Mike, I'll bet you can do it - I think for the VST synth count
you're looking for you may have to go ahead & RAM up to 2 gigs,
but if you're going to be working at 44.1k or 48k, I'm betting
you should have no problems. My Native rig is slower than the
one you're going to build & I can get into the 40's in terms of
track counts, and at 88.2k, to boot, and I routinely use three
verbs (Usually I'll have a room verb for drums, some other kind
of reverb for other instruments, and yet another - usually a
Plate - for vocals, plus most of the time another group for a
delay.

Now, depending on what other EFX/plugin's I'm using on
individual tracks, I may have to start "Freezing" some tracks
in order to be able to keep the buffer settings at such levels
that I can maintain low latency (if it gets down to this,
usually I'll freeze the kick, snare & bass, and sometimes the
rhythm guitars - most of the time, once I get whatever
compression plugin applied to those, it's pretty much "set it
and forget it" for me, anyway... plus if you need to "unfreeze"
them it only takes a moment, and then to re-freeze it, just a
couple of mere moments more).

Regarding your VSTi's - while I don't have a ton of experience
using them (I have a few, just don't use them much), I
understand that if you're using a lot of sample-based VSTi's
you may be better off going with a third hard drive for
streaming those samples (1x system drive, 1x audio drive, and
1x drive just for the VSTi samples); so you may want to do some
homework on that to see if that's indeed the most-recommended
type of setup.

Neil

"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>
>While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking and mixing,
>I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort of in the box
>solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a computer around an
>Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB around 1000mhz (I can't
>believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows me away everytime I think about
>it..) I'd like to be able to run about five to six synths, three verbs on
fx

>sends, and of course several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various
>channels. I'm wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of
>track counts folks are getting.
>
>
><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
><HTML><HEAD>
><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
><STYLE></STYLE>
></HEAD>
><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>While I'm definately going to continue
=
>to use Paris=20
>for tracking and mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting
=
>some=20

>building a=20
>computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB =
>around=20
>1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows me away =
>everytime=20
>I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run about five to six synths,
=
>three=20

>the=20

>what=20

></FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>
>

Subject: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by emarenot on Wed, 29 Nov 2006 16:52:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_001F_01C71393.B6F9E860
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking and mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort of in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track counts folks are getting.

------=_NextPart_000_001F_01C71393.B6F9E860
Content-Type: text/html;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>While I'm definately going to continue =
to use Paris=20
for tracking and mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting =
some=20
sort of in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about =
building a=20
computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB =
around=20
1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows me away =
everytime=20
I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run about five to six synths, =
three=20
verbs on fx sends, and of course several comp plugs and eq's etc on =
the=20
various channels. I'm wondering if anyone has a similar set up and =
what=20
sort of track counts folks are getting.   =20
</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>

------=_NextPart_000_001F_01C71393.B6F9E860--

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?

I was going to give track counts, but after re-thinkng what Iwasgoing to post,
I think there things to consider.

1) Doing both, composing and recording /mixing, I feel should done on 2 machines..

2) Having sais, you can do both on a fast PC/Mac setup. However, to get optimum
performance,you have to make some choices.

-Compose (midi Sequence) you song first with VSTis
-Then Either freeze or render those tracks audio tracks.
-You really want to do the above first, because when you start tracking live
instruments or vocals and adding fxs(plugins) depending on you track count,
your PC will start to slow down..

That's why I like the 2 PC/Mac approach. 1 for Instruments, & 1 for Audio
recording and mixing..

"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>
>While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking and mixing,
>I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort of in the box
>solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a computer around an
>Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB around 1000mhz (I can't
>believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows me away everytime I think about
>it..) I'd like to be able to run about five to six synths, three verbs on
fx
>sends, and of course several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various
>channels. I'm wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of
>track counts folks are getting.
>
>
><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
><HTML><HEAD>
><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
><STYLE></STYLE>
></HEAD>
><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>While I'm definately going to continue
=
>to use Paris=20
>for tracking and mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting
=
>some=20

>building a=20
>computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB =
>around=20
>1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows me away =
>everytime=20
>I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run about five to six synths,
=
>three=20

>the=20

>what=20

></FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Wed, 29 Nov 2006 19:59:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand
this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

--B_3247649999_923925
Content-type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design, etc. I also
have a full orchestral template that will run easily on this system.

as well.

If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon), or if
you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos are slightly

seeing from DAW builders. A quad core is the fastest, but there seem to be
diminishing returns on dual quad cores.

Regards,
Dedric

On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
<emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:

> While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking and mixing,
> I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort of in the box
> solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a computer around an Athlon
> 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB around 1000mhz (I can't believe that
> sort of speed on the FSB -blows me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like
> to be able to run about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of
> course several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm wondering
> if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track counts folks are
> getting.
>

--B_3247649999_923925
Content-type: text/html; charset="ISO-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<HTML>
<HEAD>
<TITLE>Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?</TITLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY>
<FONT FACE=3D"Verdana"><SPAN STYLE=3D'font-size:12.0px'>I can’t speak for=
 an Athlon 64/4000, but on my X2 4400 I run a similar setup at low latency a=
ll the time for commercial spots, sound design, etc. I also have a ful=
l orchestral template that will run easily on this system.

I’ve also run some projects of 50-100 tracks with plugins without pro=
blems as well.

If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon), or i=
f you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos are s=
lightly better performers than AMD chips at the moment – at least from=
 specs I’m seeing from DAW builders. A quad core is the fastest,=
 but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.

Regards,
Dedric

On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R." <ema=
renot@yahoo.com> wrote:

</SPAN></FONT><BLOCKQUOTE><SPAN STYLE=3D'font-size:12.0px'><FONT
FACE=3D"Arial"=
>While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking and mixing=
, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort of in the box sol=
ution for writing. I'm thinking about building a computer around an At=

hlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB around 1000mhz (I can't belie=
ve that sort of speed on the FSB -blows me away everytime I think about it..=
) I'd like to be able to run about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sen=
ds, and of course several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. &=
nbsp;I'm wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track cou=
nts folks are getting.
</FONT><FONT FACE=3D"Verdana">
</FONT></SPAN></BLOCKQUOTE><SPAN STYLE=3D'font-size:12.0px'><FONT
FACE=3D"Verda=
na">
</FONT></SPAN>
</BODY>
</HTML>

--B_3247649999_923925--

Hi Dedric,
The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
I've seen and tested so far.
The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done to
choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really like
the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.

There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at least
with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.

The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.

Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the
Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be on
  pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it

Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you you
can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name will
help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you

can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
for each latency setting.

If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
fine tune it if needed.

 http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip

Thanks Chris

Dedric Terry wrote:

> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
> this system.
>

> problems as well.
>
> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos

> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking and
>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort of
>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB
>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows
>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>   counts folks are getting.
>
>

--
Chris Ludwig

ADK Pro Audio
(859) 635-5762
www.adkproaudio.com
chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Thu, 30 Nov 2006 00:38:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Chris,

I'll run it tomorrow and let you know the results. I'm sure my X2 will give
paltry results next to the quad and probably fall well short of the core duo
as well. ;-)

I'm holding out for a dual quad core at some point, but a dual core-duo is
also tempting.

Regards,
Dedric

On 11/29/06 3:33 PM, in article 456e0841@linux, "Chris Ludwig"
<chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

> Hi Dedric,
> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
> I've seen and tested so far.
> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done to
> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really like
> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>
> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at least
> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>
> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>
>
> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the

---

> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be on
> pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>
> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you you
> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name will
> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
> for each latency setting.
>
> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
> fine tune it if needed.
>
> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>
>
> Thanks Chris
>
>
>
>
> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> I can¹t speak for an Athlon 64/4000, but on my X2 4400 I run a similar
>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>> this system.
>>
>> I¹ve also run some projects of 50-100 tracks with plugins without
>> problems as well.
>>
>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos
>> are slightly better performers than AMD chips at the moment - at least
>> from specs I¹m seeing from DAW builders. A quad core is the fastest,
>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking and
>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort of
>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB
>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows

>> me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>> about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>> several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>> wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>> counts folks are getting.
>>
>>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Chris Ludwig on Thu, 30 Nov 2006 01:28:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

FYI,
 It would be great if anyone with Cubase/Nuendo Apple g5 machines want
to run it the test it would be great to get the numbers.
Hopefully it will open and play fine on one. I used all internal plug
ins so it should be fine.:)

Chris

Chris Ludwig wrote:

> Hi Dedric,
> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
> I've seen and tested so far.
> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
> to choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really
> like the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>
> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at
> least with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>
> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>
>
> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than
> the Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will
> be on   pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>
> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you

> you can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the
> name will help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to
> confirm that you can run that number of plug ins. make note of the
> number.
> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
> for each latency setting.
>
> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I
> can fine tune it if needed.
>
> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>
>
> Thanks Chris
>
>
>
>
> Dedric Terry wrote:
>

>> similar setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound
>> design, etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run
>> easily on this system.
>>

>> problems as well.
>>
>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo
>> (xeon), or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel
>> core duos are slightly better performers than AMD chips at the moment

>> the fastest, but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad
>> cores.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking and
>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort of
>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB
>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows
>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course

>> several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>> wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>> counts folks are getting.
>>
>

--
Chris Ludwig
ADK
chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
(859) 635-5762

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 15:19:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I know
they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself. I
for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio consulting
advice.

If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC or
Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).

And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.

And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now, not
talking about updating our PCs once a month.

Best of luck!

Dedric

On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
> Chris and others,
>
> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time on
> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..

>
> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very old.
> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant. But,
> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)
>
>
>
>
> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>> Hi Dedric,
>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>> I've seen and tested so far.
>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done to
>
>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really like
>
>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>
>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at least
>
>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>
>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>
>>
>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the
>
>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be on
>
>> pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>
>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you you
>
>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name will
>
>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
>
>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>> for each latency setting.
>>
>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can

>
>> fine tune it if needed.
>>
>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>
>>
>> Thanks Chris
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:

>
>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>
>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>>> this system.
>>>

>>> problems as well.
>>>
>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>
>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos
>

>

>
>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking and
>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort of
>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB
>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows
>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>   counts folks are getting.

```
>>>
>>>
>>
>> --
>> Chris Ludwig
>>
>> ADK Pro Audio
>> (859) 635-5762
>> www.adkproaudio.com
>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>
```

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by LaMont on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 15:49:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Chris and others,

This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time on PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..

You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very old. This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant. But, I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>Hi Dedric,
>The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>I've seen and tested so far.
>The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done to

>choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really like

>the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>
>There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at least

>with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>
>The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>

>
>Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the

>Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be on

> pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>
>Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you you

>can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name will

>help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you

>can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>for each latency setting.
>
>If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can

>fine tune it if needed.
>
> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>
>
>Thanks Chris
>
>
>
>
>Dedric Terry wrote:

>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,

>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>> this system.
>>

>> problems as well.
>>
>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),

>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos

>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking and
>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort of
>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB
>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows
>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>   counts folks are getting.
>>
>>
>
>--
>Chris Ludwig
>
>ADK Pro Audio
>(859) 635-5762
>www.adkproaudio.com
>chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Neil on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 16:22:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The downside of the prevailing "DSP-based" (and I assume you're
talking about Pro-Tools here) is that it's so expensive that you
could be on the "upgrade path", that you so decry, on a regular
basis every couple of months & STILL not equal the cost of an HD
system! Then when Digi decides to do one of their system
upgrades, you have to pretty much buy everything all over
again... again at a very high entrance fee.

There are, of course, advantages, too - which I think are pretty
clear to most here, but it's not all shiny happy people in
Digiland, either. Just some perspective there.

Neil

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>Chris and others,
>
>This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time on
>PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>
>You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very old.
>This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant. But,
>I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)
>
>
>
>
>Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>Hi Dedric,
>>The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>I've seen and tested so far.
>>The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>>I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done to
>
>>choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really like
>
>>the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>
>>There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at least
>
>>with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>
>>The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>
>>
>>Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the
>
>>Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be on
>
>> pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>
>>Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically

>>load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you you
>
>>can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name will
>
>>help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
>
>>can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>for each latency setting.
>>
>>If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
>
>>fine tune it if needed.
>>
>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>
>>
>>Thanks Chris
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Dedric Terry wrote:

>
>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>
>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on

>>> this system.
>>>

>>> problems as well.
>>>
>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>
>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos
>

>

>
>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."

>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
and
>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
of
>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an FSB
>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows
>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>--
>>Chris Ludwig
>>
>>ADK Pro Audio
>>(859) 635-5762
>>www.adkproaudio.com
>>chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by LaMont on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 16:28:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the guys
do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and tribulations
and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much apart
of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP based
(for me) position.

As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi PC)I
pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot of
money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe an
HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.

I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I know

>they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself.
 I
>for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio consulting
>advice.
>
>If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC or
>Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
>etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
>that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>
>And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>
>And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now, not
>talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>
>Best of luck!
>
>Dedric
>
>
>On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> Chris and others,
>>
>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time
on
>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>
>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very
old.
>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant. But,
>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>> Hi Dedric,
>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
to

>>
>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really like
>>
>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>
>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at least
>>
>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>
>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>>
>>>
>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the
>>
>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be
on
>>
>>>   pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>
>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
you
>>
>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name will
>>
>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
>>
>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>> for each latency setting.
>>>
>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
>>
>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>
>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>
>>>
>>> Thanks Chris
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Dedric Terry wrote:

>>
>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>
>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>>>> this system.
>>>>

>>>> problems as well.
>>>>
>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>
>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos
>>

>>

>>
>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
and
>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
of
>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
FSB
>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows
>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>> --
>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>
>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>> (859) 635-5762
>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com

>>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by LaMont on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 16:39:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Neil,
No, I was not only talking about Pro-Tools. But a little perspective. There
are still alot (read more) Pro-Tool Mix3 setups than HD setups. So, you don;t
have to upgrade the various Digi setups if you wan to..

I was talking about PAris, Pro Tools, Soundscape..Radar.

P.S.
I personaly would not for over the money for the Creamware stuff for summing.

The truth of the matter toimprover your ITB summing, just get a decent analog
or digital mixer(Mackie..Yamaha 01x 02r,). Most of the current summing boxes
are nothing more than the forementioed mixers without the faders.. Electronic
Musician did a summing shoot-out this year and the results were astounding.:
needless to say , that a mackie VLZ summed just as good as most of the 5k
summing boxes. So that should tell you something and it should tell you that
by add a better mixer to sum than the DAW is all that's needed..

I use a Soundcraft Ghost console to sum for now, and yesit even improves
Paris stereo imaging. For Neundo and Pro Tools, it takes it to another level.

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>The downside of the prevailing "DSP-based" (and I assume you're
>talking about Pro-Tools here) is that it's so expensive that you
>could be on the "upgrade path", that you so decry, on a regular
>basis every couple of months & STILL not equal the cost of an HD
>system! Then when Digi decides to do one of their system
>upgrades, you have to pretty much buy everything all over
>again... again at a very high entrance fee.
>
>There are, of course, advantages, too - which I think are pretty
>clear to most here, but it's not all shiny happy people in
>Digiland, either. Just some perspective there.
>
>Neil
>

Page 25 of 159 ---- Generated from   The PARIS Forums

>
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Chris and others,
>>
>>This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time on
>>PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>
>>You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very old.
>>This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant. But,
>>I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>Hi Dedric,
>>>The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what

>>>I've seen and tested so far.
>>>The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run

>>>projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>>>I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
to
>>
>>>choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>>benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really like
>>
>>>the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>
>>>There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at least
>>
>>>with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>
>>>The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>>
>>>
>>>Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the
>>
>>>Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be
on
>>
>>> pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it

>>>
>>>Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically

>>>load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you you
>>
>>>can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name will
>>
>>>help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
>>
>>>can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test

>>>for each latency setting.
>>>
>>>If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
>>
>>>fine tune it if needed.
>>>
>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>
>>>
>>>Thanks Chris
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Dedric Terry wrote:

>>
>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>
>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>
>>>> this system.
>>>>

>>>> problems as well.
>>>>
>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>
>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos
>>

>>

>>
>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>

>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
>and
>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
>of
>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
>FSB
>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows
>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>--
>>>Chris Ludwig
>>>
>>>ADK Pro Audio
>>>(859) 635-5762
>>>www.adkproaudio.com
>>>chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 16:46:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The native DAW upgrade path on the OSX Mac goes like this:

  1) Upgrade your software as available, if you feel it's worthwhile.

  2) There is no 2.

That's it. If you feel the need to tinker with hardware go work on your
car. ;^)

Granted, you can upgrade the Mac hardware any time you feel you need to.
I've only done that once in the last six or so years, from a dual 1GHZ

G4 PowerMac to a dual 2.5 GHZ G5 PowerMac, just to increase plugin counts without needing to freeze tracks. My current box, several years old, is still plenty fast enough to do heavy audio recording duties for years to come.

Cheers,
  -Jamie
  www.JamieKrutz.com

PS. Native Instruments Komplete 4 just arrived, finally.

LaMont wrote:
> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the guys
> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and tribulations
> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much apart
> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP based
> (for me) position.
>
> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi PC)I
> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot of
> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe an
> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>
>
> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I know
>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself.
> I
>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio consulting
>> advice.
>>
>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC or
>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>
>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>
>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now, not

>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>
>> Best of luck!
>>
>> Dedric
>>
>>
>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>> Chris and others,
>>>
>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time
> on
>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>>
>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very
> old.
>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant. But,
>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>> Hi Dedric,
>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
> to
>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really like
>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>>
>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at least
>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>>
>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the
>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be
> on
>>>>   pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it

>>>>
>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
> you
>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name will
>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>
>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>
>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:

>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>>>>> this system.
>>>>>

>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos

>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
> and
>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
> of
>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an

> FSB
>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows
>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>> --
>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>
>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Chris Ludwig on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 19:09:30 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Lamont,
I understand totally what you saying I have a bunch of customers that
because of how they work in the studio the DSP/DAW based hybrid is the
way to go. They normally have a HD rig and then native rig for
VSTi/MIDI type things. Paris has been the only DSP DAW system that ever
came close to what PT is doing. To have something that behaves close to
a PT rig in that it has good built in hardware/latency free effects that
can be run on the majority of the channels at one time with out running
out of DSP. The closest thing I've seen to this would be a Nuendo system
with a Euphonix or Yamaha DM-2000 console type setup. Any of the quality
Digital consoles out there now will easily put in the same or higher
price range as a HD/control 24 type system.

It seems to me that most people needing the mostly native setup are
composers types and home and small production studios. People who do a
bit of all of that will most likely have a hybrid setup. Just look at
the freaks on this forum!!! :)

Chris

LaMont wrote:
> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the guys
> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and tribulations
> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much apart

> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP based
> (for me) position.
>
> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi PC)I
> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot of
> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe an
> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>
>
> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I know
>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself.
> I
>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio consulting
>> advice.
>>
>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC or
>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>
>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>
>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now, not
>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>
>> Best of luck!
>>
>> Dedric
>>
>>
>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>> Chris and others,
>>>
>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time
> on
>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>>
>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very
> old.
>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant. But,

>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>> Hi Dedric,
>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
> to
>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really like
>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>>
>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at least
>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>>
>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the
>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be
> on
>>>>   pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>
>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
> you
>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name will
>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>
>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>
>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>
>>>>

>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:

>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>>>>> this system.
>>>>>

>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos

>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
> and
>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
> of
>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
> FSB
>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB -blows
>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>> --
>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>
>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>

--

Chris Ludwig

ADK Pro Audio
(859) 635-5762
www.adkproaudio.com
chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Hey LaMont, the NI stuff (and my other 3rd party Audio Unit plugins,
Zebra, GPO, Ivory, Cameleon, etc.) already run great on my dual 2.5GHZ G5.

Tons of tracks, no prob.

When I next upgrade the studio Mac it will be for animation/graphics
production reasons. The upcoming 8 core Mac Pro would be good for that.

I'm also tempted by the new core 2 duo Mac laptops, they're about as
fast as my dual G5 which is amazing for a laptop. But I'll probably hold
out for a laptop that can hold more than 3GB RAM.

I'm in no rush, my dual G5 works great. I'm having fun with the new NI
updates.

Cheers,
 -Jamie
 www.JamieKrutz.com

LaMont wrote:
> "PS. Native Instruments Komplete 4 just arrived, finally."
>
> Hey Jamie, you'll need or want that new Mac Pro core dual to run all those
> "sweet" Native Instruments Vstis :)
>
> But, you are right. You should only upgrade if there is a real need.
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> The native DAW upgrade path on the OSX Mac goes like this:
>>
>> 1) Upgrade your software as available, if you feel it's worthwhile.
>>
>> 2) There is no 2.
>>

>> That's it. If you feel the need to tinker with hardware go work on your
>
>> car. ;^)
>>
>> Granted, you can upgrade the Mac hardware any time you feel you need to.
>
>> I've only done that once in the last six or so years, from a dual 1GHZ
>> G4 PowerMac to a dual 2.5 GHZ G5 PowerMac, just to increase plugin
>> counts without needing to freeze tracks. My current box, several years
>> old, is still plenty fast enough to do heavy audio recording duties for
>
>> years to come.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>> PS. Native Instruments Komplete 4 just arrived, finally.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> LaMont wrote:
>>> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the
> guys
>>> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and tribulations
>>> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much
> apart
>>> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP
> based
>>> (for me) position.
>>>
>>> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi
> PC)I
>>> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
>>> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot
> of
>>> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe
> an
>>> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>>>
>>>
>>> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>>>
>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I
> know

>>>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself.
>>> I
>>>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>>>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio consulting
>>>> advice.
>>>>
>>>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC
> or
>>>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
>>>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
>>>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>>>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>>>
>>>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>>>
>>>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now,
> not
>>>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>>>
>>>> Best of luck!
>>>>
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Chris and others,
>>>>>
>>>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time
>>> on
>>>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>>>>
>>>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very
>>> old.
>>>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant.
> But,
>>>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it"..
> :)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Hi Dedric,
>>>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>>>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.

