📕 **omigroup** / **omigroup**   Public

<> Code   ⊙ Issues 12   ⠅⠇ Pull requests 1   💬 **Discussions**   ⊞ Projects 1   ⋯

Blogpost: the interoperability of the metaverse #564

indiebio started this conversation in **Ideas**

indiebio 3 days ago   (Maintainer)   edited ⌄

Heavy in draft

At OMI, we focus not on things themselves, but the and , the inter, the meta. All our members have projects, and specific things they are passionate about, and we use these as case studies to explore how to build bridges between them.

We acknowledge we're the nerds in the metaverse community. We're dreamers, we philosophise while others act. What is missed, perhaps, is that we also act, but as individuals. When we come together as a community to support each other, we are more interested in thinking about how to work together, how to nurture the wider metaverse ecosystem. The "actions" that result from that is often a way of thinking rather than actual code.

Interoperability has been considered as not commercially viable - as reiterated in a discussed a while ago using Second Life as an example. But that assumes a lot of things in a specific context. If you are an entrepreneur hustling to capitalise on the moment, sure, maybe interop is not your thing. But we believe that there are unexplored use cases that need interop. We want to do things that have never been approached before, that the technology now make possible and our evolving digital identities start demanding.

Rather than asking "why not just use this one thing that is not perfect but already exists?" [(Discord convo)](#) ask instead, what does this new complicated thing give us that the existing approach does not? Try to understand where the approach tries to go. For example glTF extensions.

Platform vs Framework. We've been seeing a lot of discussion where people take care to say their project is not a platform, but a framework. This also hits to the fights about how to define the Metaverse.
First, let's unpack what the difference between a platform and a framework could be:
Technically, it's simple. A "framework" is a toolbox for developers to build things. A "platform" is a finished place for users to do things. You use a framework to build a platform. "We give you tools, not rules."

Philosophically (and this is the important part): In our "open metaverse" world, "platform" is often a negative term for a "walled garden" (like VRChat or Meta) with a central owner and rules. "You own what you build; we don't."

So "we are a framework, not a platform," might translate into something like "We just provide open-source tools. We are not a walled garden, we don't control you, and our target audience is builders."

For a group of developers, this emphasis on frameworks rather than platforms may be sufficient, but OMI cares about the wider world too. Users, and interdisciplinary use cases are two particular interests for us. One example is the physical world interoperability, and meeting interest and community groups across cultures is another.

This conversation has developed with the entire community. Not all of us agree on all the same viewpoints, take this as the gist of it to continue the evolving discussion.

↑ 1

3 comments · 1 reply

| Oldest | Newest | Top |

indiebio 2 days ago (Maintainer) (Author)   edited ▾

Platform - Framework - Infrastructure
so if we assume everything will get built on Unity (example of a framework), that this is the default, then all platforms built on that framework (say, VRChat or whatever) can be thought of to become interoperable, with a bit of effort. But what about everything else? What about something built on Godot, not unity? What about data that never was intended to make it into games, like ... say, climate data? The Metaverse includes all that, and the infrastructure to allow that to happen. This even includes the cables running the internet or the energy to power things, the devices to access it, but at some point we also need to focus?

↑ 1   1 reply

indiebio 2 days ago (Maintainer) (Author)

We, as OMI, also need to focus on what our specific areas of interests are. Yes, we are a general support community, and yes, we focus on the "and" the links between, but we also need clarity, what "ands", what connecting bits?. Perhaps forcing an arbitrary focus is less of a thing, perhaps the "Commitment Sieve" idea needs development - anything goes as long as someone is willing to commit to it.

indiebio yesterday (Maintainer) (Author)   edited ▾

OMI cares about the wider world too - this is the convergence culture stuff. https://indiebio.co.za/metaculture/

I think media, popular, political, and games culture extending into emergent games, multi-player games, offline games, they're all converging - Henry Jenkins's convergence culture. This has political implications; The transition from broadcast to participatory
media has enabled users to form new connections and gain insights, but also allowed actors to spread misinformation and manipulation.

Proponents of the open metaverse pursue community-driven networks, but these face unique social hurdles, particularly when tackling politically charged topics or crossing disciplinary boundaries. While these networks should foster engaging experiences, they often fall short.

Other refs to incorporate, notes from https://indiebio.co.za/foss-tozzi/ and https://indiebio.co.za/the-proteus-paradox-notes-from-nick-yee-book/ which reminds me there is a recent article by Matteo Pietropaoli "Cyberculture and Metaverse: Developments from the past to the future" I need to finish reading and making notes on!

↑ 1   0 replies

---

indiebio yesterday (Maintainer) (Author)   edited ▾

Sean-RP1: don't think about technology, think about the future of interactions. It's not 2D anymore, it's spatial. It needs a stack of infrastructure, a stack of standards...

↑ 1   0 replies

Category

💡 **Ideas**

Labels

None yet

---

1 participant