about the industry going through a “reset.” What tells you that we’re now entering the “rebuild”—and what should leaders be doing before the new model is obvious?**

Where are you placing bets today? And perhaps more importantly, what are you willing to stop doing in order to create room for that future?

6:25–6:30 PM — Closing Remarks & Day 2 Preview

Jean-Michel Blottière – Founder & CEO – RTC | RESET

Jean-Michel Blottière closes Day 1 with a brief synthesis of the day’s discussions, announces the AMD-sponsored gala dinner, and previews Wednesday’s program — Working Session readouts, cross-group synthesis, and the move from discussion to concrete next steps and shared actions

6:30–7:30 PM — Break Before the Gala Dinner

8:00–10:00 PM — Gala Dinner

Sponsored by AMD

Welcome Remarks

John Canning — Director of Strategic Partnerships, Media & Entertainment — AMD

An informal evening to continue the conversations of Day 1 in a more relaxed setting, strengthen connections across industries, and reflect on the ideas that will carry into Wednesday’s plenary and action sessions.

RESET London 26 at a glance

Wednesday, Sept 9, 2026

Bentley Systems HQ, 43rd Floor, 8 Bishopsgate, London EC2N 4BQ, UK

From Insight to Action

How the Day Is Designed

Wednesday is not a recap of Tuesday.

It asks which conclusions are strong enough to survive outside the room — and which shared problems merit further action.

Tuesday creates hypotheses.

Wednesday turns selected hypotheses into ownership.

Synthesis contributors will track the connections, contradictions and actionable propositions emerging across the readouts, cross-group integration and Action Lab.

MORNING PLENARY

From Insight to Action

Wednesday moves from discussion to decision. The morning tests which conclusions from Tuesday's Working Sessions are strong enough to survive across disciplines; the afternoon identifies the shared problems worth acting on, the people prepared to own them, and the evidence needed to move forward

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

Main Auditorium

08:45–09:00 — Welcome Back & Day 2 Framing

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

A brief synthesis of Day 1 and a look ahead.

Tuesday asked where business models need to change, what organizations must become, and which ideas survive production reality. Wednesday asks a simpler question:

What are we prepared to do about it?

The objective is not to reopen yesterday's conversations, but to identify:

- what survived scrutiny;
- where the Working Sessions reached meaningful conclusions;
- where important disagreements remain;
- which problems cut across multiple groups;
- and which ideas deserve action beyond RESET London.

09:00–10:45 — Working Session Readouts — What Survived the Room?

Each Working Session reports back on the problem it addressed, the conclusions reached, the tensions that remain unresolved, and the actions or experiments it believes should move forward.

The readouts should not be a recap of everything discussed. Each group should answer five questions:

1. **What problem were we trying to solve?**
2. **What did we conclude?**
3. **What evidence supports that conclusion?**
4. **What remains unresolved or contested?**
5. **What should happen next?**

Hybrid Workflows & Production-Ready AI — From Claims to Evidence

- **Judith Crow** — SideFX | **Danilo Papic** — Netfork | **John Canning** — AMD | **Sam Richards** — Co-Chair, Technology Committee — Visual Effects Society

Can we demonstrate that a new workflow is genuinely better once control, revisions, integration, supervision, compute, provenance, acceptable use and total production cost are taken into account

Readout should address

- Which criteria actually distinguish a production-ready workflow from an impressive demonstration?
- Where did AI genuinely improve the production equation?

- Where did conventional or hybrid approaches remain better?
- Which costs moved rather than disappeared?
- What parts of the workflow must remain deterministic or controllable?
- Is there a shared evaluation framework companies could use beyond RESET?

Expected outcome

A Production-Ready AI Evaluation Framework and, if appropriate, one candidate workflow or shared problem worth testing across several companies.

Volumetric Capture & the Human Asset — What Is the Performer Actually Worth?

- **Toby Hyder** — XO Link | **Addie Reiss** — Digital Nation Entertainment | **Brett Ineson** — Animatrik

As appearance becomes easier to reproduce, what remains uniquely valuable about authentic performance, identity, provenance and a reusable human digital asset?

Readout should address

- What exactly is being captured: likeness, performance, identity, authorship or a reusable asset?
- What does controlled capture preserve that generative reconstruction does not?
- When is that additional value worth paying for?
- Who should own and control reuse?
- Can performers participate economically in future reuse?
- Is there a viable business model beyond the original capture session?

Expected outcome

A Human Digital Asset Value Framework defining what is valuable, who controls it, and when controlled capture is economically justified.

AI Economics & Value Capture — Who Will Capture the Value of AI Transformation?