>>>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
>>> to
>>>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really
> like
>>>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at
> least
>>>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than
> the
>>>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will
> be
>>> on
>>>>>> pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
>>> you
>>>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name
> will
>>>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that
> you
>>>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I
> can
>>>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:

>>>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily
> on
>>>>>>> this system.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos

>>>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
>>> and
>>>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
>>> of
>>>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building
> a
>>>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
>>> FSB
>>>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB
> -blows
>>>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>> --
>>>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>>>
>>>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>

LOL

LaMont wrote:
> "PS. Native Instruments Komplete 4 just arrived, finally."
>
> Hey Jamie, you'll need or want that new Mac Pro core dual to run all those
> "sweet" Native Instruments Vstis :)
>
> But, you are right. You should only upgrade if there is a real need.
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> The native DAW upgrade path on the OSX Mac goes like this:
>>
>> 1) Upgrade your software as available, if you feel it's worthwhile.
>>
>> 2) There is no 2.
>>
>> That's it. If you feel the need to tinker with hardware go work on your
>
>> car. ;^)
>>
>> Granted, you can upgrade the Mac hardware any time you feel you need to.
>
>> I've only done that once in the last six or so years, from a dual 1GHZ
>> G4 PowerMac to a dual 2.5 GHZ G5 PowerMac, just to increase plugin
>> counts without needing to freeze tracks. My current box, several years
>> old, is still plenty fast enough to do heavy audio recording duties for
>
>> years to come.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>> PS. Native Instruments Komplete 4 just arrived, finally.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> LaMont wrote:
>>> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the
> guys
>>> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and tribulations

>>> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much
> apart
>>> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP
> based
>>> (for me) position.
>>>
>>> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi
> PC)I
>>> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
>>> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot
> of
>>> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe
> an
>>> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>>>
>>>
>>> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>>>
>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I
> know
>>>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself.
>>> I
>>>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>>>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio consulting
>>>> advice.
>>>>
>>>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC
> or
>>>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
>>>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
>>>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>>>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>>>
>>>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>>>
>>>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now,
> not
>>>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>>>
>>>> Best of luck!
>>>>
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>

>>>>> Chris and others,
>>>>>
>>>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time
>>> on
>>>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>>>>
>>>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very
>>> old.
>>>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant.
> But,
>>>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it"..
> :)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Hi Dedric,
>>>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>>>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>>>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
>>> to
>>>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really
> like
>>>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at
> least
>>>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than
> the
>>>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will
> be
>>> on
>>>>>> pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
>>> you
>>>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name

> will
>>>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that
> you
>>>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I
> can
>>>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:

>>>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily
> on
>>>>>>> this system.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos

>>>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
>>> and
>>>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
>>> of
>>>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building
> a
>>>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an

>>> FSB
>>>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB
> -blows
>>>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>> --
>>>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>>>
>>>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>

--
Chris Ludwig

ADK Pro Audio
(859) 635-5762
www.adkproaudio.com
chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by LaMont on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 19:27:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"PS. Native Instruments Komplete 4 just arrived, finally."

Hey Jamie, you'll need or want that new Mac Pro core dual to run all those
"sweet" Native Instruments Vstis :)

But, you are right. You should only upgrade if there is a real need.

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>The native DAW upgrade path on the OSX Mac goes like this:
>
> 1) Upgrade your software as available, if you feel it's worthwhile.
>
> 2) There is no 2.
>
>That's it. If you feel the need to tinker with hardware go work on your

>car. ;^)
>
>Granted, you can upgrade the Mac hardware any time you feel you need to.

>I've only done that once in the last six or so years, from a dual 1GHZ
>G4 PowerMac to a dual 2.5 GHZ G5 PowerMac, just to increase plugin
>counts without needing to freeze tracks. My current box, several years
>old, is still plenty fast enough to do heavy audio recording duties for

>years to come.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>PS. Native Instruments Komplete 4 just arrived, finally.
>
>
>
>
>
>LaMont wrote:
>> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the
guys
>> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and tribulations
>> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much
apart
>> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP
based
>> (for me) position.
>>
>> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi
PC)I
>> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
>> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot
of
>> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe
an
>> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>>
>>
>> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>>
>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I
know
>>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself.

>> I
>>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio consulting
>>> advice.
>>>
>>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC
or
>>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
>>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
>>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>>
>>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>>
>>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now,
not
>>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>>
>>> Best of luck!
>>>
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>>
>>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Chris and others,
>>>>
>>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time
>> on
>>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>>>
>>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very
>> old.
>>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant.
But,
>>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it"..
:)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>>> Hi Dedric,
>>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.

>>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
>> to
>>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really
like
>>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>>>
>>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at
least
>>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>>>
>>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than
the
>>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will
be
>> on
>>>>> pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>>
>>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
>> you
>>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name
will
>>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that
you
>>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I
can
>>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:

>>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily
on
>>>>>> this system.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos

>>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
>> and
>>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
>> of
>>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building
a
>>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
>> FSB
>>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the FSB
-blows
>>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>> --
>>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>>
>>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Chris Ludwig on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 19:32:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

HI Lamont,

Lamont wrote:
> Hey Neil,
> No, I was not only talking about Pro-Tools. But a little perspective. There
> are still alot (read more) Pro-Tool Mix3 setups than HD setups. So, you don;t
> have to upgrade the various Digi setups if you wan to..

Well maybe the converters :)
>
> I was talking about PAris, Pro Tools, Soundscape..Radar.
>
Paris would really be the only one that was close enough functionality
wise to be compared to Pro Tools. The other are really just glorified
hard disk recorders.

> P.S.
> I personaly would not for over the money for the Creamware stuff for summing.

ditto.

>
> The truth of the matter toimprover your ITB summing, just get a decent analog
> or digital mixer(Mackie..Yamaha 01x 02r,). Most of the current summing boxes
> are nothing more than the forementioed mixers without the faders.. Electronic
> Musician did a summing shoot-out this year and the results were astounding.:
> needless to say , that a mackie VLZ summed just as good as most of the 5k
> summing boxes. So that should tell you something and it should tell you that
> by add a better mixer to sum than the DAW is all that's needed..
>
> I use a Soundcraft Ghost console to sum for now, and yesit even improves
> Paris stereo imaging. For Neundo and Pro Tools, it takes it to another level.
>
>

Although I'd rather wish they would do the mixers in a rack mount form
with out the automation and faders just the routing/ summing and effects
type parts.

Actually really wish that dead-end things like the UAD and TC power
core and various firewire DSP would stop dicking around and just write
native plug-ins. I really think they are just using the hardware as

giant dongles now. I'd rather have a tiny USB one.

I'd rather see these DSP people put the effects on the external
converters or purely digital I/O like MADI. Then be able to add DSP
chips to the boxes to be able ti add more processing power to the units.
But I don't see that happening see that happening soon.

>
>

>

Chris

--
Chris Ludwig

ADK Pro Audio
(859) 635-5762
www.adkproaudio.com
chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by LaMont on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 21:15:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Lol!!! :)

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>HI Lamont,
>
>
>Lamont wrote:
>> Hey Neil,
>> No, I was not only talking about Pro-Tools. But a little perspective.
There
>> are still alot (read more) Pro-Tool Mix3 setups than HD setups. So, you
don;t
>> have to upgrade the various Digi setups if you wan to..
>
>
>Well maybe the converters :)
>>
>> I was talking about PAris, Pro Tools, Soundscape..Radar.
>>
>Paris would really be the only one that was close enough functionality
>wise to be compared to Pro Tools. The other are really just glorified

>hard disk recorders.
>
>
>> P.S.
>> I personaly would not for over the money for the Creamware stuff for summing.
>
>ditto.
>
>>
>> The truth of the matter toimprover your ITB summing, just get a decent analog
>> or digital mixer(Mackie..Yamaha 01x 02r,). Most of the current summing boxes
>> are nothing more than the forementioed mixers without the faders.. Electronic
>> Musician did a summing shoot-out this year and the results were astounding.:
>> needless to say , that a mackie VLZ summed just as good as most of the 5k
>> summing boxes. So that should tell you something and it should tell you that
>> by add a better mixer to sum than the DAW is all that's needed..
>>
>> I use a Soundcraft Ghost console to sum for now, and yesit even improves
>> Paris stereo imaging. For Neundo and Pro Tools, it takes it to another level.
>>
>>
>
>Although I'd rather wish they would do the mixers in a rack mount form
>with out the automation and faders just the routing/ summing and effects

>type parts.
>
>Actually really wish that dead-end things like the UAD and TC power
>core and various firewire DSP would stop dicking around and just write
>native plug-ins. I really think they are just using the hardware as
>giant dongles now. I'd rather have a tiny USB one.
>
>I'd rather see these DSP people put the effects on the external
>converters or purely digital I/O like MADI. Then be able to add DSP
>chips to the boxes to be able ti add more processing power to the units.
>But I don't see that happening see that happening soon.
>
>>
>>
>
>>
>
>Chris

```
>
>--
>Chris Ludwig
>
>ADK Pro Audio
>(859) 635-5762
>www.adkproaudio.com
>chrisl@adkproaudio.com
```

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 21:46:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Lamont - I probably did misinterpret. I don't disagree about the advantages of hybrid/dsp at all.
I think most everyone on this board knows the pros and cons both ways, and most all of us have quite a bit of experience building
systems (except Mac users perhaps ;-). After all, part of the admission fee here is that you be a bit of a DAW/gear slut. ;-)

Even Mac users have to admit it gets expensive buying a new Mac every 3 years or so just to gain more power to
run VSTi's and plugins that demand it (depending on the user's requirements of course). However, that is no different with dsp rigs.
You end up adding $5000 Accel cards to an HD rig to add more power, unless you start with HD3 and never need more than that.
So the costs are actually relative. You don't save money by going with ProTools or Soundscape or Fairlight, you just spend it in a different way,
and once you add in the cost of comparable plugins in TDM format, you do spend more, no way around it really. It's a matter of going with
what works best and makes you more productive and profitable.

As Chris pointed out in another post, native is most common in the pro realm for composing and sound design (which is most
of what I do, along with audio post - hence my interest in Fairlight).

I also agree with him that dedicated dsp plugin cards are getting a bit long in the tooth.
Imho, it's time for Fairlight to get out of their closed market mindset and release CC-1 as a standalone generic dsp engine
for DAWs, plugins, etc (or more likely, time for other developers to get on board with it - could be in the
works already from the way it sounds....). Or perhaps Clearspeed will eventually have some DAW applications.

The goal for dsp/hybird I prefer is a more open platform so we can begin to merge our preferences in native and dsp into

a truely expandable environment - more flexibiltiy and upgradeability with
that approach - better longterm investment, imho.

Regards,
Dedric

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45704a29$1@linux...
>
> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the guys
> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and tribulations
> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much
> apart
> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP
> based
> (for me) position.
>
> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi
> PC)I
> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot of
> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe an
> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>
>
> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I know
>>they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself.
> I
>>for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>>discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio
>>consulting
>>advice.
>>
>>If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC or
>>Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
>>etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
>>that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>>version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>
>>And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>
>>And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now, not
>>talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>
>>Best of luck!
>>

>>Dedric

>>

>>

>>On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"

>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>

>>>

>>> Chris and others,

>>>

>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time

> on

>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..

>>>

>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very

> old.

>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant.

>>> But,

>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>>>> Hi Dedric,

>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what

>>>> I've seen and tested so far.

>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run

>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.

>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done

> to

>>>

>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo

>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really

>>>> like

>>>

>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.

>>>>

>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at

>>>> least

>>>

>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.

>>>>

>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same

>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card

>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the

>>>
>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be
> on
>>>
>>>>   pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>
>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
> you
>>>
>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name
>>>> will
>>>
>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
>>>
>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>
>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
>>>
>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>
>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>> I can't speak for an Athlon 64/4000, but on my X2 4400 I run a similar
>>>
>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>>
>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>>>>> this system.
>>>>>
>>>>> I've also run some projects of 50-100 tracks with plugins without
>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>>
>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos
>>>
>>>>> are slightly better performers than AMD chips at the moment - at least
>>>

>>>>> from specs I'm seeing from DAW builders. A quad core is the fastest,
>>>
>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
> and
>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
> of
>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
> FSB
>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the
>>>>> FSB -blows
>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>> --
>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>
>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Fri, 01 Dec 2006 22:37:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Dedric,

OK, I had to look it up:

My dual 2.5GHZ G5 cost about $1200 additional in 2004 after selling my

previous dual 1GHZ G4. I can't say that's all that expensive for the jump in processing power, especially considering the many things the system gets used for here.

I think Deej has me beat in having higher computer costs, and probably most everyone else here, too, who has been building machines and replacing them over and over in the last few years. And that's not even counting the time it takes to build them and debug the problems we hear about.

Meanwhile the trusty G5 still does all the tracks and AU/FX plugins I need. In fact it's gotten better with the periodic Logic updates, OSX updates and updates from plugin vendors, the system has gotten more solid and capable over time.

So I don't need to buy another computer for audio. Priceless. :^)

Any further studio computer upgrading here will be due to graphics/animation/video production. Although the G5 is doing reasonably well in those areas, too (was one reason I got it), so there's no big rush to upgrade.

I agree that it's a matter of going with what works best for whatever you do. And also, what you value in the process.

Cheers,
 -Jamie
 www.JamieKrutz.com

Dedric Terry wrote:
> Hey Lamont - I probably did misinterpret. I don't disagree about the
> advantages of hybrid/dsp at all.
> I think most everyone on this board knows the pros and cons both ways, and
> most all of us have quite a bit of experience building
> systems (except Mac users perhaps ;-). After all, part of the admission fee
> here is that you be a bit of a DAW/gear slut. ;-)
>
> Even Mac users have to admit it gets expensive buying a new Mac every 3
> years or so just to gain more power to
> run VSTi's and plugins that demand it (depending on the user's requirements
> of course). However, that is no different with dsp rigs.
> You end up adding $5000 Accel cards to an HD rig to add more power, unless
> you start with HD3 and never need more than that.
> So the costs are actually relative. You don't save money by going with
> ProTools or Soundscape or Fairlight, you just spend it in a different way,
> and once you add in the cost of comparable plugins in TDM format, you do
> spend more, no way around it really. It's a matter of going with

> what works best and makes you more productive and profitable.
>
> As Chris pointed out in another post, native is most common in the pro realm
> for composing and sound design (which is most
> of what I do, along with audio post - hence my interest in Fairlight).
>
> I also agree with him that dedicated dsp plugin cards are getting a bit long
> in the tooth.
> Imho, it's time for Fairlight to get out of their closed market mindset and
> release CC-1 as a standalone generic dsp engine
> for DAWs, plugins, etc (or more likely, time for other developers to get on
> board with it - could be in the
> works already from the way it sounds....). Or perhaps Clearspeed will
> eventually have some DAW applications.
>
> The goal for dsp/hybird I prefer is a more open platform so we can begin to
> merge our preferences in native and dsp into
> a truely expandable environment - more flexibiltiy and upgradeability with
> that approach - better longterm investment, imho.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45704a29$1@linux...
>> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the guys
>> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and tribulations
>> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much
>> apart
>> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP
>> based
>> (for me) position.
>>
>> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi
>> PC)I
>> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
>> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot of
>> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe an
>> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>>
>>
>> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>>
>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I know
>>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself.
>>> I
>>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio

>>> consulting
>>> advice.
>>>
>>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC or
>>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
>>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
>>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>>
>>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>>
>>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now, not
>>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>>
>>> Best of luck!
>>>
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>>
>>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Chris and others,
>>>>
>>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time
>> on
>>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>>>
>>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very
>> old.
>>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant.
>>>> But,
>>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>>> Hi Dedric,
>>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
>> to
>>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really
>>>>> like

>>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>>>
>>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at
>>>>> least
>>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>>>
>>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the
>>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be
>> on
>>>>>   pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>>
>>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
>> you
>>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name
>>>>> will
>>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
>>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
>>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>>
>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>> I can't speak for an Athlon 64/4000, but on my X2 4400 I run a similar
>>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>>>>>> this system.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I've also run some projects of 50-100 tracks with plugins without
>>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos

>>>>>> are slightly better performers than AMD chips at the moment - at least
>>>>>> from specs I'm seeing from DAW builders. A quad core is the fastest,
>>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
>> and
>>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
>> of
>>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
>> FSB
>>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the
>>>>>> FSB -blows
>>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>> --
>>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>>
>>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 04:03:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Jamie,

You and the other Mac users know we PC users just give you a hard time
because your comps have fruit on them. ;-)

For my work, the only limit on what I could use is what I can afford (hence
spaced upgrades have more to do with budget than obsolescence or problems) -

the same would be true if I were using Macs though.

I actually keep the older machines around for offline tasks and network use (effects/VSTi slaves, video playback, backup storage, etc). I just recently retired my G4 450 (former Paris Mac) and passed it along to my son for learning software, games, etc (he's 6, so it's more than enough for him).

BTW - speaking of intense animation, probably old news, but there's an HD video online from Animusic - I like some of their other work better, but fun all the same:
http://www.apple.com/quicktime/guide/hd/animusic2dvd.html

Regards,
Dedric

PS: I'm starting to consider selling my HP laptop and getting a Macbook for net/email, etc, simply to be able to have both platforms handy. Just not sure how well I can integrate it into the studio at the moment to justify it though.

On 12/1/06 3:37 PM, in article 4570ac34@linux, "Jamie K"
<Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
> Hey Dedric,
>
> OK, I had to look it up:
>
> My dual 2.5GHZ G5 cost about $1200 additional in 2004 after selling my
> previous dual 1GHZ G4. I can't say that's all that expensive for the
> jump in processing power, especially considering the many things the
> system gets used for here.
>
> I think Deej has me beat in having higher computer costs, and probably
> most everyone else here, too, who has been building machines and
> replacing them over and over in the last few years. And that's not even
> counting the time it takes to build them and debug the problems we hear
> about.
>
> Meanwhile the trusty G5 still does all the tracks and AU/FX plugins I
> need. In fact it's gotten better with the periodic Logic updates, OSX
> updates and updates from plugin vendors, the system has gotten more
> solid and capable over time.
>
> So I don't need to buy another computer for audio. Priceless. :^)
>
> Any further studio computer upgrading here will be due to

> graphics/animation/video production. Although the G5 is doing reasonably
> well in those areas, too (was one reason I got it), so there's no big
> rush to upgrade.
>
> I agree that it's a matter of going with what works best for whatever
> you do. And also, what you value in the process.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> Hey Lamont - I probably did misinterpret. I don't disagree about the
>> advantages of hybrid/dsp at all.
>> I think most everyone on this board knows the pros and cons both ways, and
>> most all of us have quite a bit of experience building
>> systems (except Mac users perhaps ;-). After all, part of the admission fee
>> here is that you be a bit of a DAW/gear slut. ;-)
>>
>> Even Mac users have to admit it gets expensive buying a new Mac every 3
>> years or so just to gain more power to
>> run VSTi's and plugins that demand it (depending on the user's requirements
>> of course). However, that is no different with dsp rigs.
>> You end up adding $5000 Accel cards to an HD rig to add more power, unless
>> you start with HD3 and never need more than that.
>> So the costs are actually relative. You don't save money by going with
>> ProTools or Soundscape or Fairlight, you just spend it in a different way,
>> and once you add in the cost of comparable plugins in TDM format, you do
>> spend more, no way around it really. It's a matter of going with
>> what works best and makes you more productive and profitable.
>>
>> As Chris pointed out in another post, native is most common in the pro realm
>> for composing and sound design (which is most
>> of what I do, along with audio post - hence my interest in Fairlight).
>>
>> I also agree with him that dedicated dsp plugin cards are getting a bit long
>> in the tooth.
>> Imho, it's time for Fairlight to get out of their closed market mindset and
>> release CC-1 as a standalone generic dsp engine
>> for DAWs, plugins, etc (or more likely, time for other developers to get on
>> board with it - could be in the
>> works already from the way it sounds....). Or perhaps Clearspeed will
>> eventually have some DAW applications.
>>
>> The goal for dsp/hybird I prefer is a more open platform so we can begin to
>> merge our preferences in native and dsp into
>> a truely expandable environment - more flexibiltiy and upgradeability with

>> that approach - better longterm investment, imho.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45704a29$1@linux...
>>> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the guys
>>> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and tribulations
>>> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much
>>> apart
>>> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP
>>> based
>>> (for me) position.
>>>
>>> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi
>>> PC)I
>>> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
>>> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot of
>>> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe an
>>> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>>>
>>>
>>> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>>>
>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I know
>>>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself.
>>> I
>>>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>>>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio
>>>> consulting
>>>> advice.
>>>>
>>>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC or
>>>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
>>>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
>>>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>>>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>>>
>>>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>>>
>>>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now, not
>>>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>>>
>>>> Best of luck!
>>>>
>>>> Dedric
>>>>

>>>>
>>>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Chris and others,
>>>>>
>>>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time
>>> on
>>>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>>>>
>>>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very
>>> old.
>>>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant.
>>>>> But,
>>>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Hi Dedric,
>>>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>>>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>>>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
>>> to
>>>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really
>>>>>> like
>>>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at
>>>>>> least
>>>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the
>>>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be
>>> on
>>>>>> pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you

>>> you
>>>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name
>>>>>> will
>>>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
>>>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
>>>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>> I can't speak for an Athlon 64/4000, but on my X2 4400 I run a similar
>>>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>>>>>>> this system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I've also run some projects of 50-100 tracks with plugins without
>>>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos
>>>>>>> are slightly better performers than AMD chips at the moment - at least
>>>>>>> from specs I'm seeing from DAW builders. A quad core is the fastest,
>>>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
>>> and
>>>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
>>> of
>>>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
>>> FSB
>>>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the

>>>>>>> FSB -blows
>>>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>> --
>>>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>>>
>>>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>
>>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Neil on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 04:51:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>> P.S.
>> I personaly would not for over the money for the Creamware stuff for summing.
>
>ditto.

Why not? If you (Lamont) are willing to fork over $2k for a
digital mixer, and you can fork over $750 instead & get a
"digimixerinabox", what's the difference? ASSUMING it does, in
fact, work well for summing - I'll admit I dunno yet... will
find out in a week or so & you guys can determine for
yourselves, since I'll post some more summing comparison clips
at that time.

