📖 **omigroup** / **gltf-extensions**   Public

`<> Code`    ⊙ Issues 8    ⑃ Pull requests 4    💬 **Discussions**    ▶ Actions       ⋯

# OMI glTF Working Group Meeting 1/26/2023 #138

**lyuma** started this conversation in **General**

---

🐸 **lyuma**   on Jan 26   ( Maintainer )          edited ▾

This meeting is on 1/26/2023 at 10:30 PM (UTC) / 2:30 PM (PST) in the OMI Discord within the #omi-weekly-meeting channel. During the meeting, we will be using the #omi-gltf-extensions channel to manage a speaker queue, post links, and for any sidebar discussions.

To be notified of this meeting and others, subscribe to the OMI Meetings and Events Calendar or add yourself to the @omi-gltf-subgroup role in the #roles channel of the OMI Discord.

## Agenda:

- We discussed https://openmv.org (Open Metaverse Foundation) and how we can synergize with their efforts. Should we make a showcase of our projects to open up a broader discussion?

- jin - proposals how to make our specs and work more accessible to others. showcase gltf models

- Review pull requests https://github.com/omigroup/gltf-extensions/pulls

- EXT_skin_humanoid

- OMI_personality proposal #133 - may postpone because ant couldn't make it this week.

- OMI_link

- OMI_spawn_point

- Review MSFT_physics
  - Continue discussion from last week: OMI glTF Working Group Meeting 12/15/2022 #128 (comment)
  - Replace `isKinematic` with a string enum for the body type eoineoineoin/glTF_Physics#4
  - Remove the `centerOfMass` property eoineoineoin/glTF_Physics#5
  - Remove the `isHollow` parameter from collider shapes eoineoineoin/glTF_Physics#6
  - Define explicit units for all relevant properties eoineoineoin/glTF_Physics#7

- Licensing Extension https://twitter.com/superhoge/status/1596757861882740736

- KHR_audio / Khronos feedback
  - gltf-sample-assets

- Third Room Extensions

- glXF

- Show and tell

- Create next weeks agenda

To propose another item for the agenda, comment below (preferably before the meeting).

↑ 1

## 2 comments

Oldest    Newest    Top

**aaronfranke**  on Jan 26   Collaborator                                                                edited ▾

Discussion highlights in the first 30 minutes of the chat:

- We want to work together with OMF and any other standards groups, not against them.
- The OMF approach is to focus on taking the data that companies would otherwise put in a proprietary format and put that data in GLTF and as a result it's only ensured to work good in that context but can be technically readable in others, as opposed to our focus of trying to make general-purpose standards that work for many use cases.
- The OMF approach is an easier ask for companies because it's essentially giving them full control over the data.
- If multiple companies put their data in an open format, it's an easier job for us at OMI to look at what they have in common and build a standard from that.

↑ 1                                                                                              0 replies

**lyuma**  on Jan 26   Maintainer   Author

As a working group, I believe there to be interest in members of OMI in adapting the EXT_skeleton_humanoid to serve as an animation format for existing VRM 0.0 and VRM 1.0 models which do not explicitly implement the still-WIP EXT_skeleton_humanoid extension.

So part of the work OMI may work on is to define a workflow for applying EXT_skeleton_humanoid animations to *existing* VRM 0.0 and 1.0 models.

↑ 1                                                                                              0 replies

**Category**

💬  **General**

**Labels**

None yet

**2 participants**