- **José Frederick San Román** — Adelfas Capital Partners |

When technology changes the economics of production, where can durable value, margin and new commercial models actually be created?

Readout should address

- Who actually captures the productivity gain?
- Where can margins remain defensible?
- Which existing commercial models are becoming structurally weaker?
- What new markets, services or revenue models become possible?
- Does fee-for-service remain viable?
- Which problems are investable businesses — and which require collective funding?

Expected outcome

A Value-Capture Map identifying where economic value can realistically accrue and one or two alternative commercial models worth further testing.

AECO — From Project Data to Enterprise Intelligence

- **David Ayeni** — Vistergy | **Greg Demchak** — Bentley Systems | **David Gillespie** — Foster + Partners | **Clemens Lindner** — ZHA Architects | **Vishu Bhooshan** — ZHA Architects | **Edward White** — Independent

How can fragmented project data, tools and expertise become a durable enterprise intelligence architecture spanning design, engineering, construction and operation?

Readout should address

- How does project-level intelligence become enterprise knowledge?
- What information needs to survive between disciplines, tools and projects?
- What must remain stable when representations and platforms keep changing?
- Does a phased, handoff-based operating model still make sense?
- How should accountability and evidence be preserved when AI participates in decisions?
- Which capabilities belong inside individual firms, and which could benefit from shared standards or infrastructure?

Expected outcome

An AECO Enterprise Intelligence Reference Architecture and, ideally, one shared pilot, interoperability challenge or standards problem worth pursuing after RESET.

Talent & Expertise — Talent Without the Ladder

- **Thibaut Delahaye** — École des Nouvelles Images

If AI automates the work through which people traditionally learned their craft, how must industry and education redesign the path to expertise?

Readout should address

- Which junior tasks are disappearing — and which of them were actually learning mechanisms?
- How is judgment developed when execution becomes easier to automate?
- Which experiences must remain hands-on?
- Who is responsible for developing future expertise?
- How can AI accelerate apprenticeship without eliminating it?
- What must industry provide that education cannot provide alone?

Expected outcome

A New Apprenticeship Model and one practical pilot linking educators and employers.

Synthesis contributors: **Edward White** — Independent

10:45–11:15 Networking Break

MORNING WORKING SESSIONS

11:15–12:30 — Cross-Group Integration — Where the Answers Collide

The Working Sessions come back together to identify the dependencies and contradictions between their conclusions. Where does economics invalidate a technically sound solution? Where does governance prevent scale? Where does talent become the missing dependency? Which capabilities should be shared rather than duplicated — and what needs to happen first?

Questions to pressure-test

Economics vs technology

- Where does a technically strong solution become economically irrational?
- Where do infrastructure, verification or supervision costs change the conclusion?
- Are any groups assuming productivity gains that another group's economics challenge?

Governance and accountability

- Where does governance prevent an otherwise viable idea from scaling?
- Which conclusions require new forms of accountability, provenance or sign-off?
- Are any proposed workflows dependent on responsibilities that have not yet been assigned?

Talent

- Where does talent become the limiting dependency?
- Are we designing new workflows without designing a path to the expertise they require?
- Which productivity gains could unintentionally weaken tomorrow's talent pipeline?

Ownership and infrastructure

- Which capabilities should be shared rather than duplicated?
- Which problems are genuinely enterprise-specific, and which are common industry problems?
- What should companies own, what should they rent, and what should they stop building alone?

Sequencing

- Which changes depend on something else happening first?
- What are the enabling conditions for the strongest proposals?
- Where do two apparently good conclusions contradict one another?

What the session should produce

A Cross-Group Dependency Map identifying:

- shared problems;
- major contradictions;
- enabling dependencies;

- possible shared infrastructure;
- and the strongest candidates to carry into the afternoon Action Lab.

Synthesis Contributor: **Edward White** — Independent

12:30-2:00 PM Networking Lunch

AFTERNOON PLENARY

Action Lab

From Shared Problems to Shared Action

The afternoon is designed to distinguish between three kinds of outcome:

1. problems individual companies should solve themselves;
2. opportunities that may become commercial ventures;
3. shared industry problems that may require collective action.

The goal is not to launch initiatives for the sake of launching them. A proposal should move forward only if the problem is sufficiently shared, painful, measurable and actionable.

Working Session leads and contributors from across the summit will reconvene for the Action Lab. Remote participation will remain open for contributors whose expertise or organizations are relevant to the initiatives moving forward.

2:00–3:00 PM — What Should We Solve Together?

Which problems identified during RESET are sufficiently shared, painful and well defined that participants should consider testing or solving them together? Potential initiatives will be examined against practical criteria including measurable value, willing participants, manageable scope, governance, IP, resources and the possibility of a meaningful 60–90 day outcome.