Neil

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by DJ on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 04:56:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Jamie,

I'd say my computer costs were around $1000.00, but yeah, the time it took to find the magic bullet was pretty unbelievable this time around. My problem was stability between the two DAWs that I'm now convinced was clock related (vis-a-vis syncing 3 x RME cards to ADAT sync and/or WC sync which was being generated from a standalone clock and 3 x MECs, each of which was compounding errors due to the latency between the EDS cards) and could likely have been solved by either getting a MADI based RME system or going with something like I've got here now. So far, this Pulsar system is like having Paris stability/latency on a native system and slaves flawlessly to Paris with no wierdness at all. Had I listened to Dimitrios a year ago and taken this plunge into the unknown, I would have saved myself a year of grief.
;o)
Deej

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4570ac34@linux...
>
> Hey Dedric,
>
> OK, I had to look it up:
>
> My dual 2.5GHZ G5 cost about $1200 additional in 2004 after selling my
> previous dual 1GHZ G4. I can't say that's all that expensive for the jump
> in processing power, especially considering the many things the system
> gets used for here.
>
> I think Deej has me beat in having higher computer costs, and probably
> most everyone else here, too, who has been building machines and replacing
> them over and over in the last few years. And that's not even counting the
> time it takes to build them and debug the problems we hear about.
>
> Meanwhile the trusty G5 still does all the tracks and AU/FX plugins I
> need. In fact it's gotten better with the periodic Logic updates, OSX
> updates and updates from plugin vendors, the system has gotten more solid
> and capable over time.
>
> So I don't need to buy another computer for audio. Priceless. :^)
>
> Any further studio computer upgrading here will be due to
> graphics/animation/video production. Although the G5 is doing reasonably
> well in those areas, too (was one reason I got it), so there's no big rush
> to upgrade.
>
> I agree that it's a matter of going with what works best for whatever you
> do. And also, what you value in the process.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie

> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> Hey Lamont - I probably did misinterpret. I don't disagree about the
>> advantages of hybrid/dsp at all.
>> I think most everyone on this board knows the pros and cons both ways,
>> and most all of us have quite a bit of experience building
>> systems (except Mac users perhaps ;-). After all, part of the admission
>> fee here is that you be a bit of a DAW/gear slut. ;-)
>>
>> Even Mac users have to admit it gets expensive buying a new Mac every 3
>> years or so just to gain more power to
>> run VSTi's and plugins that demand it (depending on the user's
>> requirements of course). However, that is no different with dsp rigs.
>> You end up adding $5000 Accel cards to an HD rig to add more power,
>> unless you start with HD3 and never need more than that.
>> So the costs are actually relative. You don't save money by going with
>> ProTools or Soundscape or Fairlight, you just spend it in a different
>> way,
>> and once you add in the cost of comparable plugins in TDM format, you do
>> spend more, no way around it really. It's a matter of going with
>> what works best and makes you more productive and profitable.
>>
>> As Chris pointed out in another post, native is most common in the pro
>> realm for composing and sound design (which is most
>> of what I do, along with audio post - hence my interest in Fairlight).
>>
>> I also agree with him that dedicated dsp plugin cards are getting a bit
>> long in the tooth.
>> Imho, it's time for Fairlight to get out of their closed market mindset
>> and release CC-1 as a standalone generic dsp engine
>> for DAWs, plugins, etc (or more likely, time for other developers to get
>> on board with it - could be in the
>> works already from the way it sounds....). Or perhaps Clearspeed will
>> eventually have some DAW applications.
>>
>> The goal for dsp/hybird I prefer is a more open platform so we can begin
>> to merge our preferences in native and dsp into
>> a truely expandable environment - more flexibiltiy and upgradeability
>> with that approach - better longterm investment, imho.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45704a29$1@linux...
>>> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the
>>> guys

>>> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and
>>> tribulations
>>> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much
>>> apart
>>> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP
>>> based
>>> (for me) position.
>>>
>>> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi
>>> PC)I
>>> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
>>> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot
>>> of
>>> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe
>>> an
>>> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>>>
>>>
>>> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>>>
>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I
>>>> know
>>>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for
>>>> himself.
>>> I
>>>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>>>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio
>>>> consulting
>>>> advice.
>>>>
>>>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC
>>>> or
>>>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools,
>>>> Soundscape,
>>>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those
>>>> systems
>>>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>>>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>>>
>>>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>>>
>>>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now,
>>>> not
>>>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>>>
>>>> Best of luck!
>>>>

>>>> Dedric

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"

>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>> Chris and others,

>>>>>

>>>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time

>>> on

>>>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..

>>>>>

>>>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very

>>> old.

>>>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant.

>>>>> But,

>>>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it"..

>>>>> :)

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>>>>>> Hi Dedric,

>>>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what

>>>>>> I've seen and tested so far.

>>>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run

>>>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k

>>>>>> buffer.

>>>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done

>>> to

>>>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo

>>>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really

>>>>>> like

>>>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at

>>>>>> least

>>>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've

>>>>>> tested.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same

>>>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card

>>>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than

>>>>>> the

>>>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be
>>> on
>>>>>>   pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
>>> you
>>>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name
>>>>>> will
>>>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that
>>>>>> you
>>>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I
>>>>>> can
>>>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>> I can't speak for an Athlon 64/4000, but on my X2 4400 I run a
>>>>>>> similar
>>>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound
>>>>>>> design,
>>>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>>>>>>> this system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I've also run some projects of 50-100 tracks with plugins without
>>>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo
>>>>>>> (xeon),
>>>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core
>>>>>>> duos
>>>>>>> are slightly better performers than AMD chips at the moment - at
>>>>>>> least
>>>>>>> from specs I'm seeing from DAW builders. A quad core is the
>>>>>>> fastest,
>>>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
>>> and
>>>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
>>> of
>>>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
>>> FSB
>>>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the
>>>>>>> FSB -blows
>>>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>> --
>>>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>>>
>>>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by chuck duffy on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 14:43:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Actually really wish that dead-end things like the UAD and TC power
core and various firewire DSP would stop dicking around and just write
native plug-ins. I really think they are just using the hardware as
giant dongles now. I'd rather have a tiny USB one."

AMEN CHRIS!

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>HI Lamont,
>
>
>Lamont wrote:

>> Hey Neil,
>> No, I was not only talking about Pro-Tools. But a little perspective. There
>> are still alot (read more) Pro-Tool Mix3 setups than HD setups. So, you don;t
>> have to upgrade the various Digi setups if you wan to..
>
>
>Well maybe the converters :)
>>
>> I was talking about PAris, Pro Tools, Soundscape..Radar.
>>
>Paris would really be the only one that was close enough functionality
>wise to be compared to Pro Tools. The other are really just glorified
>hard disk recorders.
>
>
>> P.S.
>> I personaly would not for over the money for the Creamware stuff for summing.
>
>ditto.
>
>>
>> The truth of the matter toimprover your ITB summing, just get a decent analog
>> or digital mixer(Mackie..Yamaha 01x 02r,). Most of the current summing boxes
>> are nothing more than the forementioed mixers without the faders.. Electronic
>> Musician did a summing shoot-out this year and the results were astounding.:
>> needless to say , that a mackie VLZ summed just as good as most of the 5k
>> summing boxes. So that should tell you something and it should tell you that
>> by add a better mixer to sum than the DAW is all that's needed..
>>
>> I use a Soundcraft Ghost console to sum for now, and yesit even improves
>> Paris stereo imaging. For Neundo and Pro Tools, it takes it to another level.
>>
>>
>
>Although I'd rather wish they would do the mixers in a rack mount form
>with out the automation and faders just the routing/ summing and effects

>type parts.
>
>Actually really wish that dead-end things like the UAD and TC power
>core and various firewire DSP would stop dicking around and just write

>native plug-ins. I really think they are just using the hardware as
>giant dongles now. I'd rather have a tiny USB one.
>
>I'd rather see these DSP people put the effects on the external
>converters or purely digital I/O like MADI. Then be able to add DSP
>chips to the boxes to be able ti add more processing power to the units.
>But I don't see that happening see that happening soon.
>
>>
>>
>
>>
>
>Chris
>
>--
>Chris Ludwig
>
>ADK Pro Audio
>(859) 635-5762
>www.adkproaudio.com
>chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 15:33:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Deej,

$1K in computer parts for all your variations and multiple systems since
2004, that's pretty good. I would have guessed higher. Certainly the
labor and distraction is higher, but if you enjoy that then it isn't so
much of a penalty. OTOH if/when you don't, then it is.

Add in your DSP FX stuff for things I'm doing native and you have me
beat by far in straight investment layout. But then the question
becomes: "what sounds best?" And that's subjective. There isn't an easy
answer. "Listen to Dimitrios" is pretty good. Or just "listen." :^)

In Neil's test I preferred the native Cubase mix over the PARIS mix,
which was interesting. I don't know if Cubase and Logic sound similar
but I wouldn't be too surprised if they do. Did I prefer native because
I'm used to mixing in Logic? Or is it because I've always liked a more
open sound? Or is it because Neil didn't mix for the same sound in all
scenarios but just left things flat for the test (a valid approach)?
It's hard to say. I liked my PARIS mixes when I was using it, and I like
my Logic mixes now. My guess is I can find my preferred sounds within

the toolsets of both.

I'm not in the school that sez everyone must have the same system.
Diversity is great, choice is good. I enjoy hearing technical tales
about struggles in the shared quest to make great music. I've walked a
long path from 4 track to DAW myself.

I think the road I'm on now is simpler, more integrated and probably
ultimately more affordable than the path you're on at this point, but
our subjective levels of satisfaction may be comparable, now that things
are finally working for both of us.

Cheers,
  -Jamie
  www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:
> Jamie,
>
> I'd say my computer costs were around $1000.00, but yeah, the time it took
> to find the magic bullet was pretty unbelievable this time around. My
> problem was stability between the two DAWs that I'm now convinced was clock
> related (vis-a-vis syncing 3 x RME cards to ADAT sync and/or WC sync which
> was being generated from a standalone clock and 3 x MECs, each of which was
> compounding errors due to the latency between the EDS cards) and could
> likely have been solved by either getting a MADI based RME system or going
> with something like I've got here now. So far, this Pulsar system is like
> having Paris stability/latency on a native system and slaves flawlessly to
> Paris with no wierdness at all. Had I listened to Dimitrios a year ago and
> taken this plunge into the unknown, I would have saved myself a year of
> grief.
> ;o)
> Deej
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4570ac34@linux...
>> Hey Dedric,
>>
>> OK, I had to look it up:
>>
>> My dual 2.5GHZ G5 cost about $1200 additional in 2004 after selling my
>> previous dual 1GHZ G4. I can't say that's all that expensive for the jump
>> in processing power, especially considering the many things the system
>> gets used for here.
>>
>> I think Deej has me beat in having higher computer costs, and probably
>> most everyone else here, too, who has been building machines and replacing
>> them over and over in the last few years. And that's not even counting the

>> time it takes to build them and debug the problems we hear about.
>>
>> Meanwhile the trusty G5 still does all the tracks and AU/FX plugins I
>> need. In fact it's gotten better with the periodic Logic updates, OSX
>> updates and updates from plugin vendors, the system has gotten more solid
>> and capable over time.
>>
>> So I don't need to buy another computer for audio. Priceless. :^)
>>
>> Any further studio computer upgrading here will be due to
>> graphics/animation/video production. Although the G5 is doing reasonably
>> well in those areas, too (was one reason I got it), so there's no big rush
>> to upgrade.
>>
>> I agree that it's a matter of going with what works best for whatever you
>> do. And also, what you value in the process.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>> Hey Lamont - I probably did misinterpret. I don't disagree about the
>>> advantages of hybrid/dsp at all.
>>> I think most everyone on this board knows the pros and cons both ways,
>>> and most all of us have quite a bit of experience building
>>> systems (except Mac users perhaps ;-). After all, part of the admission
>>> fee here is that you be a bit of a DAW/gear slut. ;-)
>>>
>>> Even Mac users have to admit it gets expensive buying a new Mac every 3
>>> years or so just to gain more power to
>>> run VSTi's and plugins that demand it (depending on the user's
>>> requirements of course). However, that is no different with dsp rigs.
>>> You end up adding $5000 Accel cards to an HD rig to add more power,
>>> unless you start with HD3 and never need more than that.
>>> So the costs are actually relative. You don't save money by going with
>>> ProTools or Soundscape or Fairlight, you just spend it in a different
>>> way,
>>> and once you add in the cost of comparable plugins in TDM format, you do
>>> spend more, no way around it really. It's a matter of going with
>>> what works best and makes you more productive and profitable.
>>>
>>> As Chris pointed out in another post, native is most common in the pro
>>> realm for composing and sound design (which is most
>>> of what I do, along with audio post - hence my interest in Fairlight).
>>>
>>> I also agree with him that dedicated dsp plugin cards are getting a bit

>>> long in the tooth.
>>> Imho, it's time for Fairlight to get out of their closed market mindset
>>> and release CC-1 as a standalone generic dsp engine
>>> for DAWs, plugins, etc (or more likely, time for other developers to get
>>> on board with it - could be in the
>>> works already from the way it sounds....). Or perhaps Clearspeed will
>>> eventually have some DAW applications.
>>>
>>> The goal for dsp/hybird I prefer is a more open platform so we can begin
>>> to merge our preferences in native and dsp into
>>> a truely expandable environment - more flexibiltiy and upgradeability
>>> with that approach - better longterm investment, imho.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45704a29$1@linux...
>>>> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the
>>>> guys
>>>> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and
>>>> tribulations
>>>> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much
>>>> apart
>>>> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP
>>>> based
>>>> (for me) position.
>>>>
>>>> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi
>>>> PC)I
>>>> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
>>>> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot
>>>> of
>>>> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe
>>>> an
>>>> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I
>>>>> know
>>>>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for
>>>>> himself.
>>>> I
>>>>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>>>>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio
>>>>> consulting

>>>>> advice.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC
>>>>> or
>>>>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools,
>>>>> Soundscape,
>>>>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those
>>>>> systems
>>>>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>>>>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>>>>
>>>>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>>>>
>>>>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now,
>>>>> not
>>>>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>>>>
>>>>> Best of luck!
>>>>>
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Chris and others,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time
>>>> on
>>>>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very
>>>> old.
>>>>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant.
>>>>>> But,
>>>>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it"..
>>>>>> :)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Hi Dedric,
>>>>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>>>>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>>>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>>>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k
>>>>>>> buffer.

>>>>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
>>>> to
>>>>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>>>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really
>>>>>>> like
>>>>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at
>>>>>>> least
>>>>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've
>>>>>>> tested.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be
>>>> on
>>>>>>>   pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
>>>> you
>>>>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name
>>>>>>> will
>>>>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that
>>>>>>> you
>>>>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I
>>>>>>> can
>>>>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>>> I can't speak for an Athlon 64/4000, but on my X2 4400 I run a

>>>>>>>> similar
>>>>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound
>>>>>>>> design,
>>>>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>>>>>>>> this system.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I've also run some projects of 50-100 tracks with plugins without
>>>>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo
>>>>>>>> (xeon),
>>>>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core
>>>>>>>> duos
>>>>>>>> are slightly better performers than AMD chips at the moment - at
>>>>>>>> least
>>>>>>>> from specs I'm seeing from DAW builders. A quad core is the
>>>>>>>> fastest,
>>>>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
>>>> and
>>>>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
>>>> of
>>>>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
>>>> FSB
>>>>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the
>>>>>>>> FSB -blows
>>>>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> --
>>>>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 16:14:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dedric Terry wrote:
> Hey Jamie,
>
> You and the other Mac users know we PC users just give you a hard time
> because your comps have fruit on them. ;-)

Jealousy is such an ugly thing. I'll send you a banana sticker. ;^)

> For my work, the only limit on what I could use is what I can afford (hence
> spaced upgrades have more to do with budget than obsolescence or problems) -
> the same would be true if I were using Macs though.

Yeah, most of us have to work within some sort of budget.

Over the years Mac critics, me among them, have argued that Macs are
more expensive. Too expensive. And I had other, technical, criticisms of
previous generations of Macs.

However, more recently the value proposition has improved, and OSX is a
huge step forward for Apple.

Although the old perceptions have inertia, the reality, from my current
experience, is much better.

> I actually keep the older machines around for offline tasks and network use
> (effects/VSTi slaves, video playback, backup storage, etc). I just recently
> retired my G4 450 (former Paris Mac) and passed it along to my son for
> learning software, games, etc (he's 6, so it's more than enough for him).

I have an old Pentium box lying around that cost around $3k. It
depreciated almost immediately and wasn't worth selling, so I kept it
for BeOS, Linux and compatibility with old Wi98 stuff just in case. It
now sits with my beloved Amigas in retirement and watches the action
happening on the OSX box.

My G5 is fast enough that I don't need other computers slaved for FX or
instrument plugins. That makes things much simpler. The G5 can also
address enough HD space that I don't need another server or, for that
matter, a network. It has enough RAM (currently 2.5GB, can address up to

---

8GB) to do a reasonable amount of multitasking.

It's really convenient to do it all on one fast, capable box in the
studio. Less bailing wire, duct tape and magic incantations needed to
hold it all together. :^)

Almost no administration time needed.

> BTW - speaking of intense animation, probably old news, but there's an HD
> video online from Animusic - I like some of their other work better, but fun
> all the same:
> http://www.apple.com/quicktime/guide/hd/animusic2dvd.html

Clever stuff. I saw another one of those a while back that also
impressed me.

Cheers,
 -Jamie
 www.JamieKrutz.com

> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> PS: I'm starting to consider selling my HP laptop and getting a Macbook for
> net/email, etc, simply to be able to have both platforms handy. Just not
> sure how well I can integrate it into the studio at the moment to justify it
> though.
>
>
> On 12/1/06 3:37 PM, in article 4570ac34@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> Hey Dedric,
>>
>> OK, I had to look it up:
>>
>> My dual 2.5GHZ G5 cost about $1200 additional in 2004 after selling my
>> previous dual 1GHZ G4. I can't say that's all that expensive for the
>> jump in processing power, especially considering the many things the
>> system gets used for here.
>>
>> I think Deej has me beat in having higher computer costs, and probably
>> most everyone else here, too, who has been building machines and
>> replacing them over and over in the last few years. And that's not even
>> counting the time it takes to build them and debug the problems we hear
>> about.

>>
>> Meanwhile the trusty G5 still does all the tracks and AU/FX plugins I
>> need. In fact it's gotten better with the periodic Logic updates, OSX
>> updates and updates from plugin vendors, the system has gotten more
>> solid and capable over time.
>>
>> So I don't need to buy another computer for audio. Priceless. :^)
>>
>> Any further studio computer upgrading here will be due to
>> graphics/animation/video production. Although the G5 is doing reasonably
>> well in those areas, too (was one reason I got it), so there's no big
>> rush to upgrade.
>>
>> I agree that it's a matter of going with what works best for whatever
>> you do. And also, what you value in the process.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>> Hey Lamont - I probably did misinterpret. I don't disagree about the
>>> advantages of hybrid/dsp at all.
>>> I think most everyone on this board knows the pros and cons both ways, and
>>> most all of us have quite a bit of experience building
>>> systems (except Mac users perhaps ;-). After all, part of the admission fee
>>> here is that you be a bit of a DAW/gear slut. ;-)
>>>
>>> Even Mac users have to admit it gets expensive buying a new Mac every 3
>>> years or so just to gain more power to
>>> run VSTi's and plugins that demand it (depending on the user's requirements
>>> of course). However, that is no different with dsp rigs.
>>> You end up adding $5000 Accel cards to an HD rig to add more power, unless
>>> you start with HD3 and never need more than that.
>>> So the costs are actually relative. You don't save money by going with
>>> ProTools or Soundscape or Fairlight, you just spend it in a different way,
>>> and once you add in the cost of comparable plugins in TDM format, you do
>>> spend more, no way around it really. It's a matter of going with
>>> what works best and makes you more productive and profitable.
>>>
>>> As Chris pointed out in another post, native is most common in the pro realm
>>> for composing and sound design (which is most
>>> of what I do, along with audio post - hence my interest in Fairlight).
>>>
>>> I also agree with him that dedicated dsp plugin cards are getting a bit long
>>> in the tooth.
>>> Imho, it's time for Fairlight to get out of their closed market mindset and

>>> release CC-1 as a standalone generic dsp engine
>>> for DAWs, plugins, etc (or more likely, time for other developers to get on
>>> board with it - could be in the
>>> works already from the way it sounds....). Or perhaps Clearspeed will
>>> eventually have some DAW applications.
>>>
>>> The goal for dsp/hybird I prefer is a more open platform so we can begin to
>>> merge our preferences in native and dsp into
>>> a truely expandable environment - more flexibiltiy and upgradeability with
>>> that approach - better longterm investment, imho.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45704a29$1@linux...
>>>> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the guys
>>>> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and tribulations
>>>> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much
>>>> apart
>>>> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this pro-DSP
>>>> based
>>>> (for me) position.
>>>>
>>>> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi
>>>> PC)I
>>>> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that after
>>>> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot of
>>>> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe an
>>>> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I know
>>>>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for himself.
>>>> I
>>>>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>>>>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio
>>>>> consulting
>>>>> advice.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a PC or
>>>>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools, Soundscape,
>>>>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those systems
>>>>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>>>>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>>>>

>>>>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>>>>
>>>>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now, not
>>>>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>>>>
>>>>> Best of luck!
>>>>>
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Chris and others,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much time
>>>> on
>>>>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting very
>>>> old.
>>>>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant.
>>>>>> But,
>>>>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it".. :)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Hi Dedric,
>>>>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from what
>>>>>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>>>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me run
>>>>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k buffer.
>>>>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've done
>>>> to
>>>>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo
>>>>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really
>>>>>>> like
>>>>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at
>>>>>>> least
>>>>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've tested.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than the
>>>>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will be
>>>> on
>>>>>>>   pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet. Basically
>>>>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as you
>>>> you
>>>>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name
>>>>>>> will
>>>>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that you
>>>>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the test
>>>>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I can
>>>>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>>> I can't speak for an Athlon 64/4000, but on my X2 4400 I run a similar
>>>>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound design,
>>>>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily on
>>>>>>>> this system.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I've also run some projects of 50-100 tracks with plugins without
>>>>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo (xeon),
>>>>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core duos
>>>>>>>> are slightly better performers than AMD chips at the moment - at least
>>>>>>>> from specs I'm seeing from DAW builders. A quad core is the fastest,
>>>>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for tracking
>>>> and
>>>>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some sort
>>>> of
>>>>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building a
>>>>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with an
>>>> FSB
>>>>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the
>>>>>>>> FSB -blows
>>>>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to run
>>>>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of course
>>>>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of track
>>>>>>>>   counts folks are getting.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> --
>>>>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 16:24:35 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

LaMont wrote:
> this whole vintage craze is really playing on the
> fears of users who are so desperate to make a"Hit-Record" hat they want evey
> out-board peice of gear that was used n a given hit-record. These folks don't
> realize that although you may be able o purchase that old Putec, you'll never
> be able to purchase : Talent, and song-writing /arranging skills..

