Subject: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 00:27:57 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If you use a UAD-1 with Cubase can you monitor with effects while tracking with no latency (or 2ms like this article says) ?

  http://www.soundonsound.com/sos/apr04/articles/pcmusician.ht m

Basically I'm wondering, if I track with headphones is there a way to track with effects on and not have the latency problem? Is there a better card or way to do this or is it just not possible?

Thanks,
John

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by gene lennon on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 02:43:08 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

John <no@no.com> wrote:
>If you use a UAD-1 with Cubase can you monitor with effects while
>tracking with no latency (or 2ms like this article says) ?
>
> http://www.soundonsound.com/sos/apr04/articles/pcmusician.ht m
>
>Basically I'm wondering, if I track with headphones is there a way to
>track with effects on and not have the latency problem? Is there a
>better card or way to do this or is it just not possible?
>
>Thanks,
>John

This is from the article you pointed to:

would be about 6ms, but the additional latency due to the UAD1 insert would be 512 samples, or about 12ms, making overall latency 18ms. If you passed your audio through several insert effects, each one would add a further 12ms

The UAD-1 will always add a minimum of 12ms (For 1 plugin) to the latency of the sound card and DAW buffers.

The answer to your question remains NO.

With Paris this is not an issue, but with native DAWs, the best you can do

with plugins is to use a fast card with a fast computer and zero latency plugins. The recommended method remains using outboard hardware before the converters for compression /effects and use parallel monitoring on the input. Gene

---

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 12:18:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So what does this part of the article mean?

However, one possible solution would be to try running a dedicated DSP card such as the PowerCore or UAD1 alongside a DSP-assisted soundcard such as the Mixtreme or original Pulsar. This would allow 'zero latency' monitoring with DSP effects on your live input signals, with the option of further high-quality delay-compensated plug-in insert and send

gene lennon wrote:
> John <no@no.com> wrote:
>
>>If you use a UAD-1 with Cubase can you monitor with effects while
>>tracking with no latency (or 2ms like this article says) ?
>>
>> http://www.soundonsound.com/sos/apr04/articles/pcmusician.ht m
>>
>>Basically I'm wondering, if I track with headphones is there a way to
>>track with effects on and not have the latency problem? Is there a
>>better card or way to do this or is it just not possible?
>>
>>Thanks,
>>John
>
>
> This is from the article you pointed to:
>

> would be about 6ms, but the additional latency due to the UAD1 insert would
> be 512 samples, or about 12ms, making overall latency 18ms. If you passed
> your audio through several insert effects, each one would add a further 12ms

>
> The UAD-1 will always add a minimum of 12ms (For 1 plugin) to the latency
> of the sound card and DAW buffers.
>
> The answer to your question remains NO.

>
> With Paris this is not an issue, but with native DAWs, the best you can do
> with plugins is to use a fast card with a fast computer and zero latency
> plugins. The recommended method remains using outboard hardware before the
> converters for compression /effects and use parallel monitoring on the input.
> Gene
>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 16:03:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

bummer, thanks for the explanation. Sounds like pcs have a long way to
go to get quality live effects.

gene lennon wrote:
> John <no@no.com> wrote:
>
>>So what does this part of the article mean?
>>
>>
>>However, one possible solution would be to try running a dedicated DSP
>>card such as the PowerCore or UAD1 alongside a DSP-assisted soundcard
>>such as the Mixtreme or original Pulsar. This would allow 'zero latency'
>
>
>>monitoring with DSP effects on your live input signals, with the option
>
>
>>of further high-quality delay-compensated plug-in insert and send

>>
>
>
> It means if you run a DSP-assisted soundcard such as the Mixtreme or original
> Pulsar, you can use the effects on the card during live recording to monitor
> through, and then use other plugins like the UAD-1 later for mixing with.
> Unfortunately, it never sounds the same, and this kind of software based
> dual split signal can be very complex to set up in some systems. For less
> money you could get an RNC.
>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by EK Sound on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 16:27:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I had a talk with a Steinberg product specialist at NAMM about this. My question specifically was "why can't I access *send* effects while using direct monitoring". He said they are waiting for CPU's to get faster before implimenting this. I made the point that send effects would usually be used for delay based effects (delay, chorus, reverb), so the added latency shouldn't be too much of an issue. Using a bit of native verb to wet a vocal take for instance... usually the verb effect itself has predelay in it already, so what's a few more milliseconds there. He agreed that it made sense.

As for tracking live through software comps etc... Nuendo can do this now (via inserts on input buses), but it will never get to "0" for latency. There will always be *some* processing delay no matter how fast machines get.

David.

John wrote:
> bummer, thanks for the explanation. Sounds like pcs have a long way to
> go to get quality live effects.
>
> gene lennon wrote:
>
>> John <no@no.com> wrote:
>>
>>> So what does this part of the article mean?
>>>
>>>
>>> However, one possible solution would be to try running a dedicated
>>> DSP card such as the PowerCore or UAD1 alongside a DSP-assisted
>>> soundcard such as the Mixtreme or original Pulsar. This would allow
>>> 'zero latency'
>>
>>
>>
>>> monitoring with DSP effects on your live input signals, with the option
>>
>>
>>
>>> of further high-quality delay-compensated plug-in insert and send

>>>
>>
>>
>> It means if you run a DSP-assisted soundcard such as the Mixtreme or
>> original
>> Pulsar, you can use the effects on the card during live recording to
>> monitor

>> through, and then use other plugins like the UAD-1 later for mixing with.
>> Unfortunately, it never sounds the same, and this kind of software based
>> dual split signal can be very complex to set up in some systems. For less
>> money you could get an RNC.
>>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by JB on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 16:27:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> This is from the article you pointed to:
>
> "So if you were running with a 256-sample buffer at 44.1kHz, playback
> latency
> would be about 6ms, but the additional latency due to the UAD1 insert
> would
> be 512 samples, or about 12ms, making overall latency 18ms. If you passed
> your audio through several insert effects, each one would add a further
> 12ms
> to the overall latency."
>
> The UAD-1 will always add a minimum of 12ms (For 1 plugin) to the latency
> of the sound card and DAW buffers.
>
> The answer to your question remains NO.

