

 **omigroup / gltf-extensions** Public[Code](#) [Issues 12](#) [Pull requests 2](#) [Discussions](#) [Actions](#) ...

OMI glTF Working Group Meeting 08/31/23 #188

antpb started this conversation in **General**



antpb 3 hours ago Maintainer

This meeting is on 08/31/2023 at 9:30 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:

- Let's talk physics
- Questions asked in the glTF room: **Why is it not good enough to have the MSFT spec? How is it bad that assets get sucked into Unity packages?**

Backlog:

- OMI Vehicles Extensions Research
- OMI / MX Components Extension
- 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_link](#)
- [OMI_spawn_point](#)
- Review [MSFT_physics](#)
 - [glTF_Physics_Blender_Exporter](#)
 - [glTF_Physics_Godot_Importer](#)
- 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

5 comments · 3 replies

Oldest

Newest

Top



antpb 3 hours ago

Maintainer

Author

Noting stated reasons in the meeting "why not use MSFT":

-We don't have people in the meetings to discuss things so we have stayed contained in our group working on ours with consideration for theirs. Developing our own spec is demonstrating how a different approach can work.

-Having multiple specs gives wider coverage for experimenting.

-We've seen fast adoption of the OMI spec with more frequent feedback and discussions happening within OMI.

Note: MSFT is renaming some physics related extensions to the KHR prefix.

↑ 1

1 reply



aaronfranke 2 hours ago

Collaborator

Also worth noting about fast adoption of OMI: MSFT has had this too, Eoin from Microsoft has said that they have customers using MSFT physics which is part of what makes him resistant to change things.



antpb 2 hours ago

Maintainer

Author

edited ▾

Aaron mentioned a need for folks to jump in and take some time to review and comment on this issue: [eoineoineoin/glTF_Physics#19](#)

Some extended history can be found here: [KhronosGroup/glTF#2258 \(comment\)](#)

We realize its a lot but very few are participating. We could use some outside perspective.

↑ 1

0 replies



antpb 2 hours ago

Maintainer

Author

edited ▾

There was some discussion about triggers. @madjin mentioned a discussion on behaviors in MSF. Transcribed here:

<https://hackmd.io/@XR/metaversestandards/https%3A%2F%2Fhackmd.io%2F%40XR%2FglTF-interactivity>

<https://www.youtube.com/@metaversestandardsforum>

↑ 1

0 replies



antpb 2 hours ago

Maintainer

Author

edited ▾

We discussed `KHR_audio` and the recommendation to rename it to `KHR_audio_emitter` which better describes the behavior of the extension. Some historical reasoning behind the decision to rename `OMI_audio_emitter` to `KHR_audio` can be found here: [#73](#)

TLDR reasoning it was renamed in the past:

The extension has been renamed from `OMI_audio_emitter` to `KHR_audio`. `KHR_audio` both reflects the intent for this to be an official Khronos ratified extension and a more general audio extension to form the basis for additional extensions to provide features such as audio mixing, animation/one shot triggering of clips, additional audio format support, etc.

There was general agreement that it should be `KHR_audio_emitter`

KHR recommendation for naming extensions can be found here: <https://github.com/KhronosGroup/glTF/tree/main/extensions#naming>

The recommendation is to use KHR_scope_action so in our recommendation it makes sense that audio_emitter is the scope and action.

Names SHOULD be structured as , where scope is an existing glTF concept (e.g. mesh, texture, image) and feature describes the functionality being added within that scope. This structure is recommended, but not required.

↑ 1

1 reply



antpb 2 hours ago Maintainer Author

worth noting material extension is named `materials` which kinda deviates from the recommendation. Still, a good justification for `action_scope` in renaming `KHR_audio`.



antpb 2 hours ago Maintainer Author

I mentioned a need for the MSFT proposed extensions to be renamed to follow the scope and action suggestion in KHR extension naming. @antpb to open an issue.

Currently there is `KHR_collision_shapes` (which has the same issue as the `materials` plural extension)

and there is `KHR_rigid_bodies` which probably shouldn't break up the word and also be `scope_action`.

Suggestion `KHR_physics_body` and `KHR_physics_shape`

↑ 1

1 reply



antpb 1 hour ago Maintainer Author

issue opened here: [eoineoineoin/glTF_Physics#23](https://github.com/EOINEOINEOIN/glTF_Physics/issues/23)

Category



General

Labels

None yet

2 participants