Well put, LaMont.

I think the tools are at the point where it's possible to create an
excellent mix on anything from Garage Band on up.

The most important piece of gear is a discerning brain connected to a
good, working set of ears.

Cheers,

-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by LaMont on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 16:31:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Chris,
Great points..!!
you wrote:
Although I'd rather wish they would do the mixers in a rack mount form with
out the automation and faders just the routing/ summing and effects type
parts.

-The Neve rack mixer(summing) is becoming the go unit for ITB mixing. I only
used he Ghost because it was such a great deal and great performance. a true
hidden gem..

You wrote:
Actually really wish that dead-end things like the UAD and TC power core
and various firewire DSP would stop dicking around and just write native
plug-ins. I really think they are just using the hardware as giant dongles
now. I'd rather have a tiny USB one.

I totally agree! That's why I have not purchased a UAD card nor a Powercore
to this day. I true rip-off dongle.(IMHO)

They recently interviewd the UAD guys and the big question was put to them:
'Why not add more power to the card"?

UAD: answer was : Because they could not find a "cost-effective "DSp that
would not raise the price of the card???

So, that to me sounds like: To keep their profit margins, they want to keep
keep using "Cheap" "Video" cards that today our cost is around 30 bucks.
UAD is so cheap they don't want add any addiotional DSP or go with a newer
NVIDIA or card to give their customers more DSP juice. What a rip-off..

I can do a good mix with some Waves, SSL-Waves, URS, Sonalkis, McDSPs, and
some others. Of courese PAris plugis. I don't need UAD in it's preset state.

Vendors like Vintagekings and other vinage pro0audio dealers and manufactuers
are getting away with grand-larceny these days. Yes ,I do belive in free
market blah blah.. But, this whole vintage craze is really playing on the
fears of users who are so desperate to make a"Hit-Record" hat they want evey
out-board peice of gear that was used n a given hit-record. These folks don't
realize that although you may be able o purchase that old Putec, you'll never

be able to purchase : Talent, and song-writing /arranging skills..
Stupid. Then you have all these so-called summing mixers that are no more
boutique than the man on the moon. But, you know how the pro-audio hype bandwagon
starts,..Now, most feel that they must have a 5k summing mixer to make great
records.

And let's not get into the whold Mic-Pre/ Microphone rip-offs these days..

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>HI Lamont,
>
>
>Lamont wrote:
>> Hey Neil,
>> No, I was not only talking about Pro-Tools. But a little perspective.
There
>> are still alot (read more) Pro-Tool Mix3 setups than HD setups. So, you
don;t
>> have to upgrade the various Digi setups if you wan to..
>
>
>Well maybe the converters :)
>>
>> I was talking about PAris, Pro Tools, Soundscape..Radar.
>>
>Paris would really be the only one that was close enough functionality
>wise to be compared to Pro Tools. The other are really just glorified
>hard disk recorders.
>
>
>> P.S.
>> I personaly would not for over the money for the Creamware stuff for summing.
>
>ditto.
>
>>
>> The truth of the matter toimprover your ITB summing, just get a decent
analog
>> or digital mixer(Mackie..Yamaha 01x 02r,). Most of the current summing
boxes
>> are nothing more than the forementioed mixers without the faders.. Electronic
>> Musician did a summing shoot-out this year and the results were astounding.:
>> needless to say , that a mackie VLZ summed just as good as most of the
5k
>> summing boxes. So that should tell you something and it should tell you

that
>> by add a better mixer to sum than the DAW is all that's needed..
>>
>> I use a Soundcraft Ghost console to sum for now, and yesit even improves
>> Paris stereo imaging. For Neundo and Pro Tools, it takes it to another
level.
>>
>>
>
>Although I'd rather wish they would do the mixers in a rack mount form
>with out the automation and faders just the routing/ summing and effects

>type parts.
>
>Actually really wish that dead-end things like the UAD and TC power
>core and various firewire DSP would stop dicking around and just write
>native plug-ins. I really think they are just using the hardware as
>giant dongles now. I'd rather have a tiny USB one.
>
>I'd rather see these DSP people put the effects on the external
>converters or purely digital I/O like MADI. Then be able to add DSP
>chips to the boxes to be able ti add more processing power to the units.
>But I don't see that happening see that happening soon.
>
>>
>>
>
>>
>
>Chris
>
>--
>Chris Ludwig
>
>ADK Pro Audio
>(859) 635-5762
>www.adkproaudio.com
>chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by LaMont on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 16:36:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Why Not you ask.?
Well, wasting time for the un-known. When, ther are proven "know' summing
solutions that already rock..

Just because somebody takes a a PCI card summing approach, does not mean that a digital mixer approach is not supperior.Which it is..Plus, you go down to your loac Pro-audio storea adn actually try it out before you buy..

Mainly, I belive in PCI summing(Paris), but Most DAW users often mix the boat and have not realized thethe great benefits in a having a Digital mixer to you DAW..

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>
>>> P.S.
>>> I personaly would not for over the money for the Creamware stuff for summing.
>>
>>ditto.
>
>Why not? If you (Lamont) are willing to fork over $2k for a
>digital mixer, and you can fork over $750 instead & get a
>"digimixerinabox", what's the difference? ASSUMING it does, in
>fact, work well for summing - I'll admit I dunno yet... will
>find out in a week or so & you guys can determine for
>yourselves, since I'll post some more summing comparison clips
>at that time.
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by DJ on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 16:51:12 GMT

Hey Jamie,

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45719a46@linux...
>
> Hey Deej,
>
> $1K in computer parts for all your variations and multiple systems since
> 2004, that's pretty good. I would have guessed higher.

I was only referring to the DAW running Cubase SX. Not the audio hardware. My Paris computer has been the same since 2003 but if you lumped them together and took into account a new HD here and there, yeh.I've spent a bundle. Add the Audio hardware and it's a pretty big bundle. Not the equivalent of a HD3 system, but not cheap either. I've got 3 x RME cards sitting here in boxes right now that I may EBay pretty soon to rcover the

costs of part of this bundle

Certainly the
> labor and distraction is higher, but if you enjoy that then it isn't so
> much of a penalty. OTOH if/when you don't, then it is.

Well, I enjoy learning about this stuff, getting my hands dirty and my brain
fried.
>
> Add in your DSP FX stuff for things I'm doing native and you have me beat
> by far in straight investment layout.

O'yeah......4 x UAD-1 cards plus the plugins for them and 3 x Magma's do add
up. Still, I'm nowhere near a PT HD system.

But then the question
> becomes: "what sounds best?" And that's subjective.

Agreed. A lot of my rig involved just seeing if I could pull it off because
I was curious (or maybe obsessed ;o)

There isn't an easy
> answer. "Listen to Dimitrios" is pretty good. Or just "listen." :^)

Well, Dimitrios has been telling me about the Pulsars for a while. I was
seeking stability more then anything else after being at war with the RME
system for a year and never achieving a reliable sync situation. It was
workable, but during mixes, I could depend on a total lockup *at least*once
every hour and sometimes more often. I had Cubase set to automatically
backup my projects every 3 minutes so I seldom lost anything unless I was
doing editing when it happened. It was very frustrating. My thinking was to
try the Pulsars and possibly change my mode of working to mixing native
because I didn't expect this dual DAW scenario to be any more stable so I
figured I'd end up setting Paris aside and use the Pulsars. Having this
clocking stability was a very happy accident actually. I didn't expect it at
all. If the Pulsars didn't work, I was going to go with a MADI system but it
really was wayyyy more than I wanted to spend and didn't really have the I/O
options that I needed without spending a fortune on overkill.
>
> In Neil's test I preferred the native Cubase mix over the PARIS mix, which
> was interesting. I don't know if Cubase and Logic sound similar but I
> wouldn't be too surprised if they do. Did I prefer native because I'm used
> to mixing in Logic? Or is it because I've always liked a more open sound?
> Or is it because Neil didn't mix for the same sound in all scenarios but
> just left things flat for the test (a valid approach)? It's hard to say.

I liked Neil's mixes too. All of them. The differences were subtle though I
immediately picked the Paris mix as being the *most* pleasing to my ear. Was

it borne of familiarity with the sonic footprint rather than the superiority
of the sonic footprint????...well, like you said, it's subjective and I'm
sure that familiarity had something to do with it. One reason I work the way
I do is because I like it. Tracking in Paris is just so effortless for me
and mixing on both platforms is something I'm comfortable with. In some
ways, it's a PITA, but in others it's extremely flexible and easy to use to
achieve certain things.

I liked my PARIS mixes when I was using it, and I like
> my Logic mixes now. My guess is I can find my preferred sounds within the
> toolsets of both.

So it's all good. We get pretty overwound by the details involved in this
stuff (speaking generally now as referring to engineers) but that's in our
nature as anal retentive perfectionistic types and I think that whether
one's primary focus in this endeavor is as a musician/producer or as an
engineer, the devil is always in the details at some point. It's the thing
that makes the studio world go 'round.
>
> I'm not in the school that sez everyone must have the same system.
> Diversity is great, choice is good. I enjoy hearing technical tales about
> struggles in the shared quest to make great music. I've walked a long path
> from 4 track to DAW myself.

Well, that's good, 'cause otherwise, you would have probably hired a hit man
to shut me up by now. ;oD

>
> I think the road I'm on now is simpler, more integrated and probably
> ultimately more affordable than the path you're on at this point, but our
> subjective levels of satisfaction may be comparable, now that things are
> finally working for both of us.

I'm going to be exploring the possibilities of this Scope system with the
thought in mind of eventually migrating to a native platform. This will
involve jumping through a few hoops and mapping a controller to the mixer. I
haven't decided which one yet and I'm not in any hurry. The Scope mixer and
routing is what I always dreamed Paris would be. Unfortunately, VST plugins
cannot be integrated into it without a third party VST application so the
jury is still out as to using it as my mix platform. They do have some nice,
high quality plugins and I am starting to explore them. they also have a
standalone recording app called VDAT and some kind of editor too, but it's
pretty hard to beat Cubase for VST integration and editing (and I'm sure
Logic is just as powerful).
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com

Take care,

Deej
>
>
> DJ wrote:
>> Jamie,
>>
>> I'd say my computer costs were around $1000.00, but yeah, the time it
>> took to find the magic bullet was pretty unbelievable this time around.
>> My problem was stability between the two DAWs that I'm now convinced was
>> clock related (vis-a-vis syncing 3 x RME cards to ADAT sync and/or WC
>> sync which was being generated from a standalone clock and 3 x MECs, each
>> of which was compounding errors due to the latency between the EDS cards)
>> and could likely have been solved by either getting a MADI based RME
>> system or going with something like I've got here now. So far, this
>> Pulsar system is like having Paris stability/latency on a native system
>> and slaves flawlessly to Paris with no wierdness at all. Had I listened
>> to Dimitrios a year ago and taken this plunge into the unknown, I would
>> have saved myself a year of grief.
>> ;o)
>> Deej
>>
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4570ac34@linux...
>>> Hey Dedric,
>>>
>>> OK, I had to look it up:
>>>
>>> My dual 2.5GHZ G5 cost about $1200 additional in 2004 after selling my
>>> previous dual 1GHZ G4. I can't say that's all that expensive for the
>>> jump in processing power, especially considering the many things the
>>> system gets used for here.
>>>
>>> I think Deej has me beat in having higher computer costs, and probably
>>> most everyone else here, too, who has been building machines and
>>> replacing them over and over in the last few years. And that's not even
>>> counting the time it takes to build them and debug the problems we hear
>>> about.
>>>
>>> Meanwhile the trusty G5 still does all the tracks and AU/FX plugins I
>>> need. In fact it's gotten better with the periodic Logic updates, OSX
>>> updates and updates from plugin vendors, the system has gotten more
>>> solid and capable over time.
>>>
>>> So I don't need to buy another computer for audio. Priceless. :^)
>>>
>>> Any further studio computer upgrading here will be due to

>>> graphics/animation/video production. Although the G5 is doing reasonably
>>> well in those areas, too (was one reason I got it), so there's no big
>>> rush to upgrade.
>>>
>>> I agree that it's a matter of going with what works best for whatever
>>> you do. And also, what you value in the process.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>> Hey Lamont - I probably did misinterpret. I don't disagree about the
>>>> advantages of hybrid/dsp at all.
>>>> I think most everyone on this board knows the pros and cons both ways,
>>>> and most all of us have quite a bit of experience building
>>>> systems (except Mac users perhaps ;-). After all, part of the
>>>> admission fee here is that you be a bit of a DAW/gear slut. ;-)
>>>>
>>>> Even Mac users have to admit it gets expensive buying a new Mac every 3
>>>> years or so just to gain more power to
>>>> run VSTi's and plugins that demand it (depending on the user's
>>>> requirements of course). However, that is no different with dsp rigs.
>>>> You end up adding $5000 Accel cards to an HD rig to add more power,
>>>> unless you start with HD3 and never need more than that.
>>>> So the costs are actually relative. You don't save money by going with
>>>> ProTools or Soundscape or Fairlight, you just spend it in a different
>>>> way,
>>>> and once you add in the cost of comparable plugins in TDM format, you
>>>> do spend more, no way around it really. It's a matter of going with
>>>> what works best and makes you more productive and profitable.
>>>>
>>>> As Chris pointed out in another post, native is most common in the pro
>>>> realm for composing and sound design (which is most
>>>> of what I do, along with audio post - hence my interest in Fairlight).
>>>>
>>>> I also agree with him that dedicated dsp plugin cards are getting a bit
>>>> long in the tooth.
>>>> Imho, it's time for Fairlight to get out of their closed market mindset
>>>> and release CC-1 as a standalone generic dsp engine
>>>> for DAWs, plugins, etc (or more likely, time for other developers to
>>>> get on board with it - could be in the
>>>> works already from the way it sounds....). Or perhaps Clearspeed will
>>>> eventually have some DAW applications.
>>>>
>>>> The goal for dsp/hybird I prefer is a more open platform so we can
>>>> begin to merge our preferences in native and dsp into

>>>> a truely expandable environment - more flexibiltiy and upgradeability
>>>> with that approach - better longterm investment, imho.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:45704a29$1@linux...
>>>>> Dedric, I think you mis interpreted my post. Ilove what Chris and the
>>>>> guys
>>>>> do. My post was about just reading about variuous trials and
>>>>> tribulations
>>>>> and the cost fator of being on DAW upgrade path, which I was very much
>>>>> apart
>>>>> of the trend :) I was just recently(Jan 06)that I've taken this
>>>>> pro-DSP based
>>>>> (for me) position.
>>>>>
>>>>> As a person who has (1 Paris PC, 2-NativeNeundo PCs, 1 Giga PC, 1 VSTi
>>>>> PC)I
>>>>> pretty much quality as a PC -DAW gear slut. But, I reconnized that
>>>>> after
>>>>> my last mega (Dual-Dual-core Opteron setup), that I was spending a lot
>>>>> of
>>>>> money for a solution that frankly, i could've purchased a HD1 or maybe
>>>>> an
>>>>> HD2..But, that's just me.. I prefer DSP based systems than Native.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> I too build DAWS-in my neck of the woods(Michgan) for studios,
>>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>> Lamont - Chris and ADK build native DAWs as a business. As far as I
>>>>>> know
>>>>>> they don't sell ProTools or Soundscape, but Chris can speak for
>>>>>> himself.
>>>>> I
>>>>>> for one appreciate his participation, contribution and advice in PC
>>>>>> discussions here and don't see how it is contradictory to studio
>>>>>> consulting
>>>>>> advice.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you prefer dsp based, that's great. I can't see how upgrading a
>>>>>> PC or
>>>>>> Mac is more expensive than upgrading a dsp DAW a la ProTools,
>>>>>> Soundscape,
>>>>>> etc. Then consider that you still have a PC or Mac running those
>>>>>> systems

>>>>>> that will have to be upgraded at some point, in some form (e.g. a new
>>>>>> version of PT software comes out, a new conversion tool update, etc).
>>>>>>
>>>>>> And if you want to run Giga, NI softsynths, etc...same thing.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> And fwiw, we were advising Mike R. on what options are out there now,
>>>>>> not
>>>>>> talking about updating our PCs once a month.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Best of luck!
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 12/1/06 8:49 AM, in article 457040f5$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Chris and others,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This is the reason I prefer DSP based DAWS. We spend way too much
>>>>>>> time
>>>>> on
>>>>>>> PC/MAc upgrades, chip-sets, what won't play with what..etc..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> You're constantly on the DAW upgrade path which to me,is getting
>>>>>>> very
>>>>> old.
>>>>>>> This is strange coming from a DaW builder and studio DAW consultant.
>>>>>>> But,
>>>>>>> I've had enough. After my last Opteron upgrade, I said "That's it"..
>>>>>>> :)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hi Dedric,
>>>>>>>> The Core2 based system seems to be the lowest latency setup from
>>>>>>>> what
>>>>>>>> I've seen and tested so far.
>>>>>>>> The Quad core that I'm using in the home system atm is letting me
>>>>>>>> run
>>>>>>>> projects at the lowest latency of my Fireface 800 which is 48k
>>>>>>>> buffer.
>>>>>>>> I haven't been able to get any demo project or project that I've
>>>>>>>> done
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> choke at that latency. I had to redo our in house Cubase/Nuendo

>>>>>>>> benchmark just to push the damn thing. The 3 UAD cards don't really
>>>>>>>> like
>>>>>>>> the latency that low. They seem more stable at 128 and higher lol.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> There is performance hits on the Xeons at the low latencies but at
>>>>>>>> least
>>>>>>>> with the quad core Xeons the extra horse power makes up for it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The Core 2 Quad runs circles around any Dual-Core Opterons I've
>>>>>>>> tested.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Here is the bench mark we use currently. It's based on the same
>>>>>>>> methodology of the infamous Blofelds test but with out sound card
>>>>>>>> performance issues. I haven't tried this on many machine other than
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> Opterons, Xeons and quads so not even sure what results there will
>>>>>>>> be
>>>>> on
>>>>>>>> pre-Core 2 Duo system or a AMD X2/AM2 system. I just finished it
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Haven't had a chance to right all the instructions out yet.
>>>>>>>> Basically
>>>>>>>> load the project at 1024 buffer load as many magneto plug ins as
>>>>>>>> you
>>>>> you
>>>>>>>> can then save the project under a new name. Adding 1024 to the name
>>>>>>>> will
>>>>>>>> help keep track of the versions. Reload the project to confirm that
>>>>>>>> you
>>>>>>>> can run that number of plug ins. make note of the number.
>>>>>>>> Close the program then reopen the default project and repeat the
>>>>>>>> test
>>>>>>>> for each latency setting.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If you have any problem or suggestion for the test let me know so I
>>>>>>>> can
>>>>>>>> fine tune it if needed.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> http://www.adkproaudio.com/downloads/set_me_free_benchmark.z ip
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Thanks Chris
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:

>>>>>>>>> I can't speak for an Athlon 64/4000, but on my X2 4400 I run a
>>>>>>>>> similar
>>>>>>>>> setup at low latency all the time for commercial spots, sound
>>>>>>>>> design,
>>>>>>>>> etc. I also have a full orchestral template that will run easily
>>>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>>>> this system.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I've also run some projects of 50-100 tracks with plugins without
>>>>>>>>> problems as well.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> If you are building, consider an Intel core duo, dual core duo
>>>>>>>>> (xeon),
>>>>>>>>> or if you have the budget, and quad core system. The Intel core
>>>>>>>>> duos
>>>>>>>>> are slightly better performers than AMD chips at the moment - at
>>>>>>>>> least
>>>>>>>>> from specs I'm seeing from DAW builders. A quad core is the
>>>>>>>>> fastest,
>>>>>>>>> but there seem to be diminishing returns on dual quad cores.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> On 11/29/06 9:52 AM, in article 456d8e00@linux, "Mike R."
>>>>>>>>> <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>   While I'm definately going to continue to use Paris for
>>>>>>>>> tracking
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>   mixing, I've been thinking more and more about getting some
>>>>>>>>> sort
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>   in the box solution for writing. I'm thinking about building
>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>   computer around an Athlon 64 4000 and some sort of mobo with
>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>> FSB
>>>>>>>>>   around 1000mhz (I can't believe that sort of speed on the
>>>>>>>>> FSB -blows
>>>>>>>>>   me away everytime I think about it..) I'd like to be able to
>>>>>>>>> run
>>>>>>>>>   about five to six synths, three verbs on fx sends, and of
>>>>>>>>> course
>>>>>>>>>   several comp plugs and eq's etc on the various channels. I'm
>>>>>>>>>   wondering if anyone has a similar set up and what sort of
>>>>>>>>> track
>>>>>>>>>   counts folks are getting.

```
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> --
>>>>>>>> Chris Ludwig
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> ADK Pro Audio
>>>>>>>> (859) 635-5762
>>>>>>>> www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>
```

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 17:00:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 12/2/06 9:14 AM, in article 4571a3d1@linux, "Jamie K"
<Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> Hey Jamie,
>>
>> You and the other Mac users know we PC users just give you a hard time
>> because your comps have fruit on them. ;-)
>
> Jealousy is such an ugly thing. I'll send you a banana sticker. ;^)
>

Excellent! Although a vegetable would be great... I think Broccoli would
make a great computer logo. ;-)

> Over the years Mac critics, me among them, have argued that Macs are
> more expensive. Too expensive. And I had other, technical, criticisms of
> previous generations of Macs.
>
> However, more recently the value proposition has improved, and OSX is a
> huge step forward for Apple.
>
> Although the old perceptions have inertia, the reality, from my current
> experience, is much better.