A central question:

When an industry recognizes a common inefficiency but no single company can justify solving it alone, is the barrier technological — or the way innovation is funded and coordinated?

Questions to pressure-test

The problem

- Is the pain genuinely shared by several organizations?

Invited perspectives: **Austin Reed** — HNTB | **Judith Crow** — SideFX | **Toby Hyder** — XO Link | **Reeti Gupta** — Newcomb & Boyd | **Andy McNamara** — Cinesite | **Mark Kauffman** — WSP | **Addie Reiss** — Digital Nation Entertainment *Is it specific enough to solve?*

- Is it specific enough to solve
- What happens if nobody acts?

Invited perspectives: **Lincoln Wallen** — Framestore Company 3 Group | **Patrik Schumacher** — ZHA Architects | **Sol Rogers** — Magnopus

Value

- Is there measurable economic, operational or strategic value?

Invited perspectives: **José Frederick San Román** — Adelfas Capital Partners | **David Gillespie** — Foster + Partners | **John Canning** — AMD | **Tony Prosser** — RealTime

- **Who benefits — and who actually captures the gain?**

Invited perspectives: **Joseph Bell** — AWS | **Toby Hyder** — XO Link |

- **Who would be prepared to commit resources?**

Scope

- **Can the idea be reduced to a meaningful 60–90 day test?**

Invited perspectives: **Judith Crow** — SideFX | **Danilo Papic** — Netfork | **David Ayeni** — Vistergy | **Greg Demchak** — Bentley Systems | **Ava Oppenheimer** — Trylto

- **What is the smallest useful version of the experiment?**
- **What would constitute success or failure?**

Invited perspectives: **Danilo Papic** — Netfork | **Elena Garcés** — Adobe Research |

Participation

- Which organizations need to participate?

Invited perspectives: **Greg Demchak** — Bentley Systems | **Brett Ineson** — Animatrik | **Austin Reed** — HNTB | **Joseph Bell** — AWS | **Reeti Gupta** — Newcomb & Boyd | **Nandhini Giri** — Purdue University | **Mark Kauffman** — WSP | **Joe Steel** — Visual Skies | **Kerenza Harris** — SCI-Arc / Morphosis

- Is there a credible owner or champion?

Invited perspectives: **John Canning** — AMD | **Sol Rogers** — Magnopus | **David Ayeni** — Vistergy | **Peter Nofz** — Rodeo FX

- Does the initiative require technology providers, practitioners, researchers, educators or investors?

Invited perspectives: **Elena Garcés** — Adobe Research | **Neil Trevett** — Khronos | **Thibaut Delahaye** — École des Nouvelles Images | **José Frederick San Román** — Adelfas Capital Partners | **Sam Richards** — Visual Effects Society

Production reality

- **Can the proposal survive real production or project constraints rather than only a controlled experiment?**

Invited perspectives: **Dave Schulz** — MPC | **Austin Reed** — HNTB | **Gary Mundell** — Tippett Studio | **David Gillespie** — Foster + Partners | **Reeti Gupta** — Newcomb & Boyd | **Priam Givord** — Priam Givord Studio

- **Which parts must remain deterministic, controllable, traceable or revisionable?**

Invited perspectives: **Judith Crow** — SideFX | **Sam Richards** — Visual Effects Society | **David Ayeni** — Vistergy | **Elena Garcés** — Adobe Research | **Rich Welsh** — SMPTE

- **At what point should an existing workflow or process be redesigned rather than optimized?**

Invited perspectives: **Gary Mundell** — Tippett Studio | **Lincoln Wallen** — Framestore Company 3 Group | **Clemens Lindner** — ZHA Architects | **Peter Nofz** — Rodeo FX |

Governance, standards and IP

- **What can be shared — and what must remain proprietary?**

Invited perspectives: **David Morin** — Academy Software Foundation | **Neil Trevett** — Khronos | **David Gillespie** — Foster + Partners | **Rich Welsh** — SMPTE

- **What standards, provenance or acceptable-use rules are needed before an initiative can scale?**

Invited perspectives: **Sam Richards** — Visual Effects Society | **Neil Trevett** — Khronos | **Rich Welsh** — SMPTE | **Elena Garcés** — Adobe Research | **David Ayeni** — Vistergy

- **Who owns what is created — particularly when people, data, models and captured assets are combined?**

Invited perspectives: **Addie Reiss** — Digital Nation Entertainment | **Brett Ineson** — Animatrik | **Joe Steel** — Visual Skies | **Toby Hyder** — XO Link

- Can the initiative remain neutral enough for competitors to participate?