I actually do this. The scenario outlined above is using a 256-sample
buffer. An RME card can use a 64-sample buffer, using a fast computer (I use
an Athlon 3200). This gives 1.5ms latency per pass, or 6ms total latency
with a UAD-1. I If you were to use 96k, you could cut the latency in half,
but you would need a very fast computer.

Now getting my PC to do this was no easy task. I had to turn off most XP
services, and I have to disable my network card. I get no audible glitches,
but who knows if I'm dropping samples, so I only do this when I'm messing
around. For serious recording, I jack the buffer up to 1024 samples and use
Zero Latency Monitoring in the RME card.

So for me, at this time, this is not a solution for serious recording, but
it can be done, and I think with the right system, with the proper tweaks,
it can be done reliably.

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by gene lennon on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 16:38:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

John <no@no.com> wrote:
>So what does this part of the article mean?
>
>
>However, one possible solution would be to try running a dedicated DSP
>card such as the PowerCore or UAD1 alongside a DSP-assisted soundcard
>such as the Mixtreme or original Pulsar. This would allow 'zero latency'

>monitoring with DSP effects on your live input signals, with the option

>of further high-quality delay-compensated plug-in insert and send

>

It means if you run a DSP-assisted soundcard such as the Mixtreme or original
Pulsar, you can use the effects on the card during live recording to monitor
through, and then use other plugins like the UAD-1 later for mixing with.
Unfortunately, it never sounds the same, and this kind of software based
dual split signal can be very complex to set up in some systems. For less
money you could get an RNC.

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by Deej [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 17:44:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't see the point. Hardware
still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much
or more than good audio hardware.

I agree with you. I built a fairly *mooselike* DAW recently to see if I
could get this happening. My dual core is running at almost 5000MHz (if you
take both cores into account). Still, it's not ready for this kind of thing
in any kind of critical scenario.

Another thing I've found is that even with 4 x UAD-1 cards, if I get more
than 17 UAD-1 plugins happening (with the UAD meter showing only ound 50%) I
start getting crackling in the audio. I called UA about this yesterday and
they said to drastically increaswe the buffer settings on my RME cards.
WTF??? I built this system so I could mix at low latencies (I have my
reasons for wanting to mix at low latencies) and now if I use even half the
horsepower available to me with the UAD-1 cards, the whole scenario is in
the toilet.

Quad dual cores might be the ticket. When I can justify tht kind of expense
for convenience, I'll probably just buy a Neve Capricorn instead.

;o)

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message
news:43d7ac51$1@linux...
>
>
>
> >I actually do this. The scenario outlined above is using a 256-sample
> >buffer. An RME card can use a 64-sample buffer, using a fast computer (I
> use
> >an Athlon 3200). This gives 1.5ms latency per pass, or 6ms total latency
>
> >with a UAD-1. I If you were to use 96k, you could cut the latency in
half,
>
> >but you would need a very fast computer.
> >
> >Now getting my PC to do this was no easy task. I had to turn off most XP
>
> >services, and I have to disable my network card. I get no audible
glitches,
>
> >but who knows if I'm dropping samples, so I only do this when I'm messing
>
> >around. For serious recording, I jack the buffer up to 1024 samples and
> use
> >Zero Latency Monitoring in the RME card.
> >
> >So for me, at this time, this is not a solution for serious recording,
but
>
> >it can be done, and I think with the right system, with the proper
tweaks,
>
> >it can be done reliably.
> >
> >
>
> I've done this as well. Using my G5 at 96, I can get down to 32 buffers
and
> get the UAD-1 down to 6ms, but it is incredibly taxing on the system.
Perhaps
> on a Quad, but other than for academic reasons, I don't see the point.
Hardware
> still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much
> or more than good audio hardware.
>
> As to Quads..report to follow.
> Gene

>
_____

_____

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by gene lennon on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 17:50:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

>I actually do this. The scenario outlined above is using a 256-sample
>buffer. An RME card can use a 64-sample buffer, using a fast computer (I use
>an Athlon 3200). This gives 1.5ms latency per pass, or 6ms total latency

>with a UAD-1. I If you were to use 96k, you could cut the latency in half,

>but you would need a very fast computer.
>
>Now getting my PC to do this was no easy task. I had to turn off most XP

>services, and I have to disable my network card. I get no audible glitches,

>but who knows if I'm dropping samples, so I only do this when I'm messing

>around. For serious recording, I jack the buffer up to 1024 samples and use
>Zero Latency Monitoring in the RME card.
>
>So for me, at this time, this is not a solution for serious recording, but

>it can be done, and I think with the right system, with the proper tweaks,

>it can be done reliably.
>
>

get the UAD-1 down to 6ms, but it is incredibly taxing on the system. Perhaps

still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much
or more than good audio hardware.