You are exactly right here - price vs. performance was once a significant
difference, but the new Intel Macs are right in line with comparable off the
shelf PCs. Of course one can still save $200-$400 building a PC vs. the
same config in a Mac, but not buying off-the-shelf. I tend to defend PCs to
some degree, but the new Macs are very nice.
>
> My G5 is fast enough that I don't need other computers slaved for FX or

> instrument plugins. That makes things much simpler. The G5 can also
> address enough HD space that I don't need another server or, for that
> matter, a network. It has enough RAM (currently 2.5GB, can address up to
> 8GB) to do a reasonable amount of multitasking.
>
For me the multiple systems are needed for orchestral libraries, and PC or
Mac, that's pretty much standard for composing (there are guys in LA I've
talked with using even larger rigs).

With hundreds of articulations required for a score, there isn't a single
box that I could use to run a full complement. And what I could load into a
current PC/Mac will usually only account for about 30 seconds of scoring in
one style/tempo.

I am guessing that with 64G of Ram in a quad quad core or dual octo core we
might get closer to moving large scale orchestration to only one or two
systems, but the low latency capabilities in the dual quads aren't scaling
as expected yet. But even then we'll probably just be using 24/96k sample
libraries to continue the networking requirements. It really isn't any
different than running outboard samplers/synths. Not quite as convenient as
running everything in one system, but also not as bad as it sounds (actually
quite liberating to know that the percussion section will always be there -
no dropped timpani rolls during French horn crescendos :-)

Then if I add in other cpu/ram/disk streaming intensive VSTi's, full screen
DV resolution video playback, the faster/more the better - I already have an
extra PC is dedicated to full screen video (not unlike using a VCube or deck
really).

Regards,
Dedric

> It's really convenient to do it all on one fast, capable box in the
> studio. Less bailing wire, duct tape and magic incantations needed to
> hold it all together. :^)
>
> Almost no administration time needed.
>
>
>> BTW - speaking of intense animation, probably old news, but there's an HD
>> video online from Animusic - I like some of their other work better, but fun
>> all the same:
>> http://www.apple.com/quicktime/guide/hd/animusic2dvd.html
>
> Clever stuff. I saw another one of those a while back that also
> impressed me.
>
> Cheers,

> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 17:45:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 12/2/06 9:31 AM, in article 45719c34$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
> They recently interviewd the UAD guys and the big question was put to them:
> 'Why not add more power to the card"?
>
> UAD: answer was : Because they could not find a "cost-effective "DSp that
> would not raise the price of the card???

UA is a very small company. This is the same necessity of survival that
has locked Digidesign into using Motorola dsps that are far from cutting
edge.

It's very expensive to change course completely with dsp or cpu based
development, or start from scratch without $5,000,000 in development budget
and base a product around a higher end dsp, *and* expect it to pay for
itself.

Joe Bryan addressed this in an interview with Sound on Sound a year or two
ago. They didn't have a ton of capital at startup, so the card had to be
affordable to sell enough to pay for itself, and feasible for a limited
development team. Fairlight has taken a more expensive development route
with the CC-1. That's probably part of the reason they are only bundling it
with Dream systems, and selling different track counts/processing capability
levels as licenses at different price points - to ensure they make up the
heavy development cost.

I'm not trying to defend UA other than understanding their business model.
But imho, too many users seem to blame companies for trying to run a
profitable business when the same users are making equally biased decisions
for exactly the same reason: wanting cheaper more capable products in order
to spend less and make more; or buy marketing hype because xyz producer made
a hit record with that gear.

I do agree the vintage gear craze is absurd beyond belief. To me there is
some great character and quality in some vintage gear, but not all has the
quality available today. There is way too much "follow the leader" bad

engineering going on, and companies are all to happy to appeal to whatever sells.

Dedric

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by DJ on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 18:26:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Neil,

The Cubase editor works for me because I usually end up arranging the songs during the mix. We have a bunch of drop-dead, unbelievable musicians here. One of my session players, Gary Cook has been voted national flatpicking champion and mandolin god of the universe at quite a few festival venues. There are others around here who are at that level, fiddle players, dobroists, pianists, etc. We're talking Nashville session player level. Gary is buddies with Tony Rice and a bunch of that crew in Tennessee and has hangs with/records with Charlie Daniels and his band quite a bit (no slouches in that band). Our pianist was Toby Keiths pianist for many years and has a lot of Nashville session experience. these guys can just walk in the door and create magic. What my partner and I do a lot of here is get a guitar/vocal track happening to some kind of simple rythym/click-I usually use Groove Agent. Then we bring in a bass player and drummer and nail down the rythym section. After that we bring in the rest of the players. We usually have arrangements for them and they are rehearsed so there is a general direction this should go and these guys are good so we can usually get the basics down PDQ........but then the fun starts because these guys are mostly disgustingly egotistical virtuosos so we just turn them loose and let them go nuts all over the basic arrangement until they wear themselves out. Once all of this mayhem is finished, the comping starts. 90% of the noodling around gets shitcanned but the other 10% is golden and comes directly from the freedom we give these guys to have fun. My job is usually to integrate these snippets into the song as hooks or whatever and arrange everything so that it integrates well. I'll grab a cool lick on a guitar, a cool lick on a fiddle or mando or whatever and make a hook out of it, find a part of another instrument that counterpoints it and go to town. The Cubase editor works extremely well for this and if I need to pitch a note up or down a cent or two to achieve a nice harmonic between two instruments in a solo or whatever, then it's done quickly. Also, the fadesins/outs between tracks are so easily managed as well as basic gain changes, rendering of FX (if desired), etc. It has just spoiled me rotten. I just find it much easier/more intuitive than the Paris editor.
;o)

"Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4571bbb9$1@linux...

>
> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>>but it's
>>pretty hard to beat Cubase for VST integration and editing
>
> Deej, I've seen you rave about the Cubase editing features a
> lot... what kind of editing do you find yourself doing? The
> reason I ask is that any editing I have to do is pretty much
> simple stuff like crossfading punches, moving the xfades around
> so they're in the least noticeable place, the occasional snip
> to get rid of an extraneous string noise or vocal artifact
> ("hack!, mmmmrgh, AHEM!")   lol; and that's about it, really...
> am I missing the boat on something really cool here with regard
> to more enhanced editing capabilities?
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by DJ on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 18:29:36 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I tend to defend PCs to
some degree, but the new Macs are very nice.

Yep!!! I agree..especially because they can run Windows

;oD

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C196FF25.5D82%dterry@keyofd.net...
> On 12/2/06 9:14 AM, in article 4571a3d1@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>> Hey Jamie,
>>>
>>> You and the other Mac users know we PC users just give you a hard time
>>> because your comps have fruit on them. ;-)
>>
>> Jealousy is such an ugly thing. I'll send you a banana sticker. ;^)
>>
>
> Excellent! Although a vegetable would be great... I think Broccoli would
> make a great computer logo. ;-)
>
>> Over the years Mac critics, me among them, have argued that Macs are
>> more expensive. Too expensive. And I had other, technical, criticisms of

>> previous generations of Macs.
>>
>> However, more recently the value proposition has improved, and OSX is a
>> huge step forward for Apple.
>>
>> Although the old perceptions have inertia, the reality, from my current
>> experience, is much better.
>
> You are exactly right here - price vs. performance was once a significant
> difference, but the new Intel Macs are right in line with comparable off
> the
> shelf PCs. Of course one can still save $200-$400 building a PC vs. the
> same config in a Mac, but not buying off-the-shelf. I tend to defend PCs
> to
> some degree, but the new Macs are very nice.
>>
>> My G5 is fast enough that I don't need other computers slaved for FX or
>> instrument plugins. That makes things much simpler. The G5 can also
>> address enough HD space that I don't need another server or, for that
>> matter, a network. It has enough RAM (currently 2.5GB, can address up to
>> 8GB) to do a reasonable amount of multitasking.
>>
> For me the multiple systems are needed for orchestral libraries, and PC or
> Mac, that's pretty much standard for composing (there are guys in LA I've
> talked with using even larger rigs).
>
> With hundreds of articulations required for a score, there isn't a single
> box that I could use to run a full complement. And what I could load into
> a
> current PC/Mac will usually only account for about 30 seconds of scoring
> in
> one style/tempo.
>
> I am guessing that with 64G of Ram in a quad quad core or dual octo core
> we
> might get closer to moving large scale orchestration to only one or two
> systems, but the low latency capabilities in the dual quads aren't scaling
> as expected yet. But even then we'll probably just be using 24/96k sample
> libraries to continue the networking requirements. It really isn't any
> different than running outboard samplers/synths. Not quite as convenient
> as
> running everything in one system, but also not as bad as it sounds
> (actually
> quite liberating to know that the percussion section will always be
> there -
> no dropped timpani rolls during French horn crescendos :-)
>
> Then if I add in other cpu/ram/disk streaming intensive VSTi's, full

> screen
> DV resolution video playback, the faster/more the better - I already have
> an
> extra PC is dedicated to full screen video (not unlike using a VCube or
> deck
> really).
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
>> It's really convenient to do it all on one fast, capable box in the
>> studio. Less bailing wire, duct tape and magic incantations needed to
>> hold it all together. :^)
>>
>> Almost no administration time needed.
>>
>>
>>> BTW - speaking of intense animation, probably old news, but there's an
>>> HD
>>> video online from Animusic - I like some of their other work better, but
>>> fun
>>> all the same:
>>> http://www.apple.com/quicktime/guide/hd/animusic2dvd.html
>>
>> Clever stuff. I saw another one of those a while back that also
>> impressed me.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by neil[1] on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 18:45:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>but it's
>pretty hard to beat Cubase for VST integration and editing

Deej, I've seen you rave about the Cubase editing features a
lot... what kind of editing do you find yourself doing? The
reason I ask is that any editing I have to do is pretty much
simple stuff like crossfading punches, moving the xfades around
so they're in the least noticeable place, the occasional snip

to get rid of an extraneous string noise or vocal artifact
("hack!, mmmmrgh, AHEM!")   lol; and that's about it, really...
am I missing the boat on something really cool here with regard
to more enhanced editing capabilities?

Neil

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by DJ on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 18:46:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I talked to Tom Freeman at UA week before last. They've got something new up
their sleeve but nobody's taking yet.

;o)

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C19709D4.5D89%dterry@keyofd.net...
> On 12/2/06 9:31 AM, in article 45719c34$1@linux, "LaMont"
> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> They recently interviewd the UAD guys and the big question was put to
>> them:
>> 'Why not add more power to the card"?
>>
>> UAD: answer was : Because they could not find a "cost-effective "DSp that
>> would not raise the price of the card???
>
> UA is a very small company. This is the same necessity of survival that
> has locked Digidesign into using Motorola dsps that are far from cutting
> edge.
>
> It's very expensive to change course completely with dsp or cpu based
> development, or start from scratch without $5,000,000 in development
> budget
> and base a product around a higher end dsp, *and* expect it to pay for
> itself.
>
> Joe Bryan addressed this in an interview with Sound on Sound a year or two
> ago. They didn't have a ton of capital at startup, so the card had to be
> affordable to sell enough to pay for itself, and feasible for a limited
> development team. Fairlight has taken a more expensive development route
> with the CC-1. That's probably part of the reason they are only bundling
> it
> with Dream systems, and selling different track counts/processing
> capability

> levels as licenses at different price points - to ensure they make up the
> heavy development cost.
>
> I'm not trying to defend UA other than understanding their business model.
> But imho, too many users seem to blame companies for trying to run a
> profitable business when the same users are making equally biased
> decisions
> for exactly the same reason: wanting cheaper more capable products in
> order
> to spend less and make more; or buy marketing hype because xyz producer
> made
> a hit record with that gear.
>
> I do agree the vintage gear craze is absurd beyond belief. To me there is
> some great character and quality in some vintage gear, but not all has the
> quality available today. There is way too much "follow the leader" bad
> engineering going on, and companies are all to happy to appeal to whatever
> sells.
>
> Dedric
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 19:03:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dedric Terry wrote:
> On 12/2/06 9:14 AM, in article 4571a3d1@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
> You are exactly right here - price vs. performance was once a significant
> difference, but the new Intel Macs are right in line with comparable off the
> shelf PCs. Of course one can still save $200-$400 building a PC vs. the
> same config in a Mac, but not buying off-the-shelf. I tend to defend PCs to
> some degree, but the new Macs are very nice.

It's natural to defend a purchase. But no matter what I buy, the bottom
line is we need multiple choices in the marketplace to keep the
competitive pressure on. It benefits everyone who buys any particular
type of computer to have at least some tiny semblance of a competitive
market. It would be great to have more choices than we do.

So I actually don't want everyone to buy what I use. A market with only
one solution available is not a market.

>> My G5 is fast enough that I don't need other computers slaved for FX or
>> instrument plugins. That makes things much simpler. The G5 can also
>> address enough HD space that I don't need another server or, for that
>> matter, a network. It has enough RAM (currently 2.5GB, can address up to
>> 8GB) to do a reasonable amount of multitasking.
>>
> For me the multiple systems are needed for orchestral libraries, and PC or
> Mac, that's pretty much standard for composing (there are guys in LA I've
> talked with using even larger rigs).

I can report unequivocally that here, with a pretty good test case,
there is simply no need for a second machine to run instrument plugins.

I use an orchestral library, GPO, and another, the VSL subset included
with Kontakt 2. G5 handles them no sweat. My piano main library is 35GB
of samples. No problem on the G5. I have just about every form of
synthesis in plugin format for sound design. I have a decent selection
of sample libraries. The G5 handles it all. I can layer Audio Unit
instruments until the cows come home. And I don't even have cows! :^)

If I ever exceed the CPU capabilities, I can simply freeze tracks. But I
haven't need to do that on this machine, at least so far.

Logic does offer multi-machine support of its native plugins, so I could
add another machine if I needed. But I haven't been pinched for
processing power on the G5. 5GHZ on a pair of RISC chips is a lot of CPU
cycles.

Consider: The G5 is probably 5X the speed of my last machine, which was
maybe 8x the speed of the one before that. This box can address much
more RAM. It has much faster HD access and multiple ways to connect more
of them, over a TB here. Realistically, I already have the speed of
multiple machines in one box. OSX supports multi-processors,
multithreading, preemptive multitasking, dynamic RAM allocation, virtual
memory, all in a user-transparent way.

Lessee, right now I have fourteen main apps up including Logic, which
itself is running half a dozen Audio Units (B4II, Kontakt 2, Ivory,
EVP88, Pro53, EVD6 at the moment). A light morning; I still have plenty
of memory and processor cycles to spare.

The newer boxes are even faster than my several year old wonder (and 8
processor cores are the next big thing), so I would say the days of
needing to hassle with a second box are over, at least on the Mac with
Logic and 3rd party Audio Units.

I can't speak for older systems or different designs, but if a multi-box
system is working OK for someone, they may as well keep using it, why not?

> With hundreds of articulations required for a score, there isn't a single
> box that I could use to run a full complement. And what I could load into a
> current PC/Mac will usually only account for about 30 seconds of scoring in
> one style/tempo.

Wow, really? I need to hear one of your scores. Clearly we're having
different experiences. What libraries do you use?

> I am guessing that with 64G of Ram in a quad quad core or dual octo core we
> might get closer to moving large scale orchestration to only one or two
> systems, but the low latency capabilities in the dual quads aren't scaling
> as expected yet. But even then we'll probably just be using 24/96k sample
> libraries to continue the networking requirements. It really isn't any
> different than running outboard samplers/synths. Not quite as convenient as
> running everything in one system, but also not as bad as it sounds (actually
> quite liberating to know that the percussion section will always be there -
> no dropped timpani rolls during French horn crescendos :-)

Heh. My timpani and horns are very good about not dropping out, (that
is, ever since that one Logic bug was finally fixed, grrrr!) and they
all live happily on one box.

> Then if I add in other cpu/ram/disk streaming intensive VSTi's, full screen
> DV resolution video playback, the faster/more the better - I already have an
> extra PC is dedicated to full screen video (not unlike using a VCube or deck
> really).

I used to sync via SMPTE to a BetaCamSP deck. Now I run the video in
Logic, too, as Quicktime. Very slick, SMPTE offset, automatic scene
detection, import/export audio from the video. I've also used Soundtrack
Pro in a similar way, but much prefer to compose in Logic. Either way,
it's all on one box.

Cheers,
 -Jamie
 www.JamieKrutz.com

> Regards,
> Dedric
>
>> It's really convenient to do it all on one fast, capable box in the
>> studio. Less bailing wire, duct tape and magic incantations needed to

>> hold it all together. :^)
>>
>> Almost no administration time needed.
>>
>>
>>> BTW - speaking of intense animation, probably old news, but there's an HD
>>> video online from Animusic - I like some of their other work better, but fun
>>> all the same:
>>> http://www.apple.com/quicktime/guide/hd/animusic2dvd.html
>> Clever stuff. I saw another one of those a while back that also
>> impressed me.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 19:09:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That sounds like fun! It's nice to hear about the magic making side of
your experience. The highest end gear in your studio walks in on legs.

Cheers,
 -Jamie
 www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:
> Hi Neil,
>
> The Cubase editor works for me because I usually end up arranging the songs
> during the mix. We have a bunch of drop-dead, unbelievable musicians here.
> One of my session players, Gary Cook has been voted national flatpicking
> champion and mandolin god of the universe at quite a few festival venues.
> There are others around here who are at that level, fiddle players,
> dobroists, pianists, etc. We're talking Nashville session player level. Gary
> is buddies with Tony Rice and a bunch of that crew in Tennessee and has
> hangs with/records with Charlie Daniels and his band quite a bit (no
> slouches in that band). Our pianist was Toby Keiths pianist for many years
> and has a lot of Nashville session experience. these guys can just walk in
> the door and create magic. What my partner and I do a lot of here is get a
> guitar/vocal track happening to some kind of simple rythym/click-I usually
> use Groove Agent. Then we bring in a bass player and drummer and nail down

> the rythym section. After that we bring in the rest of the players. We
> usually have arrangements for them and they are rehearsed so there is a
> general direction this should go and these guys are good so we can usually
> get the basics down PDQ........but then the fun starts because these guys
> are mostly disgustingly egotistical virtuosos so we just turn them loose and
> let them go nuts all over the basic arrangement until they wear themselves
> out. Once all of this mayhem is finished, the comping starts. 90% of the
> noodling around gets shitcanned but the other 10% is golden and comes
> directly from the freedom we give these guys to have fun. My job is usually
> to integrate these snippets into the song as hooks or whatever and arrange
> everything so that it integrates well. I'll grab a cool lick on a guitar, a
> cool lick on a fiddle or mando or whatever and make a hook out of it, find a
> part of another instrument that counterpoints it and go to town. The Cubase
> editor works extremely well for this and if I need to pitch a note up or
> down a cent or two to achieve a nice harmonic between two instruments in a
> solo or whatever, then it's done quickly. Also, the fadesins/outs between
> tracks are so easily managed as well as basic gain changes, rendering of FX
> (if desired), etc. It has just spoiled me rotten. I just find it much
> easier/more intuitive than the Paris editor.
> ;o)
>
>
> "Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4571bbb9$1@linux...
>> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>>> but it's
>>> pretty hard to beat Cubase for VST integration and editing
>> Deej, I've seen you rave about the Cubase editing features a
>> lot... what kind of editing do you find yourself doing? The
>> reason I ask is that any editing I have to do is pretty much
>> simple stuff like crossfading punches, moving the xfades around
>> so they're in the least noticeable place, the occasional snip
>> to get rid of an extraneous string noise or vocal artifact
>> ("hack!, mmmmrgh, AHEM!")   lol; and that's about it, really...
>> am I missing the boat on something really cool here with regard
>> to more enhanced editing capabilities?
>>
>> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by DJ on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 19:25:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's funny Jamie. I've always been able to pick up an inanimate object and
figure out how to get something melodic out of it, I learned to play my
grandmother's Hammond organ and piano by ear but I've never learned to read

music. In my younger days I was a fairly proficient guitarist but I really
haven't played an instrument in years and I'm so rusty/incompetent now that
I sorta' cringe when I pick one up. I would love to have the luxury of
having time to practice and of going back to school and study music and
arranging. I've always had a bit of an ear for it though I seldom have any
idea at all what I'm after at the beginning. I just sorta jump into it like
a kid doing a cannonball into a swimming pool and flail around until
something I like spills over the rim.

;o)

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4571ccf4@linux...
>
> That sounds like fun! It's nice to hear about the magic making side of
> your experience. The highest end gear in your studio walks in on legs.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> DJ wrote:
>> Hi Neil,
>>
>> The Cubase editor works for me because I usually end up arranging the
>> songs during the mix. We have a bunch of drop-dead, unbelievable
>> musicians here. One of my session players, Gary Cook has been voted
>> national flatpicking champion and mandolin god of the universe at quite a
>> few festival venues. There are others around here who are at that level,
>> fiddle players, dobroists, pianists, etc. We're talking Nashville session
>> player level. Gary is buddies with Tony Rice and a bunch of that crew in
>> Tennessee and has hangs with/records with Charlie Daniels and his band
>> quite a bit (no slouches in that band). Our pianist was Toby Keiths
>> pianist for many years and has a lot of Nashville session experience.
>> these guys can just walk in the door and create magic. What my partner
>> and I do a lot of here is get a guitar/vocal track happening to some kind
>> of simple rythym/click-I usually use Groove Agent. Then we bring in a
>> bass player and drummer and nail down the rythym section. After that we
>> bring in the rest of the players. We usually have arrangements for them
>> and they are rehearsed so there is a general direction this should go and
>> these guys are good so we can usually get the basics down PDQ........but
>> then the fun starts because these guys are mostly disgustingly
>> egotistical virtuosos so we just turn them loose and let them go nuts all
>> over the basic arrangement until they wear themselves out. Once all of
>> this mayhem is finished, the comping starts. 90% of the noodling around
>> gets shitcanned but the other 10% is golden and comes directly from the
>> freedom we give these guys to have fun. My job is usually to integrate
>> these snippets into the song as hooks or whatever and arrange everything

>> so that it integrates well. I'll grab a cool lick on a guitar, a cool
>> lick on a fiddle or mando or whatever and make a hook out of it, find a
>> part of another instrument that counterpoints it and go to town. The
>> Cubase editor works extremely well for this and if I need to pitch a note
>> up or down a cent or two to achieve a nice harmonic between two
>> instruments in a solo or whatever, then it's done quickly. Also, the
>> fadesins/outs between tracks are so easily managed as well as basic gain
>> changes, rendering of FX (if desired), etc. It has just spoiled me
>> rotten. I just find it much easier/more intuitive than the Paris editor.
>> ;o)
>>
>>
>> "Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4571bbb9$1@linux...
>>> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>>>> but it's
>>>> pretty hard to beat Cubase for VST integration and editing
>>> Deej, I've seen you rave about the Cubase editing features a
>>> lot... what kind of editing do you find yourself doing? The
>>> reason I ask is that any editing I have to do is pretty much
>>> simple stuff like crossfading punches, moving the xfades around
>>> so they're in the least noticeable place, the occasional snip
>>> to get rid of an extraneous string noise or vocal artifact
>>> ("hack!, mmmmrgh, AHEM!")   lol; and that's about it, really...
>>> am I missing the boat on something really cool here with regard
>>> to more enhanced editing capabilities?
>>>
>>> Neil
>>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by LaMont on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 19:40:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Good Post Decric ..

