omigroup / **omigroup** `Public`

<> Code   ⊙ Issues `13`   ⌥ Pull requests `1`   💬 **Discussions**   ⊞ Projects `1`   ⋯

2025-10-23 Weekly glTF Meeting number ?? #561

indiebio started this conversation in **Weekly Meetings**

indiebio 6 hours ago `Maintainer`

Some notes from the glTF meeting.

It was recorded using mee6 and SeaVoice.

The question came up again about how to maintain momentum on the meetings. We discussed why we got involved in this area, what we want from meetings, how we are complementary to e.g. Khronos, and if changing the name of the group could be more inviting to new members. This led to discussing the values of the group, as presented by aaron and humbletim.

↑ 1

4 comments · 3 replies

Oldest   Newest | Top

indiebio 6 hours ago `Maintainer` `Author`

Why are we here?
Aaron: became frustrated by the fragmented nature of the assets / VRChat ecosystem. People had to buy asset packs, which came in Unity packages and was not ready for use, you had to pay money AND then get a suboptimal product.
Through his work at Mirror aaron also needed to load runtimes dynamically, and so needed contained, defined, generalised packages.

Humbletim had the need to balance a different set of constraints. Off the cuff, the three bullet points are:

1. durability over time
2. the ability to capture the artist's intent, with the emphasis on artist to artist exchange, rather than optimised for rendering or production deployment.
3. then humbletim is working on a declarative one shot, top down CSS type thing

↑ 1   1 reply

indiebio 6 hours ago (Maintainer) (Author)   edited ▾

extending this to the values of the group, everyone agreed on the need to avoid relying on internet services, adding to the longevity aspect, to not rely on external providers to be able to open a file or use an asset.

There was also rough agreement to extend the group's focus beyond 3D, whether that is more raw data (1D or 2D ...) or higher, as in aaron's 4D thing.

---

indiebio 6 hours ago (Maintainer) (Author)

How are we complementary to Khronos?

We all agreed that one of our strengths is being a place for sharing half-baked ideas.

OMI is much more friendly to fledgling ideas
"I like this idea but I don't want to commit to it (yet)" - we are welcoming to that. Other organisations may require more formality and commitment, or action. We're a bit more philosophical. ;)

The living conversation across channels.

↑ 1   1 reply

indiebio 6 hours ago (Maintainer) (Author)

It was then mentioned that the informality as well as the voting structure of the spec approvals may be confusing, and so it is important to note that these are two different aspects, or stages of the working group.

---

indiebio 6 hours ago (Maintainer) (Author)

Toying with different names to the group to be more welcoming to people who align with the principles and values of this subgroup, while still being specific and technical enough ...

interoperable vehicle working group - "vehicle" was too specific
interoperable gaming working group
interoperable assets working group
interoperable by intent - a bit vague as a group name
formats in motion group
drive-by formats group
iterative interop group
interop incention, lol

↑ 1   0 replies

indiebio 6 hours ago   Maintainer   Author

it may be worth looking into Robert's original thoughts on extensions: omigroup/gltf-extensions#7

↑ 1   1 reply

indiebio 6 hours ago   Maintainer   Author

aaron then shared two sheets summarising glTF specs out in the wild:

Open Brush GLTF Extension Tracker:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LoyDWjBlMyfxGyicX9_lajH_mBIq-TSzphHY6nK3X1o/edit?usp=sharing

All glTF Extensions:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1lG072Ibv4lN2CID417qgGlJZl3cX-CzM-5crbvFr5Fo/edit?usp=sharing

Category

\# **Weekly Meetings**

Labels

None yet

1 participant