Gene

_____

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by Deej [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 18:00:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> If I could track 32 channels with all the effects going at once that
> would be more than anyone could buy hardware for.

Well hmmmm...you can pretty much do this in Paris, ..depending on how many
FX your're planning to use you would need a multi card system The Paris FX
work well for this, IMHO. that's what the whole dedicted DSP thing is all
about.

Deej

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7be34$1@linux...
> If I could track 32 channels with all the effects going at once that
> would be more than anyone could buy hardware for.
>
> DJ wrote:
> > I don't see the point. Hardware
> > still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much
> > or more than good audio hardware.
> >
> > I agree with you. I built a fairly *mooselike* DAW recently to see if I
> > could get this happening. My dual core is running at almost 5000MHz (if
you
> > take both cores into account). Still, it's not ready for this kind of
thing
> > in any kind of critical scenario.
> >
> > Another thing I've found is that even with 4 x UAD-1 cards, if I get
more
> > than 17 UAD-1 plugins happening (with the UAD meter showing only ound
50%) I
> > start getting crackling in the audio. I called UA about this yesterday
and
> > they said to drastically increaswe the buffer settings on my RME cards.
> > WTF??? I built this system so I could mix at low latencies (I have my
> > reasons for wanting to mix at low latencies) and now if I use even half
the
> > horsepower available to me with the UAD-1 cards, the whole scenario is
in
> > the toilet.
> >
> > Quad dual cores might be the ticket. When I can justify tht kind of
expense
> > for convenience, I'll probably just buy a Neve Capricorn instead.
> >
> > ;o)
> >
> > "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message
> > news:43d7ac51$1@linux...

> >
> >>
> >>
> >>>I actually do this. The scenario outlined above is using a 256-sample
> >>>buffer. An RME card can use a 64-sample buffer, using a fast computer (I
> >>
> >>use
> >>
> >>>an Athlon 3200). This gives 1.5ms latency per pass, or 6ms total latency
> >>
> >>>with a UAD-1. I If you were to use 96k, you could cut the latency in
> >
> > half,
> >
> >>>but you would need a very fast computer.
> >>>
> >>>Now getting my PC to do this was no easy task. I had to turn off most XP
> >>
> >>>services, and I have to disable my network card. I get no audible
> >
> > glitches,
> >
> >>>but who knows if I'm dropping samples, so I only do this when I'm messing
> >>
> >>>around. For serious recording, I jack the buffer up to 1024 samples and
> >>
> >>use
> >>
> >>>Zero Latency Monitoring in the RME card.
> >>>
> >>>So for me, at this time, this is not a solution for serious recording,
> >
> > but
> >
> >>>it can be done, and I think with the right system, with the proper
> >
> > tweaks,
> >
> >>>it can be done reliably.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>I've done this as well. Using my G5 at 96, I can get down to 32 buffers
> >

> > and
> >
> >>get the UAD-1 down to 6ms, but it is incredibly taxing on the system.
> >
> > Perhaps
> >
> >>on a Quad, but other than for academic reasons, I don't see the point.
> >
> > Hardware
> >
> >>still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much
> >>or more than good audio hardware.
> >>
> >>As to Quads..report to follow.
> >>Gene
> >>
> >
> >
> >

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 18:01:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If I could track 32 channels with all the effects going at once that
would be more than anyone could buy hardware for.

DJ wrote:
> I don't see the point. Hardware
> still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much
> or more than good audio hardware.
>
> I agree with you. I built a fairly *mooselike* DAW recently to see if I
> could get this happening. My dual core is running at almost 5000MHz (if you
> take both cores into account). Still, it's not ready for this kind of thing
> in any kind of critical scenario.
>
> Another thing I've found is that even with 4 x UAD-1 cards, if I get more
> than 17 UAD-1 plugins happening (with the UAD meter showing only ound 50%) I
> start getting crackling in the audio. I called UA about this yesterday and
> they said to drastically increaswe the buffer settings on my RME cards.
> WTF??? I built this system so I could mix at low latencies (I have my
> reasons for wanting to mix at low latencies) and now if I use even half the
> horsepower available to me with the UAD-1 cards, the whole scenario is in
> the toilet.
>
> Quad dual cores might be the ticket. When I can justify tht kind of expense

> for convenience, I'll probably just buy a Neve Capricorn instead.
>
> ;o)
>
> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message
> news:43d7ac51$1@linux...
>
>>
>>
>>>I actually do this. The scenario outlined above is using a 256-sample
>>>buffer. An RME card can use a 64-sample buffer, using a fast computer (I
>>
>>use
>>
>>>an Athlon 3200). This gives 1.5ms latency per pass, or 6ms total latency
>>
>>>with a UAD-1. I If you were to use 96k, you could cut the latency in
>
> half,
>
>>>but you would need a very fast computer.
>>>
>>>Now getting my PC to do this was no easy task. I had to turn off most XP
>>
>>>services, and I have to disable my network card. I get no audible
>
> glitches,
>
>>>but who knows if I'm dropping samples, so I only do this when I'm messing
>>
>>>around. For serious recording, I jack the buffer up to 1024 samples and
>>
>>use
>>
>>>Zero Latency Monitoring in the RME card.
>>>
>>>So for me, at this time, this is not a solution for serious recording,
>
> but
>
>>>it can be done, and I think with the right system, with the proper
>
> tweaks,
>
>>>it can be done reliably.
>>>
>>>
>>