There was this debate (last year) on gearslutz about the UAD card issue and
it was an overwhelming fact that most of the users would gladly pay "more"
money for a "faster" DSP card..

And to be honest, I think I would galdly pay more for the UAD if it had more
horsepower than he current model(s).

Soemthing not quite right in UAD land with concernng the UAD powered plugins
business model. Factor in this :

-Their plugins have never been hacked, nor iare being sold on the black market.

So, unlike other Plugin manufactuers, their seeing a real profit and not
loses on plugins.
So what gives..??

c Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>On 12/2/06 9:31 AM, in article 45719c34$1@linux, "LaMont"
><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> They recently interviewd the UAD guys and the big question was put to
them:
>> 'Why not add more power to the card"?
>>
>> UAD: answer was : Because they could not find a "cost-effective "DSp that
>> would not raise the price of the card???
>
>UA is a very small company. This is the same necessity of survival that
>has locked Digidesign into using Motorola dsps that are far from cutting
>edge.
>
>It's very expensive to change course completely with dsp or cpu based
>development, or start from scratch without $5,000,000 in development budget
>and base a product around a higher end dsp, *and* expect it to pay for
>itself.
>
>Joe Bryan addressed this in an interview with Sound on Sound a year or two
>ago. They didn't have a ton of capital at startup, so the card had to be
>affordable to sell enough to pay for itself, and feasible for a limited
>development team. Fairlight has taken a more expensive development route
>with the CC-1. That's probably part of the reason they are only bundling
it
>with Dream systems, and selling different track counts/processing capability
>levels as licenses at different price points - to ensure they make up the
>heavy development cost.
>
>I'm not trying to defend UA other than understanding their business model.
>But imho, too many users seem to blame companies for trying to run a
>profitable business when the same users are making equally biased decisions
>for exactly the same reason: wanting cheaper more capable products in order
>to spend less and make more; or buy marketing hype because xyz producer
made
>a hit record with that gear.
>
>I do agree the vintage gear craze is absurd beyond belief. To me there
is
>some great character and quality in some vintage gear, but not all has the
>quality available today. There is way too much "follow the leader" bad

>engineering going on, and companies are all to happy to appeal to whatever
>sells.
>
>Dedric
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 19:44:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I like that image - the reflexes of swimming are similar to the reflexes
of making music in a group, diving in, taking risks, splashing around
and seeing what everyone does with it, having fun.

There are some great books and web sites on arranging if you do get some
time to spare. Maybe now that your system is coalescing you can spend
less time on that and free up some time for books and arranging exploration.

I just got together with another drummer who is giving me tips on kit
techniques to help me to my next level on drums in exchange for music
theory lessons to help him to his next level on both drums and
keyboards. The first lesson went great and I'll be practicing ghost
notes on snare this week...

Cheers,
 -Jamie
 www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:
> It's funny Jamie. I've always been able to pick up an inanimate object and
> figure out how to get something melodic out of it, I learned to play my
> grandmother's Hammond organ and piano by ear but I've never learned to read
> music. In my younger days I was a fairly proficient guitarist but I really
> haven't played an instrument in years and I'm so rusty/incompetent now that
> I sorta' cringe when I pick one up. I would love to have the luxury of
> having time to practice and of going back to school and study music and
> arranging. I've always had a bit of an ear for it though I seldom have any
> idea at all what I'm after at the beginning. I just sorta jump into it like
> a kid doing a cannonball into a swimming pool and flail around until
> something I like spills over the rim.
>
> ;o)
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4571ccf4@linux...
>> That sounds like fun! It's nice to hear about the magic making side of
>> your experience. The highest end gear in your studio walks in on legs.

>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>> Hi Neil,
>>>
>>> The Cubase editor works for me because I usually end up arranging the
>>> songs during the mix. We have a bunch of drop-dead, unbelievable
>>> musicians here. One of my session players, Gary Cook has been voted
>>> national flatpicking champion and mandolin god of the universe at quite a
>>> few festival venues. There are others around here who are at that level,
>>> fiddle players, dobroists, pianists, etc. We're talking Nashville session
>>> player level. Gary is buddies with Tony Rice and a bunch of that crew in
>>> Tennessee and has hangs with/records with Charlie Daniels and his band
>>> quite a bit (no slouches in that band). Our pianist was Toby Keiths
>>> pianist for many years and has a lot of Nashville session experience.
>>> these guys can just walk in the door and create magic. What my partner
>>> and I do a lot of here is get a guitar/vocal track happening to some kind
>>> of simple rythym/click-I usually use Groove Agent. Then we bring in a
>>> bass player and drummer and nail down the rythym section. After that we
>>> bring in the rest of the players. We usually have arrangements for them
>>> and they are rehearsed so there is a general direction this should go and
>>> these guys are good so we can usually get the basics down PDQ........but
>>> then the fun starts because these guys are mostly disgustingly
>>> egotistical virtuosos so we just turn them loose and let them go nuts all
>>> over the basic arrangement until they wear themselves out. Once all of
>>> this mayhem is finished, the comping starts. 90% of the noodling around
>>> gets shitcanned but the other 10% is golden and comes directly from the
>>> freedom we give these guys to have fun. My job is usually to integrate
>>> these snippets into the song as hooks or whatever and arrange everything
>>> so that it integrates well. I'll grab a cool lick on a guitar, a cool
>>> lick on a fiddle or mando or whatever and make a hook out of it, find a
>>> part of another instrument that counterpoints it and go to town. The
>>> Cubase editor works extremely well for this and if I need to pitch a note
>>> up or down a cent or two to achieve a nice harmonic between two
>>> instruments in a solo or whatever, then it's done quickly. Also, the
>>> fadesins/outs between tracks are so easily managed as well as basic gain
>>> changes, rendering of FX (if desired), etc. It has just spoiled me
>>> rotten. I just find it much easier/more intuitive than the Paris editor.
>>> ;o)
>>>
>>>
>>> "Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4571bbb9$1@linux...
>>>> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>>>>> but it's

>>>>> pretty hard to beat Cubase for VST integration and editing
>>>> Deej, I've seen you rave about the Cubase editing features a
>>>> lot... what kind of editing do you find yourself doing? The
>>>> reason I ask is that any editing I have to do is pretty much
>>>> simple stuff like crossfading punches, moving the xfades around
>>>> so they're in the least noticeable place, the occasional snip
>>>> to get rid of an extraneous string noise or vocal artifact
>>>> ("hack!, mmmmrgh, AHEM!")   lol; and that's about it, really...
>>>> am I missing the boat on something really cool here with regard
>>>> to more enhanced editing capabilities?
>>>>
>>>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by LaMont on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 19:45:19 GMT

Neil if I may
I use Neundo, which Cuabse is based off of:
I too have ben raving about neundo/SX editing since it's inception. Here's
why:

Hightlight a given track, right-mouse click..Boom.. It's all there for the
chosing.
-Process a track -normalize, volume/down, add convolution, cut,copy,posy,
Silence..

-Right-mouse click..Process with either Dirrectx or vst plugins..

I don;t knwo about you, but the right mouse click, is what set's the Steinbergs
apart from all other DAWS.. That's speed and power.

"Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>>but it's
>>pretty hard to beat Cubase for VST integration and editing
>
>Deej, I've seen you rave about the Cubase editing features a
>lot... what kind of editing do you find yourself doing? The
>reason I ask is that any editing I have to do is pretty much
>simple stuff like crossfading punches, moving the xfades around
>so they're in the least noticeable place, the occasional snip
>to get rid of an extraneous string noise or vocal artifact
>("hack!, mmmmrgh, AHEM!")   lol; and that's about it, really...

>am I missing the boat on something really cool here with regard
>to more enhanced editing capabilities?
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by DJ on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 20:04:58 GMT

They are making a profit and having a life with it?

;o)

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:4571c8a4$1@linux...
>
> Good Post Decric ..
>
> There was this debate (last year) on gearslutz about the UAD card issue
> and
> it was an overwhelming fact that most of the users would gladly pay "more"
> money for a "faster" DSP card..
>
> And to be honest, I think I would galdly pay more for the UAD if it had
> more
> horsepower than he current model(s).
>
> Soemthing not quite right in UAD land with concernng the UAD powered
> plugins
> business model. Factor in this :
>
> -Their plugins have never been hacked, nor iare being sold on the black
> market.
>
> So, unlike other Plugin manufactuers, their seeing a real profit and not
> loses on plugins.
> So what gives..??
>
>
> c Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>On 12/2/06 9:31 AM, in article 45719c34$1@linux, "LaMont"
>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> They recently interviewd the UAD guys and the big question was put to
> them:
>>> 'Why not add more power to the card"?
>>>

>>> UAD: answer was : Because they could not find a "cost-effective "DSp
>>> that
>>> would not raise the price of the card???
>>
>>UA is a very small company. This is the same necessity of survival that
>>has locked Digidesign into using Motorola dsps that are far from cutting
>>edge.
>>
>>It's very expensive to change course completely with dsp or cpu based
>>development, or start from scratch without $5,000,000 in development
>>budget
>>and base a product around a higher end dsp, *and* expect it to pay for
>>itself.
>>
>>Joe Bryan addressed this in an interview with Sound on Sound a year or two
>>ago. They didn't have a ton of capital at startup, so the card had to be
>>affordable to sell enough to pay for itself, and feasible for a limited
>>development team. Fairlight has taken a more expensive development route
>>with the CC-1. That's probably part of the reason they are only bundling
> it
>>with Dream systems, and selling different track counts/processing
>>capability
>>levels as licenses at different price points - to ensure they make up the
>>heavy development cost.
>>
>>I'm not trying to defend UA other than understanding their business model.
>>But imho, too many users seem to blame companies for trying to run a
>>profitable business when the same users are making equally biased
>>decisions
>>for exactly the same reason: wanting cheaper more capable products in
>>order
>>to spend less and make more; or buy marketing hype because xyz producer
> made
>>a hit record with that gear.
>>
>>I do agree the vintage gear craze is absurd beyond belief. To me there
> is
>>some great character and quality in some vintage gear, but not all has the
>>quality available today. There is way too much "follow the leader" bad
>>engineering going on, and companies are all to happy to appeal to whatever
>>sells.
>>
>>Dedric
>>
>

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4571cb6a@linux...
>> With hundreds of articulations required for a score, there isn't a single
>> box that I could use to run a full complement. And what I could load into
>> a
>> current PC/Mac will usually only account for about 30 seconds of scoring
>> in
>> one style/tempo.
>
> Wow, really? I need to hear one of your scores. Clearly we're having
> different experiences. What libraries do you use?

I'm using East West's Quantum Leap Symphonic XP library at the moment: 38G
total. For some things
I then add Symphonic Choirs at 35G (just one section (e.g. sopranos) uses
most of my free Ram).
Then factor in Stormdrum, Kontakt 2, Absynth, and numerous other VSTi's for
more varied, or modern/cinematic uses
and it adds up really fast. EW actually recommends up to 8 PCs for their
platinum library (24-bit).
The composers I've chatted with a few times in LA use 300 track templates
for composing, mutliple
PCs and a large number of outboard samplers/synths - usually 50-100 inputs.
Although I'm not anywhere
near that scale of outboard gear, I can see, and feel the need to greatly
expand my rig in my work more and more now.

I'm getting ready to put together a rather involved and dynamic piece for a
new demo - I'll email you a link when it's done.

> Heh. My timpani and horns are very good about not dropping out, (that is,
> ever since that one Logic bug was finally fixed, grrrr!) and they all live
> happily on one box.
>
That really depends on the percussionist though. Some guys are more
reliable than others, esp. if they are former
rock drummers. ;-) Hey, the trumpet player fell asleep during my
wedding....didn't even take a timpani roll to
get him to drop out. He did come back for the recessional though. :-)

With a larger templates I use up most of my Ram, and since one of the
crescendo Fr.Horn instruments I use is actually a mod-wheel dynamic
crossfade of three sample sets,
as are the timpani modwheel crossfade instruments, they tend to suck down
any remaining ram and cpu power very fast
when a lot of other instruments are loaded and running.

> I used to sync via SMPTE to a BetaCamSP deck. Now I run the video in
> Logic, too, as Quicktime. Very slick, SMPTE offset, automatic scene
> detection, import/export audio from the video. I've also used Soundtrack
> Pro in a similar way, but much prefer to compose in Logic. Either way,
> it's all on one box.

Apple has video down cold - H.264 is a superb codec, but sadly doesn't work
with Nuendo(PC- too bad).
AVI works fine but I've never been happy with compression and size vs.
quality tradeoffs.
Inline video in Nuendo actually works very well - Quicktime MJpeg works well
here though better when encoded with Vegas
than Quicktime Pro oddly. (I usually run a compressed 320x240 window in
Nuendo locally just for sync and spotting).
I also have a PC sync'd via System Link running full screen DV (720x480)
MJpeg (Quicktime playback in Cubase 4) -
looks quite good for client previews (not as clear as HD or external
monitored DV, but it works well). I'm planning to add a system
running the new Decklink HDMI PCIe card for full res HD playback to an HD
LCD TV fairly soon - for eye candy mainly.

It's pretty stunning what we can accomplish with a single computer now
though. More power and flexibility is necessary for some
things, but there is a ton of great music that can be produced with even
just a laptop.

Regards,
Dedric

>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>>> It's really convenient to do it all on one fast, capable box in the
>>> studio. Less bailing wire, duct tape and magic incantations needed to
>>> hold it all together. :^)
>>>
>>> Almost no administration time needed.
>>>
>>>
>>>> BTW - speaking of intense animation, probably old news, but there's an

>>>> HD
>>>> video online from Animusic - I like some of their other work better,
>>>> but fun
>>>> all the same:
>>>> http://www.apple.com/quicktime/guide/hd/animusic2dvd.html
>>> Clever stuff. I saw another one of those a while back that also
>>> impressed me.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 21:06:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't think Powercore has been hacked either, but it's a stock Motorola
56k chipset.
It's hard to hack low level code on a proprietary processing card (i.e
though it's just a graphics card
the processing code isn't run of the mill OS code even if it's C++ or
whatever).
It's way easier to hack an OS that has SDKs galore
floating around and so more holes in it than applications.

I really think their business model was "we ain't got a mint to fund this
puppy so what works for $500k max,
marketing and payroll included?"

As DJ said, there may be something significant on the horizon from them
anyway. Having built
hardware in a slightly larger tech company, I can attest to the approach
they are taking as making complete sense
for their size and market. We ran had 50 employees and only $1.2 mil in
annual revenue (over 10 years ago) to fund everything
we did - there were no shoot for the moon high end projects or redesigns
just because customers wanted bigger, better and faster.
We had to make what we had work, sell and pay for itself.

UA has made a huge impact on that market without even being the most
well-heeled of the dsp developers.
Imho, kudos to them and I hope the next product is even more successful than
the UAD-1 has been.

Wouldn't it be a hoot if they signed a deal with Fairlight to use the CC-1
platform, or Clearspeed cards? Being the supposed
equivalent of 8 HD Accel cards, the CC-1 could be about 16-20 times the
power of a UAD-1 (rough guess - I ran the numbers last
week, but don't remember exactly). I have no idea how the Clearspeed would
translate. Both are probably left field musings though.

Regards,
Dedric

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:4571c8a4$1@linux...
>
> Good Post Dedric ..
>
> There was this debate (last year) on gearslutz about the UAD card issue
> and
> it was an overwhelming fact that most of the users would gladly pay "more"
> money for a "faster" DSP card..
>
> And to be honest, I think I would galdly pay more for the UAD if it had
> more
> horsepower than he current model(s).
>
> Soemthing not quite right in UAD land with concernng the UAD powered
> plugins
> business model. Factor in this :
>
> -Their plugins have never been hacked, nor iare being sold on the black
> market.
>
> So, unlike other Plugin manufactuers, their seeing a real profit and not
> loses on plugins.
> So what gives..??
>
>
> c Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>On 12/2/06 9:31 AM, in article 45719c34$1@linux, "LaMont"
>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> They recently interviewd the UAD guys and the big question was put to
> them:
>>> 'Why not add more power to the card"?
>>>
>>> UAD: answer was : Because they could not find a "cost-effective "DSp
>>> that
>>> would not raise the price of the card???
>>

>>UA is a very small company. This is the same necessity of survival that
>>has locked Digidesign into using Motorola dsps that are far from cutting
>>edge.
>>
>>It's very expensive to change course completely with dsp or cpu based
>>development, or start from scratch without $5,000,000 in development
>>budget
>>and base a product around a higher end dsp, *and* expect it to pay for
>>itself.
>>
>>Joe Bryan addressed this in an interview with Sound on Sound a year or two
>>ago. They didn't have a ton of capital at startup, so the card had to be
>>affordable to sell enough to pay for itself, and feasible for a limited
>>development team. Fairlight has taken a more expensive development route
>>with the CC-1. That's probably part of the reason they are only bundling
> it
>>with Dream systems, and selling different track counts/processing
>>capability
>>levels as licenses at different price points - to ensure they make up the
>>heavy development cost.
>>
>>I'm not trying to defend UA other than understanding their business model.
>>But imho, too many users seem to blame companies for trying to run a
>>profitable business when the same users are making equally biased
>>decisions
>>for exactly the same reason: wanting cheaper more capable products in
>>order
>>to spend less and make more; or buy marketing hype because xyz producer
> made
>>a hit record with that gear.
>>
>>I do agree the vintage gear craze is absurd beyond belief. To me there
> is
>>some great character and quality in some vintage gear, but not all has the
>>quality available today. There is way too much "follow the leader" bad
>>engineering going on, and companies are all to happy to appeal to whatever
>>sells.
>>
>>Dedric
>>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by LaMont on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 21:26:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes of course Dj, but whay have are not giving the user's (customers) what

they want.
The user(customers) don;t want more plugings from UAD, but just a faster
DSP card to run more of whthe plugins they have..

But, UAD just releases another plugin to seemingly apease the customer base.
However, it's not working..

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>They are making a profit and having a life with it?
>
>;o)
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:4571c8a4$1@linux...
>>
>> Good Post Decric ..
>>
>> There was this debate (last year) on gearslutz about the UAD card issue

>> and
>> it was an overwhelming fact that most of the users would gladly pay "more"
>> money for a "faster" DSP card..
>>
>> And to be honest, I think I would galdly pay more for the UAD if it had

>> more
>> horsepower than he current model(s).
>>
>> Soemthing not quite right in UAD land with concernng the UAD powered
>> plugins
>> business model. Factor in this :
>>
>> -Their plugins have never been hacked, nor iare being sold on the black

>> market.
>>
>> So, unlike other Plugin manufactuers, their seeing a real profit and not
>> loses on plugins.
>> So what gives..??
>>
>>
>> c Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>On 12/2/06 9:31 AM, in article 45719c34$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> They recently interviewd the UAD guys and the big question was put to
>> them:

>>>> 'Why not add more power to the card"?
>>>>
>>>> UAD: answer was : Because they could not find a "cost-effective "DSp

>>>> that
>>>> would not raise the price of the card???
>>>
>>>UA is a very small company. This is the same necessity of survival that
>>>has locked Digidesign into using Motorola dsps that are far from cutting
>>>edge.
>>>
>>>It's very expensive to change course completely with dsp or cpu based
>>>development, or start from scratch without $5,000,000 in development
>>>budget
>>>and base a product around a higher end dsp, *and* expect it to pay for
>>>itself.
>>>
>>>Joe Bryan addressed this in an interview with Sound on Sound a year or
two
>>>ago. They didn't have a ton of capital at startup, so the card had to
be
>>>affordable to sell enough to pay for itself, and feasible for a limited
>>>development team. Fairlight has taken a more expensive development route
>>>with the CC-1. That's probably part of the reason they are only bundling
>> it
>>>with Dream systems, and selling different track counts/processing
>>>capability
>>>levels as licenses at different price points - to ensure they make up
the
>>>heavy development cost.
>>>
>>>I'm not trying to defend UA other than understanding their business model.
>>>But imho, too many users seem to blame companies for trying to run a
>>>profitable business when the same users are making equally biased
>>>decisions
>>>for exactly the same reason: wanting cheaper more capable products in

>>>order
>>>to spend less and make more; or buy marketing hype because xyz producer
>> made
>>>a hit record with that gear.
>>>
>>>I do agree the vintage gear craze is absurd beyond belief. To me there
>> is
>>>some great character and quality in some vintage gear, but not all has
the
>>>quality available today. There is way too much "follow the leader" bad
>>>engineering going on, and companies are all to happy to appeal to whatever

>>>sells.
>>>
>>>Dedric
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Martin Harrington on Sat, 02 Dec 2006 23:18:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Dedric,
How do you use a separate PC for full screen video, and how are they sync'd,
(sunc)?
Interesting
--
Martin Harrington
www.lendanear-sound.com

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C196FF25.5D82%dterry@keyofd.net...
> On 12/2/06 9:14 AM, in article 4571a3d1@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>> Hey Jamie,
>>>
>>> You and the other Mac users know we PC users just give you a hard time
>>> because your comps have fruit on them. ;-)
>>
>> Jealousy is such an ugly thing. I'll send you a banana sticker. ;^)
>>
>
> Excellent! Although a vegetable would be great... I think Broccoli would
> make a great computer logo. ;-)
>
>> Over the years Mac critics, me among them, have argued that Macs are
>> more expensive. Too expensive. And I had other, technical, criticisms of
>> previous generations of Macs.
>>
>> However, more recently the value proposition has improved, and OSX is a
>> huge step forward for Apple.
>>
>> Although the old perceptions have inertia, the reality, from my current
>> experience, is much better.
>

> You are exactly right here - price vs. performance was once a significant
> difference, but the new Intel Macs are right in line with comparable off
> the
> shelf PCs. Of course one can still save $200-$400 building a PC vs. the
> same config in a Mac, but not buying off-the-shelf. I tend to defend PCs
> to
> some degree, but the new Macs are very nice.
>>
>> My G5 is fast enough that I don't need other computers slaved for FX or
>> instrument plugins. That makes things much simpler. The G5 can also
>> address enough HD space that I don't need another server or, for that
>> matter, a network. It has enough RAM (currently 2.5GB, can address up to
>> 8GB) to do a reasonable amount of multitasking.
>>
> For me the multiple systems are needed for orchestral libraries, and PC or
> Mac, that's pretty much standard for composing (there are guys in LA I've
> talked with using even larger rigs).
>
> With hundreds of articulations required for a score, there isn't a single
> box that I could use to run a full complement. And what I could load into
> a
> current PC/Mac will usually only account for about 30 seconds of scoring
> in
> one style/tempo.
>
> I am guessing that with 64G of Ram in a quad quad core or dual octo core
> we
> might get closer to moving large scale orchestration to only one or two
> systems, but the low latency capabilities in the dual quads aren't scaling
> as expected yet. But even then we'll probably just be using 24/96k sample
> libraries to continue the networking requirements. It really isn't any
> different than running outboard samplers/synths. Not quite as convenient
> as
> running everything in one system, but also not as bad as it sounds
> (actually
> quite liberating to know that the percussion section will always be
> there -
> no dropped timpani rolls during French horn crescendos :-)
>
> Then if I add in other cpu/ram/disk streaming intensive VSTi's, full
> screen
> DV resolution video playback, the faster/more the better - I already have
> an
> extra PC is dedicated to full screen video (not unlike using a VCube or
> deck
> really).
>
> Regards,

> Dedric
>
>> It's really convenient to do it all on one fast, capable box in the
>> studio. Less bailing wire, duct tape and magic incantations needed to
>> hold it all together. :^)
>>
>> Almost no administration time needed.
>>
>>
>>> BTW - speaking of intense animation, probably old news, but there's an
>>> HD
>>> video online from Animusic - I like some of their other work better, but
>>> fun
>>> all the same:
>>> http://www.apple.com/quicktime/guide/hd/animusic2dvd.html
>>
>> Clever stuff. I saw another one of those a while back that also
>> impressed me.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 03 Dec 2006 04:03:06 GMT

Hi Martin,

I'm running Nuendo on the main system and Cubase 4 on the second. I have
them linked via VST System Link (SPDIF). SL is more accurate than MTC,
locks faster, and chases jog/scrub better. The video/Cubase 4 PC runs a
full screen MJpeg window, in Cubase 4, using Quicktime (17" Samsung LCD). I
convert the original Final Cut file in Vegas as MJpeg .mov, DV 720x480,
progressive, best quality, etc.