Funding

- **Who should pay?**

Invited perspectives: **José Frederick San Román** — Adelfas Capital Partners | **John Canning** — AMD | Joseph Bell — AWS |

- **Is this a venture opportunity, a consortium problem, shared R&D, open infrastructure, or something else?**

Invited perspectives: **José Frederick San Román** — Adelfas Capital Partners | **David Morin** — Academy Software Foundation | **Neil Trevett** — Khronos |

- **If everyone agrees the problem is real but nobody individually can justify solving it, is the barrier technological — or the way innovation is funded and coordinated?**

Invited perspectives: **Rick Stringfellow** — EA | **John Canning** — AMD | **Greg Demchak** — Bentley Systems

What the session should produce

A shortlist of **one to three candidate initiatives** with enough clarity to move into ownership and pilot definition.

3:00-4:00 — From RESET to Action

Owners, Pilots & Next Checkpoints

The strongest proposals move from ideas to commitments. For each initiative that survives the discussion, participants identify who will lead, who needs to participate, what will be tested, what resources are required, what remains proprietary or shared, and what evidence will determine whether the initiative should continue.

Participants whose expertise or organizations are directly relevant to a surviving initiative will be invited to help shape the next step, whether joining in person or remotely.

For each proposal

- **Who leads?**
Potential owners drawn from the relevant Working Session leads and contributors.
- **Who participates?**
*Invited perspectives across communities: **Austin Reed** — HNTB | **Addie Reiss** — Digital Nation Entertainment | **Reeti Gupta** — Newcomb & Boyd | **Joseph Bell** — AWS | **Mark Kauffman** — WSP | **Brett Ineson** — Animatrik | **Kerenza Harris** — SCI-Arc / Morphosis | **Nandhini Giri** — Purdue University | **Mateusz Gawad** — Jacobs |*
- **What exactly are we testing?**
*Invited perspectives: **Judith Crow** — SideFX | **Danilo Papic** — Netfork | **David Ayeni** — Vistergy | **Greg Demchak** — Bentley Systems | **Toby Hyder** — XO Link | **Ava Oppenheimer** — Trylto | **Nandhini Giri** — Purdue University | **Thibaut Delahaye** — École des Nouvelles Images | **Priam Givord** — Priam Givord Studio*
- **What happens during the first 60–90 days?**
*Invited perspectives: **Danilo Papic** — Netfork | **Vishu Bhooshan** — ZHA Architects |*
- **What resources are required?**
*Invited perspectives: **John Canning** — AMD | **Joseph Bell** — AWS | **José Frederick San Román** — Adelfas Capital Partners |*
- **What remains proprietary — and what is shared?**
*Invited perspectives: **David Morin** — Academy Software Foundation | **Neil Trevett** — Khronos | **Sam Richards** — Visual Effects Society | **Rich Welsh** — SMPTE*
- **What evidence determines continue / change / stop?**
*Invited perspectives: **Judith Crow** — SideFX | **Danilo Papic** — Netfork | **Elena Garcés** — Adobe Research | **Andy McNamara** — Cinesite*

- **When is the next checkpoint?**
Relevant initiative owners and participants.

What the session should produce

For each initiative that survives:

Owner → Participants → Pilot → Resources → Evidence → Next checkpoint

The objective is quality rather than quantity. One or two initiatives with genuine ownership and a credible path forward are more valuable than a long list of aspirations.

4:00-4:30 PM Networking Break

4:30-4:55 — Closing Conversation

What Must We Stop Doing?

If the conclusions of RESET London 26 are true, what is one assumption, workflow, investment, organizational habit or business practice that we should stop carrying forward?

This final conversation focuses not on predicting the future, but on identifying what the industry is ready to leave behind.

All participants — in person and remote — are invited to contribute one final RESET.

Possible lenses:

- a workflow that exists only because previous technology required it;
- a capability companies should stop rebuilding internally;
- an organizational boundary that no longer makes sense;
- an assumption about scale, labor or competitive advantage;
- an investment being protected because of sunk cost rather than future value;
- a way of training, managing or measuring people that no longer serves the organization;
- a technology dependency that has become strategic risk;
- a handoff, approval or process that no longer creates value.

What the session should produce

A concise set of “**RESETs**” — assumptions and practices the group believes should be actively challenged rather than passively inherited.

4:55–5:00 — Closing Remarks

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

Closing reflections and the path from RESET London 26 toward the next checkpoints, pilots and collaborative initiatives.

The final message can return to the central RESET London premise:

The challenge is no longer simply access to powerful technology. It is deciding what remains valuable as previously scarce capabilities become widely available — and rebuilding businesses and organizations around that new reality.