>>I've done this as well. Using my G5 at 96, I can get down to 32 buffers
>
> and
>
>>get the UAD-1 down to 6ms, but it is incredibly taxing on the system.
>
> Perhaps
>
>>on a Quad, but other than for academic reasons, I don't see the point.
>
> Hardware
>
>>still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much
>>or more than good audio hardware.
>>
>>As to Quads..report to follow.
>>Gene
>>
>
>
>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 18:29:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

oh god, eds efx.. yuck

DJ wrote:
>>If I could track 32 channels with all the effects going at once that
>>would be more than anyone could buy hardware for.
>
>
> Well hmmmm...you can pretty much do this in Paris, ..depending on how many
> FX your're planning to use you would need a multi card system The Paris FX
> work well for this, IMHO. that's what the whole dedicted DSP thing is all
> about.
>
> Deej
>
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7be34$1@linux...
>
>>If I could track 32 channels with all the effects going at once that
>>would be more than anyone could buy hardware for.
>>
>>DJ wrote:
>>

>>>I don't see the point. Hardware
>>>still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much
>>>or more than good audio hardware.
>>>
>>>I agree with you. I built a fairly *mooselike* DAW recently to see if I
>>>could get this happening. My dual core is running at almost 5000MHz (if
>
> you
>
>>>take both cores into account). Still, it's not ready for this kind of
>
> thing
>
>>>in any kind of critical scenario.
>>>
>>>Another thing I've found is that even with 4 x UAD-1 cards, if I get
>
> more
>
>>>than 17 UAD-1 plugins happening (with the UAD meter showing only ound
>
> 50%) I
>
>>>start getting crackling in the audio. I called UA about this yesterday
>
> and
>
>>>they said to drastically increaswe the buffer settings on my RME cards.
>>>WTF??? I built this system so I could mix at low latencies (I have my
>>>reasons for wanting to mix at low latencies) and now if I use even half
>
> the
>
>>>horsepower available to me with the UAD-1 cards, the whole scenario is
>
> in
>
>>>the toilet.
>>>
>>>Quad dual cores might be the ticket. When I can justify tht kind of
>
> expense
>
>>>for convenience, I'll probably just buy a Neve Capricorn instead.
>>>
>>>;o)
>>>
>>>"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message

>>>news:43d7ac51$1@linux...
>>>
>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I actually do this. The scenario outlined above is using a 256-sample
>>>>>buffer. An RME card can use a 64-sample buffer, using a fast computer
>
> (I
>
>>>>use
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>an Athlon 3200). This gives 1.5ms latency per pass, or 6ms total
>
> latency
>
>>>>>with a UAD-1. I If you were to use 96k, you could cut the latency in
>>>
>>>half,
>>>
>>>
>>>>>but you would need a very fast computer.
>>>>>
>>>>>Now getting my PC to do this was no easy task. I had to turn off most
>
> XP
>
>>>>>services, and I have to disable my network card. I get no audible
>>>
>>>glitches,
>>>
>>>
>>>>>but who knows if I'm dropping samples, so I only do this when I'm
>
> messing
>
>>>>>around. For serious recording, I jack the buffer up to 1024 samples and
>>>>
>>>>use
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Zero Latency Monitoring in the RME card.
>>>>>
>>>>>So for me, at this time, this is not a solution for serious recording,
>>>
>>>but
>>>
>>>

>>>>>it can be done, and I think with the right system, with the proper
>>>
>>>tweaks,
>>>
>>>
>>>>>it can be done reliably.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I've done this as well. Using my G5 at 96, I can get down to 32 buffers
>>>
>>>and
>>>
>>>
>>>>get the UAD-1 down to 6ms, but it is incredibly taxing on the system.
>>>
>>>Perhaps
>>>
>>>
>>>>on a Quad, but other than for academic reasons, I don't see the point.
>>>
>>>Hardware
>>>
>>>
>>>>still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much
>>>>or more than good audio hardware.
>>>>
>>>>As to Quads..report to follow.
>>>>Gene
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by Deej [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 18:39:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
> oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>
> DJ wrote:
> >>If I could track 32 channels with all the effects going at once that

> >>would be more than anyone could buy hardware for.

> >

> >

> > Well hmmmm...you can pretty much do this in Paris, ..depending on how many

> > FX your're planning to use you would need a multi card system The Paris FX

> > work well for this, IMHO. that's what the whole dedicted DSP thing is all

> > about.

> >

> > Deej

> >

> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7be34$1@linux...

> >

> >>If I could track 32 channels with all the effects going at once that

> >>would be more than anyone could buy hardware for.

> >>

> >>DJ wrote:

> >>

> >>>I don't see the point. Hardware

> >>>still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much

> >>>or more than good audio hardware.

> >>>

> >>>I agree with you. I built a fairly *mooselike* DAW recently to see if I

> >>>could get this happening. My dual core is running at almost 5000MHz (if

> >>

> > you

> >>

> >>>take both cores into account). Still, it's not ready for this kind of

> >>

> > thing

> >>

> >>>in any kind of critical scenario.