MJpeg seems to work best for native PC playback in general as I can cut down
to 75-80% of the original's size and still have acceptable quality (slightly
less clarity than the original, but no blocking or color degradation issues
as with some other codecs).

I don't have anything else running on this system when syncing video, mainly
for client playback, otherwise it's a waste of Cubase 4 :-). This machine
is slightly slow for this (Athlon XP 1900 with ATA100 drives), so it skips a

frame every now and then, but maintains sync (though I'm still looking to eliminate the skipping completely in other ways).

Sys Link with Cubase 4 and Nuendo 3 really works quite well. It's a temporary solution for video, but a faster PC with SATA II Drives would probably be perfectly fine.

Regards,
Dedric

On 12/2/06 4:18 PM, in article 45720768$1@linux, "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

> Hey Dedric,
> How do you use a separate PC for full screen video, and how are they sync'd,
> (sunc)?
> Interesting

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Sun, 03 Dec 2006 05:05:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Dedric, what is your cpu configuration (dual or single) and speed? How much RAM do you have?

It sounds like your setup is more RAM starved for sample space, and shouldn't necessarily be CPU starved for processing. Can you set the disk streaming for more efficient RAM usage?

Large libraries shouldn't need to be in RAM all at once. I run the NI stuff you listed and a bunch of other Audio Unit plugins, including some pretty large sample sets, and it's no prob here. Granted I don't run the EW stuff and if you're right about EW, I'm glad I don't.

I have 2.5 GB RAM at present and it's been enough so far for some fairly large arrangements. Other than the sample-based plugs, some AUs are synths that depend more on CPU power than RAM and they run fine in large projects as well, with the G5 muscle. Plus live instrument tracks and copious FX plugins, no sweat, one box.

What's with 8 PCs recommended to run the EW plugs? If it's just samples, that's way overkill for CPU power, assuming they're talking about current boxes.

If it's RAM limitations, then A) sample libraries shouldn't have to run completely in RAM, and B) current machines have a lot of RAM support available to buffer samples - for example 16GB on current MacPro boxes,

which should be plenty o' RAM for sample buffering.

If it's an HD i/o speed bottleneck for streaming samples, how about adding more SATA cards/drives?

I also wonder about the use of 300 tracks. A real orchestra doesn't have 300 sections. It doesn't even have 300 individual players.

Are you using 300 tracks on your stuff? I'm not. Shoot me if I do, the music would get lost in the overproduction.

Maybe the folks you talked to are just trying to save time preloading a lot of plugins they won't necessarily use, that's a choice I guess. But it'd be quicker and waste less resources to work out the arrangement with fewer plugins (but still plenty). And then add what's needed to refine, if anything. I'm not going to fault them for using outboard samplers, that just shows they've been around a while, have a lot invested in that setup, and it works for them. But anyone starting now wouldn't likely go that route.

BTW, GPO switches articulations/sample sets on the fly and runs very efficiently. Big ensembles, small footprint.

Sorry to hear about the trumpet player at your wedding, are you sure it wasn't an EW plugin? ;^) I'm really looking forward to hearing your demo piece!

Cheers,
 -Jamie
 www.JamieKrutz.com

PS. You're right about laptops, next laptop I get I'll evaluate for using the plugins at live shows. It should be as fast or faster than my G5, although with less RAM expansion and HD flexibility.

Dedric Terry wrote:
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4571cb6a@linux...
>>> With hundreds of articulations required for a score, there isn't a single
>>> box that I could use to run a full complement. And what I could load into
>>> a
>>> current PC/Mac will usually only account for about 30 seconds of scoring
>>> in
>>> one style/tempo.
>> Wow, really? I need to hear one of your scores. Clearly we're having
>> different experiences. What libraries do you use?
>
> I'm using East West's Quantum Leap Symphonic XP library at the moment: 38G

> total. For some things
> I then add Symphonic Choirs at 35G (just one section (e.g. sopranos) uses
> most of my free Ram).
> Then factor in Stormdrum, Kontakt 2, Absynth, and numerous other VSTi's for
> more varied, or modern/cinematic uses
> and it adds up really fast. EW actually recommends up to 8 PCs for their
> platinum library (24-bit).
> The composers I've chatted with a few times in LA use 300 track templates
> for composing, mutliple
> PCs and a large number of outboard samplers/synths - usually 50-100 inputs.
> Although I'm not anywhere
> near that scale of outboard gear, I can see, and feel the need to greatly
> expand my rig in my work more and more now.
>
> I'm getting ready to put together a rather involved and dynamic piece for a
> new demo - I'll email you a link when it's done.
>
>> Heh. My timpani and horns are very good about not dropping out, (that is,
>> ever since that one Logic bug was finally fixed, grrrr!) and they all live
>> happily on one box.
>>
> That really depends on the percussionist though. Some guys are more
> reliable than others, esp. if they are former
> rock drummers. ;-) Hey, the trumpet player fell asleep during my
> wedding....didn't even take a timpani roll to
> get him to drop out. He did come back for the recessional though. :-)
>
> With a larger templates I use up most of my Ram, and since one of the
> crescendo Fr.Horn instruments I use is actually a mod-wheel dynamic
> crossfade of three sample sets,
> as are the timpani modwheel crossfade instruments, they tend to suck down
> any remaining ram and cpu power very fast
> when a lot of other instruments are loaded and running.
>
>> I used to sync via SMPTE to a BetaCamSP deck. Now I run the video in
>> Logic, too, as Quicktime. Very slick, SMPTE offset, automatic scene
>> detection, import/export audio from the video. I've also used Soundtrack
>> Pro in a similar way, but much prefer to compose in Logic. Either way,
>> it's all on one box.
>
> Apple has video down cold - H.264 is a superb codec, but sadly doesn't work
> with Nuendo(PC- too bad).
> AVI works fine but I've never been happy with compression and size vs.
> quality tradeoffs.
> Inline video in Nuendo actually works very well - Quicktime MJpeg works well
> here though better when encoded with Vegas
> than Quicktime Pro oddly. (I usually run a compressed 320x240 window in
> Nuendo locally just for sync and spotting).

> I also have a PC sync'd via System Link running full screen DV (720x480)
> MJpeg (Quicktime playback in Cubase 4) -
> looks quite good for client previews (not as clear as HD or external
> monitored DV, but it works well). I'm planning to add a system
> running the new Decklink HDMI PCIe card for full res HD playback to an HD
> LCD TV fairly soon - for eye candy mainly.
>
> It's pretty stunning what we can accomplish with a single computer now
> though. More power and flexibility is necessary for some
> things, but there is a ton of great music that can be produced with even
> just a laptop.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>>> It's really convenient to do it all on one fast, capable box in the
>>>> studio. Less bailing wire, duct tape and magic incantations needed to
>>>> hold it all together. :^)
>>>>
>>>> Almost no administration time needed.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> BTW - speaking of intense animation, probably old news, but there's an
>>>>> HD
>>>>> video online from Animusic - I like some of their other work better,
>>>>> but fun
>>>>> all the same:
>>>>> http://www.apple.com/quicktime/guide/hd/animusic2dvd.html
>>>> Clever stuff. I saw another one of those a while back that also
>>>> impressed me.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>
>

Thanks Dedric,
I may give it a try although I get full screen playback in Nuendo now with
no problems, but I lose one of my screens, (2 x 19inch LCD's).
Since I built my new comp,(Intel core 2 duo E1600), everything's been
running like a dream.
--
Martin Harrington
www.lendanear-sound.com

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C1979A8A.5DBB%dterry@keyofd.net...
> Hi Martin,
>
> I'm running Nuendo on the main system and Cubase 4 on the second. I have
> them linked via VST System Link (SPDIF). SL is more accurate than MTC,
> locks faster, and chases jog/scrub better. The video/Cubase 4 PC runs a
> full screen MJpeg window, in Cubase 4, using Quicktime (17" Samsung LCD).
> I
> convert the original Final Cut file in Vegas as MJpeg .mov, DV 720x480,
> progressive, best quality, etc.
>
> MJpeg seems to work best for native PC playback in general as I can cut
> down
> to 75-80% of the original's size and still have acceptable quality
> (slightly
> less clarity than the original, but no blocking or color degradation
> issues
> as with some other codecs).
>
> I don't have anything else running on this system when syncing video,
> mainly
> for client playback, otherwise it's a waste of Cubase 4 :-). This machine
> is slightly slow for this (Athlon XP 1900 with ATA100 drives), so it skips
> a
> frame every now and then, but maintains sync (though I'm still looking to
> eliminate the skipping completely in other ways).
>
> Sys Link with Cubase 4 and Nuendo 3 really works quite well. It's a
> temporary solution for video, but a faster PC with SATA II Drives would
> probably be perfectly fine.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 12/2/06 4:18 PM, in article 45720768$1@linux, "Martin Harrington"

> <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
>
>> Hey Dedric,
>> How do you use a separate PC for full screen video, and how are they
>> sync'd,
>> (sunc)?
>> Interesting
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 03 Dec 2006 05:20:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Martin - That's certainly easier.

I usually run a heavy VSTi load while scoring that I need to cut down what I run for video on the main system, and maintain both screens for editing with post too. The separate video PC is really just eye candy. Not necessary for scoring or spotting effects.

I've heard great things about the core 2 duos, and quad cores. Great to hear yours is running well.

Regards,
Dedric

On 12/2/06 10:06 PM, in article 457258dd$1@linux, "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

> Thanks Dedric,
> I may give it a try although I get full screen playback in Nuendo now with
> no problems, but I lose one of my screens, (2 x 19inch LCD's).
> Since I built my new comp,(Intel core 2 duo E1600), everything's been
> running like a dream.

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 03 Dec 2006 07:00:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Jamie,

My system is an AMD X2 (dual core) with 2G of Ram and am planning to bump to 4G soon. EWQLSO uses NI's Kompakt player and I have the system pretty well tweaked for this.

More ram will buy me a little more space to load instruments, and a few more voices, but latency, disk streaming and cpu power also becomes an issue with these libraries at a point.

GPO is a great set - I used it for quite a while before moving to EWQLSO, and it would run fully loaded on my system I am sure (haven't used it since getting the X2). I also have Kirk Hunter's Emerald, though I only use it infrequently for a more unique sound (and where I don't need the depth of EWQL). There is a significant difference between the amount of processing (cpu, ram and disk) required between GPO and EWQSOL. Where GPO might have a single Marcato sample for Violins 1, EWQLSO will have 8 variations depending on what phrasing is required.

Regarding 300 track templates, no I don't use that many yet, but the need is there - I just haven't taken, or had the time to start setting it up. That is really borne out of the necessity of having quick access to what you might use most to minimize loading and setup times, esp. for guys scoring for weekly TV. Even with the 60-100 mid tracks I might use on a short piece, setup really gets tedious and time consuming.

Running the numbers for example:

Just for orchestra with EWQLSO, each subsection may have 30 articulations or more, then you have roughly 10-12 subsections/instruments (Vlns 1 & 2, Violas, Cellos, Basses, Trumpets, Trombones, Fr. Horns, Clarinets, Oboes, Flutes, percussion, solo instruments, etc) - right there are 300+ midi tracks to access each individually. Less common articulations may be loaded only as needed (one doesn't often need a Psycho minor 3rd half step run up ;-).

Then add in several VSTi's on a slave PC, outboard synths/samplers, etc - all that you want accessible simply by enabling a track and selecting a preset/patch, and you have a very large template.

I also frequently run a config similar to what you are describing for many projects with no problem. I can load up, for example, Kontakt 2, Stormdrum, Intakt, 4-5 instances of Rapture (imho, one of the best soft synths on the market), 2 instances of Absynth, plugins, audio tracks, and never push the system.

....but just load up the full orchestra and she starts whinin' about union regulations and demandin' double scale. ;-)

East West's 8 PC recommendation is probably based on each being a 3GHz Pentium or comparable system with 2G ram each minimum, given the timeframe of the manual, and that is for the 24-bit Platinum edition that has 3 mic positions for each instrument, including 5.1 surround samples - cutting that

to 4 core duos is possible. Spreading out any such larger library (even 16
bit stereo samples with one mic position) into just four sections makes it
easier and faster to manage loading since each PC can be loading its'
section at the same time when starting the session, and each can run at
lower latency because it isn't pushed to the limit.

Regards,
Dedric

PS: the trumpet player was a Mac user... lol ;-)

On 12/2/06 10:05 PM, in article 45725893@linux, "Jamie K"
<Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
> Hey Dedric, what is your cpu configuration (dual or single) and speed?
> How much RAM do you have?
>
> It sounds like your setup is more RAM starved for sample space, and
> shouldn't necessarily be CPU starved for processing. Can you set the
> disk streaming for more efficient RAM usage?
>
> Large libraries shouldn't need to be in RAM all at once. I run the NI
> stuff you listed and a bunch of other Audio Unit plugins, including some
> pretty large sample sets, and it's no prob here. Granted I don't run the
> EW stuff and if you're right about EW, I'm glad I don't.
>
> I have 2.5 GB RAM at present and it's been enough so far for some fairly
> large arrangements. Other than the sample-based plugs, some AUs are
> synths that depend more on CPU power than RAM and they run fine in large
> projects as well, with the G5 muscle. Plus live instrument tracks and
> copious FX plugins, no sweat, one box.
>
> What's with 8 PCs recommended to run the EW plugs? If it's just samples,
> that's way overkill for CPU power, assuming they're talking about
> current boxes.
>
> If it's RAM limitations, then A) sample libraries shouldn't have to run
> completely in RAM, and B) current machines have a lot of RAM support
> available to buffer samples - for example 16GB on current MacPro boxes,
> which should be plenty o' RAM for sample buffering.
>
> If it's an HD i/o speed bottleneck for streaming samples, how about
> adding more SATA cards/drives?
>
> I also wonder about the use of 300 tracks. A real orchestra doesn't have
> 300 sections. It doesn't even have 300 individual players.
>

> Are you using 300 tracks on your stuff? I'm not. Shoot me if I do, the
> music would get lost in the overproduction.
>
> Maybe the folks you talked to are just trying to save time preloading a
> lot of plugins they won't necessarily use, that's a choice I guess. But
> it'd be quicker and waste less resources to work out the arrangement
> with fewer plugins (but still plenty). And then add what's needed to
> refine, if anything. I'm not going to fault them for using outboard
> samplers, that just shows they've been around a while, have a lot
> invested in that setup, and it works for them. But anyone starting now
> wouldn't likely go that route.
>
> BTW, GPO switches articulations/sample sets on the fly and runs very
> efficiently. Big ensembles, small footprint.
>
> Sorry to hear about the trumpet player at your wedding, are you sure it
> wasn't an EW plugin? ;^) I'm really looking forward to hearing your demo
> piece!
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
> PS. You're right about laptops, next laptop I get I'll evaluate for
> using the plugins at live shows. It should be as fast or faster than my
> G5, although with less RAM expansion and HD flexibility.
>
>
> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4571cb6a@linux...
>>>> With hundreds of articulations required for a score, there isn't a single
>>>> box that I could use to run a full complement. And what I could load into
>>>> a
>>>> current PC/Mac will usually only account for about 30 seconds of scoring
>>>> in
>>>> one style/tempo.
>>> Wow, really? I need to hear one of your scores. Clearly we're having
>>> different experiences. What libraries do you use?
>>
>> I'm using East West's Quantum Leap Symphonic XP library at the moment: 38G
>> total. For some things
>> I then add Symphonic Choirs at 35G (just one section (e.g. sopranos) uses
>> most of my free Ram).
>> Then factor in Stormdrum, Kontakt 2, Absynth, and numerous other VSTi's for
>> more varied, or modern/cinematic uses
>> and it adds up really fast. EW actually recommends up to 8 PCs for their
>> platinum library (24-bit).
>> The composers I've chatted with a few times in LA use 300 track templates

---

>> for composing, mutliple
>> PCs and a large number of outboard samplers/synths - usually 50-100 inputs.
>> Although I'm not anywhere
>> near that scale of outboard gear, I can see, and feel the need to greatly
>> expand my rig in my work more and more now.
>>
>> I'm getting ready to put together a rather involved and dynamic piece for a
>> new demo - I'll email you a link when it's done.
>>
>>> Heh. My timpani and horns are very good about not dropping out, (that is,
>>> ever since that one Logic bug was finally fixed, grrrr!) and they all live
>>> happily on one box.
>>>
>> That really depends on the percussionist though. Some guys are more
>> reliable than others, esp. if they are former
>> rock drummers. ;-) Hey, the trumpet player fell asleep during my
>> wedding....didn't even take a timpani roll to
>> get him to drop out. He did come back for the recessional though. :-)
>>
>> With a larger templates I use up most of my Ram, and since one of the
>> crescendo Fr.Horn instruments I use is actually a mod-wheel dynamic
>> crossfade of three sample sets,
>> as are the timpani modwheel crossfade instruments, they tend to suck down
>> any remaining ram and cpu power very fast
>> when a lot of other instruments are loaded and running.
>>
>>> I used to sync via SMPTE to a BetaCamSP deck. Now I run the video in
>>> Logic, too, as Quicktime. Very slick, SMPTE offset, automatic scene
>>> detection, import/export audio from the video. I've also used Soundtrack
>>> Pro in a similar way, but much prefer to compose in Logic. Either way,
>>> it's all on one box.
>>
>> Apple has video down cold - H.264 is a superb codec, but sadly doesn't work
>> with Nuendo(PC- too bad).
>> AVI works fine but I've never been happy with compression and size vs.
>> quality tradeoffs.
>> Inline video in Nuendo actually works very well - Quicktime MJpeg works well
>> here though better when encoded with Vegas
>> than Quicktime Pro oddly. (I usually run a compressed 320x240 window in
>> Nuendo locally just for sync and spotting).
>> I also have a PC sync'd via System Link running full screen DV (720x480)
>> MJpeg (Quicktime playback in Cubase 4) -
>> looks quite good for client previews (not as clear as HD or external
>> monitored DV, but it works well). I'm planning to add a system
>> running the new Decklink HDMI PCIe card for full res HD playback to an HD
>> LCD TV fairly soon - for eye candy mainly.
>>
>> It's pretty stunning what we can accomplish with a single computer now

---

>> though. More power and flexibility is necessary for some
>> things, but there is a ton of great music that can be produced with even
>> just a laptop.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>>> It's really convenient to do it all on one fast, capable box in the
>>>>> studio. Less bailing wire, duct tape and magic incantations needed to
>>>>> hold it all together. :^)
>>>>>
>>>>> Almost no administration time needed.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> BTW - speaking of intense animation, probably old news, but there's an
>>>>>> HD
>>>>>> video online from Animusic - I like some of their other work better,
>>>>>> but fun
>>>>>> all the same:
>>>>>> http://www.apple.com/quicktime/guide/hd/animusic2dvd.html
>>>>> Clever stuff. I saw another one of those a while back that also
>>>>> impressed me.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>
>>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Sun, 03 Dec 2006 08:43:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks for the info, Dedric. So the difference between running on one
box or multiple boxes comes down to not only the speed/RAM/HD access of
the box but the plugin set you choose. My plugin set is happy on my G5,

your set is not happy on your AMD.

Over time that distinction will melt away, as computers continue gaining power.

It's also interesting to see plugin designers coming up with algorithmic emulations, which have reduced RAM requirements, as opposed to straight sample-based approaches. We'll see more of this down the road.

