

 **omigroup / gltf-extensions** Public[Code](#) [Issues 8](#) [Pull requests 4](#) **[Discussions](#)** [Actions](#) ...

## OMI\_link discussion thread #126

lyuma started this conversation in **General**



**lyuma** on Dec 8, 2022 Maintainer

edited ▾

[https://github.com/omigroup/gltf-extensions/tree/main/extensions/2.0/OMI\\_link](https://github.com/omigroup/gltf-extensions/tree/main/extensions/2.0/OMI_link)

From meeting 2022-12-08

OMI\_link

- Lyuma: concern about unspecified (non-interoperable) behavior of relative URIs.
- fragment identifiers in URIs deserve a spec:
  - node names;
  - should we make a spec for position fragment identifiers?
  - It may be wise to consider both the start and end point (preserve offset in the target document or fragment relative to the OMI\_link node)
- Add a type attribute?
- Add multiple links for fallback (for example vrchat:// but perhaps a http uri if vrchat is not installed).
- Any destination extensions may be assumed to be a destination if there
- Perhaps OMI\_link could go to any anchor target. Would we use node name? or do we want it within an extension to guarantee uniqueness?

[click me](#)

...

↑ 1

**0 comments**

Category



**General**

Labels

None yet

1 participant