> >>>

> >>>Another thing I've found is that even with 4 x UAD-1 cards, if I get

> >>

> > more

> >>

> >>>than 17 UAD-1 plugins happening (with the UAD meter showing only ound

> >>

> > 50%) I

> >>

> >>>start getting crackling in the audio. I called UA about this yesterday

> >>

> > and

> >>

> >>>they said to drastically increaswe the buffer settings on my RME cards.
> >>>WTF??? I built this system so I could mix at low latencies (I have my
> >>>reasons for wanting to mix at low latencies) and now if I use even half
> >
> > the
> >
> >>>horsepower available to me with the UAD-1 cards, the whole scenario is
> >
> > in
> >
> >>>the toilet.
> >>>
> >>>Quad dual cores might be the ticket. When I can justify tht kind of
> >
> > expense
> >
> >>>for convenience, I'll probably just buy a Neve Capricorn instead.
> >>>
> >>>;o)
> >>>
> >>>"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:43d7ac51$1@linux...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>I actually do this. The scenario outlined above is using a 256-sample
> >>>>>buffer. An RME card can use a 64-sample buffer, using a fast computer
> >
> > (I
> >
> >>>>use
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>an Athlon 3200). This gives 1.5ms latency per pass, or 6ms total
> >
> > latency
> >
> >>>>>with a UAD-1. I If you were to use 96k, you could cut the latency in
> >>>
> >>>half,
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>>but you would need a very fast computer.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Now getting my PC to do this was no easy task. I had to turn off most
> >
> > XP
> >

> >>>>>services, and I have to disable my network card. I get no audible
> >>>
> >>>glitches,
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>>but who knows if I'm dropping samples, so I only do this when I'm
> >
> > messing
> >
> >>>>>around. For serious recording, I jack the buffer up to 1024 samples
and
> >>>>
> >>>>use
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>Zero Latency Monitoring in the RME card.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>So for me, at this time, this is not a solution for serious
recording,
> >>>
> >>>but
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>>it can be done, and I think with the right system, with the proper
> >>>
> >>>tweaks,
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>>it can be done reliably.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>I've done this as well. Using my G5 at 96, I can get down to 32
buffers
> >>>
> >>>and
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>get the UAD-1 down to 6ms, but it is incredibly taxing on the system.
> >>>
> >>>Perhaps
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>on a Quad, but other than for academic reasons, I don't see the point.
> >>>
> >>>Hardware
> >>>
> >>>

> >>>>still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as much
> >>>>or more than good audio hardware.
> >>>>
> >>>>As to Quads..report to follow.
> >>>>Gene
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >
> >

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 18:51:44 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously

DJ wrote:
> If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
>
>>oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>
>>DJ wrote:
>>
>>>>If I could track 32 channels with all the effects going at once that
>>>>would be more than anyone could buy hardware for.
>>>
>>>
>>>Well hmmmm...you can pretty much do this in Paris, ..depending on how
>
> many
>
>>>FX your're planning to use you would need a multi card system The Paris
>
> FX
>
>>>work well for this, IMHO. that's what the whole dedicted DSP thing is
>
> all
>
>>>about.
>>>
>>>Deej

>>>
>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7be34$1@linux...
>>>
>>>
>>>>If I could track 32 channels with all the effects going at once that
>>>>would be more than anyone could buy hardware for.
>>>>
>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I don't see the point. Hardware
>>>>>still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as
>
> much
>
>>>>>or more than good audio hardware.
>>>>>
>>>>>I agree with you. I built a fairly *mooselike* DAW recently to see if I
>>>>>could get this happening. My dual core is running at almost 5000MHz (if
>>>
>>>you
>>>
>>>
>>>>>take both cores into account). Still, it's not ready for this kind of
>>>
>>>thing
>>>
>>>
>>>>>in any kind of critical scenario.
>>>>>
>>>>>Another thing I've found is that even with 4 x UAD-1 cards, if I get
>>>
>>>more
>>>
>>>
>>>>>than 17 UAD-1 plugins happening (with the UAD meter showing only ound
>>>
>>>50%) I
>>>
>>>
>>>>>start getting crackling in the audio. I called UA about this yesterday
>>>
>>>and
>>>
>>>
>>>>>they said to drastically increaswe the buffer settings on my RME cards.
>>>>>WTF??? I built this system so I could mix at low latencies (I have my
>>>>>reasons for wanting to mix at low latencies) and now if I use even half

>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>horsepower available to me with the UAD-1 cards, the whole scenario is
>>>
>>>in
>>>
>>>
>>>>>the toilet.
>>>>>
>>>>>Quad dual cores might be the ticket. When I can justify tht kind of
>>>
>>>expense
>>>
>>>
>>>>>for convenience, I'll probably just buy a Neve Capricorn instead.
>>>>>
>>>>>;o)
>>>>>
>>>>>"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message
>>>>>news:43d7ac51$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>I actually do this. The scenario outlined above is using a 256-sample
>>>>>>>buffer. An RME card can use a 64-sample buffer, using a fast computer
>>>
>>>(I
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>use
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>an Athlon 3200). This gives 1.5ms latency per pass, or 6ms total
>>>
>>>latency
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>with a UAD-1. I If you were to use 96k, you could cut the latency in
>>>>>
>>>>>half,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>but you would need a very fast computer.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>Now getting my PC to do this was no easy task. I had to turn off most
>>>
>>>XP
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>services, and I have to disable my network card. I get no audible
>>>>>
>>>>>glitches,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>but who knows if I'm dropping samples, so I only do this when I'm
>>>
>>>messing
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>around. For serious recording, I jack the buffer up to 1024 samples
>
> and
>
>>>>>>use
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Zero Latency Monitoring in the RME card.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>So for me, at this time, this is not a solution for serious
>
> recording,
>
>>>>>but
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>it can be done, and I think with the right system, with the proper
>>>>>
>>>>>tweaks,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>it can be done reliably.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I've done this as well. Using my G5 at 96, I can get down to 32
>
> buffers
>

>>>>>and
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>get the UAD-1 down to 6ms, but it is incredibly taxing on the system.
>>>>>
>>>>>Perhaps
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>on a Quad, but other than for academic reasons, I don't see the point.
>>>>>
>>>>>Hardware
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>still sounds better and the ultra high-end computer systems cost as
>
> much
>
>>>>>>or more than good audio hardware.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>As to Quads..report to follow.
>>>>>>Gene
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by Deej [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 19:03:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Are you proposing to run IR's while tracking live?

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7ce1d$1@linux...
> well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
>
> EK Sound wrote:
> > Which effects are you having a hard time with?
> >
> > David.
> >
> > John wrote:

> >
> >> even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
> >>
> >> DJ wrote:
> >>
> >>> If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
> >>>
> >>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
> >>>
> >>>> oh god, eds efx.. yuck
> >>>>
> >>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by EK Sound on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 19:06:34 GMT

Which effects are you having a hard time with?

David.

John wrote:
> even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
>
> DJ wrote:
>
>> If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>>
>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
>>
>>> oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>>
>>> DJ wrote:
>>>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 19:09:30 GMT

well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff

EK Sound wrote:
> Which effects are you having a hard time with?
>

> David.
>
> John wrote:
>
>> even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>
>>> If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>>>
>>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
>>>
>>>> oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 19:22:52 GMT

ok, kewl !

DJ wrote:
> Are you proposing to run IR's while tracking live?
>
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7ce1d$1@linux...
>
>>well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
>>
>>EK Sound wrote:
>>
>>>Which effects are you having a hard time with?
>>>
>>>David.
>>>
>>>John wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
>>>>
>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>>>>>
>>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...

```
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>>>>>
>>>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>>>
>
>
>
```

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by EK Sound on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 19:41:08 GMT

Try layering a room verb set to stereo input with a plate for lead
vocal. I have had really good success with this for A/C and Pop stuff.

David.

John wrote:

> well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
>
> EK Sound wrote:
>
>> Which effects are you having a hard time with?
>>
>> David.
>>
>> John wrote:
>>
>>> even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
>>>
>>> DJ wrote:
>>>
>>>> If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>>>>
>>>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
>>>>
>>>>> oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>>>>
>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>
```

---

## Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?

Posted by Don Nafe on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 22:23:32 GMT

Got any parameter numbers Dave?

Sounds interesting

DOn


"EK Sound" <spamnot.info@eksoundNO.com> wrote in message
news:43d7d56b@linux...
> Try layering a room verb set to stereo input with a plate for lead vocal.
> I have had really good success with this for A/C and Pop stuff.
>
> David.
>
> John wrote:
>
>> well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
>>
>> EK Sound wrote:
>>
>>> Which effects are you having a hard time with?
>>>
>>> David.
>>>
>>> John wrote:
>>>
>>>> even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>>>>>
>>>>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>>> oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>>>>>
>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by Aaron Allen on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 02:13:50 GMT

.....OR use a second cheapo PC to run slightly latent FX on. Dedicate it for

this and only this. Use a SPDIF or lightpipe to reduce latency further.
Trying to do this on a single nonDSP system is like not expecting a horse to
kick you in the mouth whilst standing behind it smacking it on the flanks.
You know what's coming and it's not realistic to think it won't smart :)
Natives have come a long way, but not that far yet.
Any way you cut it there is a set amount of cash you have to lay (be it
extra hardware or extra computer equipment) out to be hassle free or you'll
have compromises.

AA


"EK Sound" <spamnot.info@eksoundNO.com> wrote in message
news:43d7d56b@linux...
> Try layering a room verb set to stereo input with a plate for lead vocal.
> I have had really good success with this for A/C and Pop stuff.
>
> David.
>
> John wrote:
>
>> well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
>>
>> EK Sound wrote:
>>
>>> Which effects are you having a hard time with?
>>>
>>> David.
>>>
>>> John wrote:
>>>
>>>> even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>>>>>
>>>>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>>> oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>>>>>
>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by Edna Sloan on Sat, 28 Jan 2006 17:18:13 GMT

John, any particular IRs you referring to?  Waves?  I'm not enthralled with
Paris verbs either.
Edna

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7ce1d$1@linux...
> well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
>
> EK Sound wrote:
> > Which effects are you having a hard time with?
> >
> > David.
> >
> > John wrote:
> >
> >> even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
> >>
> >> DJ wrote:
> >>
> >>> If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
> >>>
> >>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
> >>>
> >>>> oh god, eds efx.. yuck
> >>>>
> >>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>

---

## Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Sat, 28 Jan 2006 19:59:55 GMT

no particular IRs, i have a couple hundred.  Even with True Verb I get
reallly great verb by varying the Short and Long reflections to taste.

Edna wrote:
> John, any particular IRs you referring to?  Waves?  I'm not enthralled with
> Paris verbs either.
> Edna
>
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7ce1d$1@linux...
>
>>well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
>>
>>EK Sound wrote:
>>

>>>Which effects are you having a hard time with?
>>>
>>>David.
>>>
>>>John wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
>>>>
>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>>>>>
>>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>>>>>
>>>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>>>
>
>
>

---

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by Edna Sloan on Sun, 29 Jan 2006 05:28:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I have some TC Native that are not bad, but still not what I'm hearing on
some CDs on vocals.  I'll check into the True Verb.
Thanks
"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dbce4f@linux...
> no particular IRs, i have a couple hundred.  Even with True Verb I get
> reallly great verb by varying the Short and Long reflections to taste.
>
> Edna wrote:
> > John, any particular IRs you referring to?  Waves?  I'm not enthralled
with
> > Paris verbs either.
> > Edna
> >
> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7ce1d$1@linux...
> >
> >>well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
> >>
> >>EK Sound wrote:

> >>
> >>>Which effects are you having a hard time with?
> >>>
> >>>David.
> >>>
> >>>John wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
> >>>>
> >>>>DJ wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>oh god, eds efx.. yuck
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>
> >
> >
> >

---

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Sun, 29 Jan 2006 13:19:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

With the trueverb I turn off the direct initially and put it wet 100%,
then I adjust the near and far reflections separately until I get just
the sound I want, then I drop wet to 0% and turn on the direct signal.
I usually bring wet up to only about 5% or so and then I have this sweet
clear voice with a nice room around it.   The wizoo and lexicon are nice
sounding plug verbs too but wizoo only runs in xp and i'm back on win98se.
John

Edna wrote:
> I have some TC Native that are not bad, but still not what I'm hearing on
> some CDs on vocals.  I'll check into the True Verb.
> Thanks
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dbce4f@linux...
>
>>no particular IRs, i have a couple hundred.  Even with True Verb I get
>>reallly great verb by varying the Short and Long reflections to taste.
>>

>>Edna wrote:
>>
>>>John, any particular IRs you referring to?  Waves?  I'm not enthralled
>
> with
>
>>>Paris verbs either.
>>>Edna
>>>
>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7ce1d$1@linux...
>>>
>>>
>>>>well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
>>>>
>>>>EK Sound wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Which effects are you having a hard time with?
>>>>>
>>>>>David.
>>>>>
>>>>>John wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
>>>>>>
>>>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by Edna Sloan on Sun, 29 Jan 2006 16:30:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks for the help.  The Paris verbs to me sound a little unclear and
megaphonish - cheap.  Is the TrueVerb plugin only for the UAD card?  Sorry
it wasn't a go in xp.  I'm preparing to move Paris from my P4 to an Athlon
Barton 2500+ system with xppro and sp1. Hopefully, it will run OK or at
least as good.  My P4 has an Abit board with Intel 875 CSet and nVidia video
card which works pretty well as long as you baby it somewhat.  I have an
inkling that the MoBo/Video has a lot to do with xp and Paris.
Edna

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dcc20f@linux...
> With the trueverb I turn off the direct initially and put it wet 100%,
> then I adjust the near and far reflections separately until I get just
> the sound I want, then I drop wet to 0% and turn on the direct signal.
> I usually bring wet up to only about 5% or so and then I have this sweet
> clear voice with a nice room around it.   The wizoo and lexicon are nice
> sounding plug verbs too but wizoo only runs in xp and i'm back on win98se.
> John
>
> Edna wrote:
> > I have some TC Native that are not bad, but still not what I'm hearing
on
> > some CDs on vocals.  I'll check into the True Verb.
> > Thanks
> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dbce4f@linux...
> >
> >>no particular IRs, i have a couple hundred.  Even with True Verb I get
> >>reallly great verb by varying the Short and Long reflections to taste.
> >>
> >>Edna wrote:
> >>
> >>>John, any particular IRs you referring to?  Waves?  I'm not enthralled
> >
> > with
> >
> >>>Paris verbs either.
> >>>Edna
> >>>
> >>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7ce1d$1@linux...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
> >>>>
> >>>>EK Sound wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>

> >>>>>Which effects are you having a hard time with?
> >>>>>
> >>>>>David.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>John wrote:
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>>If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>oh god, eds efx.. yuck
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >
> >

---

## Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by John [1] on Sun, 29 Jan 2006 18:20:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

trueverb is in waves and works in win98/me/xp.   Also check out  Lexicon
Pantheon Reverb DX and Wizoo verb.  Very nice.
John

Edna wrote:
> Thanks for the help.  The Paris verbs to me sound a little unclear and
> megaphonish - cheap.  Is the TrueVerb plugin only for the UAD card?  Sorry
> it wasn't a go in xp.  I'm preparing to move Paris from my P4 to an Athlon
> Barton 2500+ system with xppro and sp1. Hopefully, it will run OK or at
> least as good.  My P4 has an Abit board with Intel 875 CSet and nVidia video
> card which works pretty well as long as you baby it somewhat.  I have an
> inkling that the MoBo/Video has a lot to do with xp and Paris.
> Edna

>
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dcc20f@linux...
>
>>With the trueverb I turn off the direct initially and put it wet 100%,
>>then I adjust the near and far reflections separately until I get just
>>the sound I want, then I drop wet to 0% and turn on the direct signal.
>>I usually bring wet up to only about 5% or so and then I have this sweet
>>clear voice with a nice room around it.   The wizoo and lexicon are nice
>>sounding plug verbs too but wizoo only runs in xp and i'm back on win98se.
>>John
>>
>>Edna wrote:
>>
>>>I have some TC Native that are not bad, but still not what I'm hearing
>
> on
>
>>>some CDs on vocals.  I'll check into the True Verb.
>>>Thanks
>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dbce4f@linux...
>>>
>>>
>>>>no particular IRs, i have a couple hundred.  Even with True Verb I get
>>>>reallly great verb by varying the Short and Long reflections to taste.
>>>>
>>>>Edna wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>John, any particular IRs you referring to?  Waves?  I'm not enthralled
>>>
>>>with
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Paris verbs either.
>>>>>Edna
>>>>>
>>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7ce1d$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
>>>>>>
>>>>>>EK Sound wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Which effects are you having a hard time with?
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>David.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>John wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>
>
>

---

## Subject: Re: uad-1 latency?
Posted by Edna Sloan on Sun, 29 Jan 2006 19:14:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Will do.  Have you tried the Waves IRX stuff?

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dd0865@linux...
> trueverb is in waves and works in win98/me/xp.   Also check out  Lexicon
> Pantheon Reverb DX and Wizoo verb.  Very nice.
> John
>
> Edna wrote:
> > Thanks for the help.  The Paris verbs to me sound a little unclear and
> > megaphonish - cheap.  Is the TrueVerb plugin only for the UAD card?
Sorry

> > it wasn't a go in xp.  I'm preparing to move Paris from my P4 to an
Athlon
> > Barton 2500+ system with xppro and sp1. Hopefully, it will run OK or at
> > least as good.  My P4 has an Abit board with Intel 875 CSet and nVidia
video
> > card which works pretty well as long as you baby it somewhat.  I have an
> > inkling that the MoBo/Video has a lot to do with xp and Paris.
> > Edna
> >
> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dcc20f@linux...
> >
> >>With the trueverb I turn off the direct initially and put it wet 100%,
> >>then I adjust the near and far reflections separately until I get just
> >>the sound I want, then I drop wet to 0% and turn on the direct signal.
> >>I usually bring wet up to only about 5% or so and then I have this sweet
> >>clear voice with a nice room around it.   The wizoo and lexicon are nice
> >>sounding plug verbs too but wizoo only runs in xp and i'm back on
win98se.
> >>John
> >>
> >>Edna wrote:
> >>
> >>>I have some TC Native that are not bad, but still not what I'm hearing
> >
> > on
> >
> >>>some CDs on vocals.  I'll check into the True Verb.
> >>>Thanks
> >>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dbce4f@linux...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>no particular IRs, i have a couple hundred.  Even with True Verb I get
> >>>>reallly great verb by varying the Short and Long reflections to taste.
> >>>>
> >>>>Edna wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>John, any particular IRs you referring to?  Waves?  I'm not
enthralled
> >>>
> >>>with
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>>Paris verbs either.
> >>>>>Edna
> >>>>>
> >>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7ce1d$1@linux...
> >>>>>

> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>EK Sound wrote:
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>>Which effects are you having a hard time with?
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>David.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>John wrote:
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>oh god, eds efx.. yuck
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>
> >
> >

---

I love it but it's a CPU killer.  The Lexicon is my current fav for

simplicity and usefulness.

Edna wrote:
> Will do.  Have you tried the Waves IRX stuff?
>
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dd0865@linux...
>
>>trueverb is in waves and works in win98/me/xp.   Also check out  Lexicon
>>Pantheon Reverb DX and Wizoo verb.  Very nice.
>>John
>>
>>Edna wrote:
>>
>>>Thanks for the help.  The Paris verbs to me sound a little unclear and
>>>megaphonish - cheap.  Is the TrueVerb plugin only for the UAD card?
>
> Sorry
>
>>>it wasn't a go in xp.  I'm preparing to move Paris from my P4 to an
>
> Athlon
>
>>>Barton 2500+ system with xppro and sp1. Hopefully, it will run OK or at
>>>least as good.  My P4 has an Abit board with Intel 875 CSet and nVidia
>
> video
>
>>>card which works pretty well as long as you baby it somewhat.  I have an
>>>inkling that the MoBo/Video has a lot to do with xp and Paris.
>>>Edna
>>>
>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dcc20f@linux...
>>>
>>>
>>>>With the trueverb I turn off the direct initially and put it wet 100%,
>>>>then I adjust the near and far reflections separately until I get just
>>>>the sound I want, then I drop wet to 0% and turn on the direct signal.
>>>>I usually bring wet up to only about 5% or so and then I have this sweet
>>>>clear voice with a nice room around it.   The wizoo and lexicon are nice
>>>>sounding plug verbs too but wizoo only runs in xp and i'm back on
>
> win98se.
>
>>>>John
>>>>
>>>>Edna wrote:
>>>>
>>>>

---

>>>>>I have some TC Native that are not bad, but still not what I'm hearing

>>>

>>>on

>>>

>>>

>>>>>some CDs on vocals.  I'll check into the True Verb.

>>>>>Thanks

>>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43dbce4f@linux...

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>>no particular IRs, i have a couple hundred.  Even with True Verb I get

>>>>>>reallly great verb by varying the Short and Long reflections to taste.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>Edna wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>John, any particular IRs you referring to?  Waves?  I'm not

>

> enthralled

>

>>>>>with

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>>>Paris verbs either.

>>>>>>>Edna

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7ce1d$1@linux...

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>well for starters the verbs are lousy compared to IR stuff

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>EK Sound wrote:

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>Which effects are you having a hard time with?

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>David.

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>John wrote:

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>even after a lot of tweaking i'm not that impressed seriously
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>If you're talking about the presets, yeah, I would agree.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43d7c4c0$2@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>oh god, eds efx.. yuck
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>
>
>