I'll have to check out your setup sometime. Is EWQLSO a tedious way to orchestrate? I find GPO very performance oriented and reasonably quick to use, in addition to its efficient use of RAM/CPU.

I also keep a violin handy when I need complete control of articulation. :^)

Cheers,
  -Jamie
  www.JamieKrutz.com

PS. The groom was also a Mac user, although not exclusively. :^)

Dedric Terry wrote:
> Jamie,
>
> My system is an AMD X2 (dual core) with 2G of Ram and am planning to bump to
> 4G soon. EWQLSO uses NI's Kompakt player and I have the system pretty well
> tweaked for this.
>
> More ram will buy me a little more space to load instruments, and a few more
> voices, but latency, disk streaming and cpu power also becomes an issue with
> these libraries at a point.
>
> GPO is a great set - I used it for quite a while before moving to EWQLSO,
> and it would run fully loaded on my system I am sure (haven't used it since
> getting the X2). I also have Kirk Hunter's Emerald, though I only use it
> infrequently for a more unique sound (and where I don't need the depth of
> EWQL). There is a significant difference between the amount of processing
> (cpu, ram and disk) required between GPO and EWQSOL. Where GPO might have a
> single Marcato sample for Violins 1, EWQLSO will have 8 variations depending
> on what phrasing is required.
>
> Regarding 300 track templates, no I don't use that many yet, but the need is
> there - I just haven't taken, or had the time to start setting it up. That
> is really borne out of the necessity of having quick access to what you
> might use most to minimize loading and setup times, esp. for guys scoring

> for weekly TV. Even with the 60-100 mid tracks I might use on a short
> piece, setup really gets tedious and time consuming.
>
>
> Running the numbers for example:
>
> Just for orchestra with EWQLSO, each subsection may have 30 articulations or
> more, then you have roughly 10-12 subsections/instruments (Vlns 1 & 2,
> Violas, Cellos, Basses, Trumpets, Trombones, Fr. Horns, Clarinets, Oboes,
> Flutes, percussion, solo instruments, etc) - right there are 300+ midi
> tracks to access each individually. Less common articulations may be loaded
> only as needed (one doesn't often need a Psycho minor 3rd half step run up
> ;-).
>
> Then add in several VSTi's on a slave PC, outboard synths/samplers, etc -
> all that you want accessible simply by enabling a track and selecting a
> preset/patch, and you have a very large template.
>
> I also frequently run a config similar to what you are describing for many
> projects with no problem. I can load up, for example, Kontakt 2, Stormdrum,
> Intakt, 4-5 instances of Rapture (imho, one of the best soft synths on the
> market), 2 instances of Absynth, plugins, audio tracks, and never push the
> system.
>
> ...but just load up the full orchestra and she starts whinin' about union
> regulations and demandin' double scale. ;-)
>
> East West's 8 PC recommendation is probably based on each being a 3GHz
> Pentium or comparable system with 2G ram each minimum, given the timeframe
> of the manual, and that is for the 24-bit Platinum edition that has 3 mic
> positions for each instrument, including 5.1 surround samples - cutting that
> to 4 core duos is possible. Spreading out any such larger library (even 16
> bit stereo samples with one mic position) into just four sections makes it
> easier and faster to manage loading since each PC can be loading its'
> section at the same time when starting the session, and each can run at
> lower latency because it isn't pushed to the limit.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> PS: the trumpet player was a Mac user... lol ;-)
>
> On 12/2/06 10:05 PM, in article 45725893@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> Hey Dedric, what is your cpu configuration (dual or single) and speed?
>> How much RAM do you have?
>>

>> It sounds like your setup is more RAM starved for sample space, and
>> shouldn't necessarily be CPU starved for processing. Can you set the
>> disk streaming for more efficient RAM usage?
>>
>> Large libraries shouldn't need to be in RAM all at once. I run the NI
>> stuff you listed and a bunch of other Audio Unit plugins, including some
>> pretty large sample sets, and it's no prob here. Granted I don't run the
>> EW stuff and if you're right about EW, I'm glad I don't.
>>
>> I have 2.5 GB RAM at present and it's been enough so far for some fairly
>> large arrangements. Other than the sample-based plugs, some AUs are
>> synths that depend more on CPU power than RAM and they run fine in large
>> projects as well, with the G5 muscle. Plus live instrument tracks and
>> copious FX plugins, no sweat, one box.
>>
>> What's with 8 PCs recommended to run the EW plugs? If it's just samples,
>> that's way overkill for CPU power, assuming they're talking about
>> current boxes.
>>
>> If it's RAM limitations, then A) sample libraries shouldn't have to run
>> completely in RAM, and B) current machines have a lot of RAM support
>> available to buffer samples - for example 16GB on current MacPro boxes,
>> which should be plenty o' RAM for sample buffering.
>>
>> If it's an HD i/o speed bottleneck for streaming samples, how about
>> adding more SATA cards/drives?
>>
>> I also wonder about the use of 300 tracks. A real orchestra doesn't have
>> 300 sections. It doesn't even have 300 individual players.
>>
>> Are you using 300 tracks on your stuff? I'm not. Shoot me if I do, the
>> music would get lost in the overproduction.
>>
>> Maybe the folks you talked to are just trying to save time preloading a
>> lot of plugins they won't necessarily use, that's a choice I guess. But
>> it'd be quicker and waste less resources to work out the arrangement
>> with fewer plugins (but still plenty). And then add what's needed to
>> refine, if anything. I'm not going to fault them for using outboard
>> samplers, that just shows they've been around a while, have a lot
>> invested in that setup, and it works for them. But anyone starting now
>> wouldn't likely go that route.
>>
>> BTW, GPO switches articulations/sample sets on the fly and runs very
>> efficiently. Big ensembles, small footprint.
>>
>> Sorry to hear about the trumpet player at your wedding, are you sure it
>> wasn't an EW plugin? ;^) I'm really looking forward to hearing your demo
>> piece!

>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>> PS. You're right about laptops, next laptop I get I'll evaluate for
>> using the plugins at live shows. It should be as fast or faster than my
>> G5, although with less RAM expansion and HD flexibility.
>>
>>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4571cb6a@linux...
>>>>> With hundreds of articulations required for a score, there isn't a single
>>>>> box that I could use to run a full complement. And what I could load into
>>>>> a
>>>>> current PC/Mac will usually only account for about 30 seconds of scoring
>>>>> in
>>>>> one style/tempo.
>>>> Wow, really? I need to hear one of your scores. Clearly we're having
>>>> different experiences. What libraries do you use?
>>> I'm using East West's Quantum Leap Symphonic XP library at the moment: 38G
>>> total. For some things
>>> I then add Symphonic Choirs at 35G (just one section (e.g. sopranos) uses
>>> most of my free Ram).
>>> Then factor in Stormdrum, Kontakt 2, Absynth, and numerous other VSTi's for
>>> more varied, or modern/cinematic uses
>>> and it adds up really fast. EW actually recommends up to 8 PCs for their
>>> platinum library (24-bit).
>>> The composers I've chatted with a few times in LA use 300 track templates
>>> for composing, mutliple
>>> PCs and a large number of outboard samplers/synths - usually 50-100 inputs.
>>> Although I'm not anywhere
>>> near that scale of outboard gear, I can see, and feel the need to greatly
>>> expand my rig in my work more and more now.
>>>
>>> I'm getting ready to put together a rather involved and dynamic piece for a
>>> new demo - I'll email you a link when it's done.
>>>
>>>> Heh. My timpani and horns are very good about not dropping out, (that is,
>>>> ever since that one Logic bug was finally fixed, grrrr!) and they all live
>>>> happily on one box.
>>>>
>>> That really depends on the percussionist though. Some guys are more
>>> reliable than others, esp. if they are former
>>> rock drummers. ;-) Hey, the trumpet player fell asleep during my
>>> wedding....didn't even take a timpani roll to
>>> get him to drop out. He did come back for the recessional though. :-)
>>>

>>> With a larger templates I use up most of my Ram, and since one of the
>>> crescendo Fr.Horn instruments I use is actually a mod-wheel dynamic
>>> crossfade of three sample sets,
>>> as are the timpani modwheel crossfade instruments, they tend to suck down
>>> any remaining ram and cpu power very fast
>>> when a lot of other instruments are loaded and running.
>>>
>>>> I used to sync via SMPTE to a BetaCamSP deck. Now I run the video in
>>>> Logic, too, as Quicktime. Very slick, SMPTE offset, automatic scene
>>>> detection, import/export audio from the video. I've also used Soundtrack
>>>> Pro in a similar way, but much prefer to compose in Logic. Either way,
>>>> it's all on one box.
>>> Apple has video down cold - H.264 is a superb codec, but sadly doesn't work
>>> with Nuendo(PC- too bad).
>>> AVI works fine but I've never been happy with compression and size vs.
>>> quality tradeoffs.
>>> Inline video in Nuendo actually works very well - Quicktime MJpeg works well
>>> here though better when encoded with Vegas
>>> than Quicktime Pro oddly. (I usually run a compressed 320x240 window in
>>> Nuendo locally just for sync and spotting).
>>> I also have a PC sync'd via System Link running full screen DV (720x480)
>>> MJpeg (Quicktime playback in Cubase 4) -
>>> looks quite good for client previews (not as clear as HD or external
>>> monitored DV, but it works well). I'm planning to add a system
>>> running the new Decklink HDMI PCIe card for full res HD playback to an HD
>>> LCD TV fairly soon - for eye candy mainly.
>>>
>>> It's pretty stunning what we can accomplish with a single computer now
>>> though. More power and flexibility is necessary for some
>>> things, but there is a ton of great music that can be produced with even
>>> just a laptop.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>>> It's really convenient to do it all on one fast, capable box in the
>>>>>> studio. Less bailing wire, duct tape and magic incantations needed to
>>>>>> hold it all together. :^)
>>>>>>

>>>>>> Almost no administration time needed.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> BTW - speaking of intense animation, probably old news, but there's an
>>>>>>> HD
>>>>>>> video online from Animusic - I like some of their other work better,
>>>>>>> but fun
>>>>>>> all the same:
>>>>>>> http://www.apple.com/quicktime/guide/hd/animusic2dvd.html
>>>>>> Clever stuff. I saw another one of those a while back that also
>>>>>> impressed me.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 03 Dec 2006 13:37:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 12/3/06 1:43 AM, in article 45728b8a@linux, "Jamie K"
<Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
> Thanks for the info, Dedric. So the difference between running on one
> box or multiple boxes comes down to not only the speed/RAM/HD access of
> the box but the plugin set you choose. My plugin set is happy on my G5,
> your set is not happy on your AMD.

It's a size issue. GPO (2G) is significantly smaller than EWQLSO (38G), so
it really isn't taxing your G5 as much as EWQL would.

> I'll have to check out your setup sometime. Is EWQLSO a tedious way to
> orchestrate? I find GPO very performance oriented and reasonably quick
> to use, in addition to its efficient use of RAM/CPU.

Certainly - feel free to pop down for a visit sometime. The advantage of
EWQLSO, VSL or Sonic Implants libraries is that they provide a much wider
range of realism, and creating that realism in a score is time consuming,
though most have quite a few performance shortcuts to simplify the process -
it's easy enough to be as quick or as accurate and detailed as desired.

Regards,

Dedric

>
> I also keep a violin handy when I need complete control of articulation. :^)
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
> PS. The groom was also a Mac user, although not exclusively. :^)
>
>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Sun, 03 Dec 2006 18:06:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dedric Terry wrote:
> On 12/3/06 1:43 AM, in article 45728b8a@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> Thanks for the info, Dedric. So the difference between running on one
>> box or multiple boxes comes down to not only the speed/RAM/HD access of
>> the box but the plugin set you choose. My plugin set is happy on my G5,
>> your set is not happy on your AMD.
>
> It's a size issue. GPO (2G) is significantly smaller than EWQLSO (38G), so
> it really isn't taxing your G5 as much as EWQL would.

But since EWQL runs in Kontakt, and Kontakt can do disk streaming, there
must be a happy medium where you could have much less than 38GB of RAM
and still access the entire library.

If current machines can't yet do this in one box, that day will come. Of
course for anyone willing to freeze tracks as they go, one box should
handle it already. Continued development of algorithmic emulations will
also likely lead to less RAM heavy solutions for orchestrations, some
pieces of that puzzle are already available.

Since I'm not using EWQL, and even though I am using several other large
sample libraries, being able to run on a single box without freezing is
a great way to work. Compared to every system I've used in the past, I
really appreciate this setup.

But it's also great that working on multiple boxes is is getting the job
done for you with EWQL. For anyone who really likes and needs EWQL the

extra hardware would be worth it.

>> I'll have to check out your setup sometime. Is EWQLSO a tedious way to
>> orchestrate? I find GPO very performance oriented and reasonably quick
>> to use, in addition to its efficient use of RAM/CPU.
>
> Certainly - feel free to pop down for a visit sometime. The advantage of
> EWQLSO, VSL or Sonic Implants libraries is that they provide a much wider
> range of realism, and creating that realism in a score is time consuming,
> though most have quite a few performance shortcuts to simplify the process -
> it's easy enough to be as quick or as accurate and detailed as desired.

Next time I'm heading your way I'll stop in. I can see advantages and
disadvantages to the EWQLSO approach and it will be nice to hear how
you're using it.

I have a lot of respect for the GPO approach to make a library that's
efficient and easily performable in real time, with clever control
functions that allow enough variation and oft-used articulations to
create credible orchestrations. I also like that it's a dry library that
can be mixed into any space. The EWQLSO approach of samples recorded
with room space included is also valid and useful for many applications,
and it's an impressively deep collection.

Cheers,
 -Jamie
 www.JamieKrutz.com

PS. Just saw a report of the emergency radio system test in the Springs.
Did the air force jam your garage door? "When a secretive Air Force
installation in Colorado Springs began testing the radio signal, it
knocked out remote control garage door openers around the area. The
communication system, intended to reach first responders, uses the same
frequency as an estimated 50 million garage door openers." -AP

> Regards,
> Dedric
>
>> I also keep a violin handy when I need complete control of articulation. :^)
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>> PS. The groom was also a Mac user, although not exclusively. :^)

```
>>
>>
>>
>
```

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 03 Dec 2006 22:13:02 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 12/3/06 11:06 AM, in article 45730fa6@linux, "Jamie K"
<Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

> But since EWQL runs in Kontakt, and Kontakt can do disk streaming, there
> must be a happy medium where you could have much less than 38GB of RAM
> and still access the entire library.

DSD can only do so much streaming and swapping out with that amount of data
and number of instruments and orchestral library requires. With multiple
instruments DSD is handling multiple separate processes, not just one as
with a grand piano. (That may not be quite accurate, but it makes sense in
light of how system requirements vary when I load a large piano sample vs.
multiple orchestral instruments).
>
> If current machines can't yet do this in one box, that day will come. Of
> course for anyone willing to freeze tracks as they go, one box should
> handle it already. Continued development of algorithmic emulations will
> also likely lead to less RAM heavy solutions for orchestrations, some
> pieces of that puzzle are already available.

But emulations come at the expense of higher cpu usage, and realism. It's
certainly an interesting approach and does work fairly well in the VSTi's
I've tried, for what they are, but it still doesn't approach the realism of
a large sample library.... which itself doesn't completely replace the
realism of the real thing, though it can be quite convincing.

> Next time I'm heading your way I'll stop in. I can see advantages and
> disadvantages to the EWQLSO approach and it will be nice to hear how
> you're using it.

Please do! Seeing and hearing is the easiest way to get a feel for why many
composers go this route.   But don't anticipate benching GPO for EWQLSO
though - the whole goal is to maximize creativity, and when you have a setup
you are excited about working with and are productive with, I think it's
best to stick with it.

Regards,
Dedric

```
>
> PS. Just saw a report of the emergency radio system test in the Springs.
> Did the air force jam your garage door? "When a secretive Air Force
> installation in Colorado Springs began testing the radio signal, it
> knocked out remote control garage door openers around the area. The
> communication system, intended to reach first responders, uses the same
> frequency as an estimated 50 million garage door openers." -AP

PS: Our garage door opener is working - maybe it's in the Navy radio band.
:-)


>
>
>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>>> I also keep a violin handy when I need complete control of articulation. :^)
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>> PS. The groom was also a Mac user, although not exclusively. :^)
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
```

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by AlexPlasko on Sun, 03 Dec 2006 23:32:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

dedric
how many instances are you able to run together? do you run EWQLSO and
EWQLSC   at the same time?I have choirs, and am trying to hold out for a
group buy offering on orchestra.
word builder is amazing isnt it?
"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C19899FE.5E01%dterry@keyofd.net...
> On 12/3/06 11:06 AM, in article 45730fa6@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> But since EWQL runs in Kontakt, and Kontakt can do disk streaming, there
>> must be a happy medium where you could have much less than 38GB of RAM
>> and still access the entire library.

>
> DSD can only do so much streaming and swapping out with that amount of
> data
> and number of instruments and orchestral library requires. With multiple
> instruments DSD is handling multiple separate processes, not just one as
> with a grand piano. (That may not be quite accurate, but it makes sense
> in
> light of how system requirements vary when I load a large piano sample vs.
> multiple orchestral instruments).
>>
>> If current machines can't yet do this in one box, that day will come. Of
>> course for anyone willing to freeze tracks as they go, one box should
>> handle it already. Continued development of algorithmic emulations will
>> also likely lead to less RAM heavy solutions for orchestrations, some
>> pieces of that puzzle are already available.
>
> But emulations come at the expense of higher cpu usage, and realism. It's
> certainly an interesting approach and does work fairly well in the VSTi's
> I've tried, for what they are, but it still doesn't approach the realism
> of
> a large sample library.... which itself doesn't completely replace the
> realism of the real thing, though it can be quite convincing.
>
>> Next time I'm heading your way I'll stop in. I can see advantages and
>> disadvantages to the EWQLSO approach and it will be nice to hear how
>> you're using it.
>
> Please do! Seeing and hearing is the easiest way to get a feel for why
> many
> composers go this route.   But don't anticipate benching GPO for EWQLSO
> though - the whole goal is to maximize creativity, and when you have a
> setup
> you are excited about working with and are productive with, I think it's
> best to stick with it.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
>>
>> PS. Just saw a report of the emergency radio system test in the Springs.
>> Did the air force jam your garage door? "When a secretive Air Force
>> installation in Colorado Springs began testing the radio signal, it
>> knocked out remote control garage door openers around the area. The
>> communication system, intended to reach first responders, uses the same
>> frequency as an estimated 50 million garage door openers." -AP
>
> PS: Our garage door opener is working - maybe it's in the Navy radio band.
> :-)

>
>>
>>
>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>>> I also keep a violin handy when I need complete control of
>>>> articulation. :^)
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>> PS. The groom was also a Mac user, although not exclusively. :^)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Mon, 04 Dec 2006 00:30:25 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Alex,

I run about 8 instances of EWQL's Kompakt player. I can't run Choirs
simultaneously - too memory intensive, for the switched parts at least.
All the East West stuff is on sale for about 50% off right now. That's what
I paid for Choirs in a group buy.

Regards,
Dedric

On 12/3/06 4:32 PM, in article 45735c0c@linux, "alex plasko"
<alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:

> dedric
> how many instances are you able to run together? do you run EWQLSO and
> EWQLSC   at the same time?I have choirs, and am trying to hold out for a
> group buy offering on orchestra.
> word builder is amazing isnt it?
> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C19899FE.5E01%dterry@keyofd.net...
>> On 12/3/06 11:06 AM, in article 45730fa6@linux, "Jamie K"
>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>
>>> But since EWQL runs in Kontakt, and Kontakt can do disk streaming, there
>>> must be a happy medium where you could have much less than 38GB of RAM
>>> and still access the entire library.
>>
>> DSD can only do so much streaming and swapping out with that amount of
>> data
>> and number of instruments and orchestral library requires. With multiple
>> instruments DSD is handling multiple separate processes, not just one as
>> with a grand piano. (That may not be quite accurate, but it makes sense
>> in
>> light of how system requirements vary when I load a large piano sample vs.
>> multiple orchestral instruments).
>>>
>>> If current machines can't yet do this in one box, that day will come. Of
>>> course for anyone willing to freeze tracks as they go, one box should
>>> handle it already. Continued development of algorithmic emulations will
>>> also likely lead to less RAM heavy solutions for orchestrations, some
>>> pieces of that puzzle are already available.
>>
>> But emulations come at the expense of higher cpu usage, and realism. It's
>> certainly an interesting approach and does work fairly well in the VSTi's
>> I've tried, for what they are, but it still doesn't approach the realism
>> of
>> a large sample library.... which itself doesn't completely replace the
>> realism of the real thing, though it can be quite convincing.
>>
>>> Next time I'm heading your way I'll stop in. I can see advantages and
>>> disadvantages to the EWQLSO approach and it will be nice to hear how
>>> you're using it.
>>
>> Please do! Seeing and hearing is the easiest way to get a feel for why
>> many
>> composers go this route.   But don't anticipate benching GPO for EWQLSO
>> though - the whole goal is to maximize creativity, and when you have a
>> setup
>> you are excited about working with and are productive with, I think it's
>> best to stick with it.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>>>
>>> PS. Just saw a report of the emergency radio system test in the Springs.
>>> Did the air force jam your garage door? "When a secretive Air Force
>>> installation in Colorado Springs began testing the radio signal, it
>>> knocked out remote control garage door openers around the area. The
>>> communication system, intended to reach first responders, uses the same

>>> frequency as an estimated 50 million garage door openers." -AP
>>
>> PS: Our garage door opener is working - maybe it's in the Navy radio band.
>> :-)
>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>>> I also keep a violin handy when I need complete control of
>>>>> articulation. :^)
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>> PS. The groom was also a Mac user, although not exclusively. :^)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Track Counts in Native Systems?
Posted by Jamie K on Mon, 04 Dec 2006 18:09:03 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dedric Terry wrote:
> On 12/3/06 11:06 AM, in article 45730fa6@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> But since EWQL runs in Kontakt, and Kontakt can do disk streaming, there
>> must be a happy medium where you could have much less than 38GB of RAM
>> and still access the entire library.
>
> DSD can only do so much streaming and swapping out with that amount of data
> and number of instruments and orchestral library requires. With multiple
> instruments DSD is handling multiple separate processes, not just one as
> with a grand piano. (That may not be quite accurate, but it makes sense in
> light of how system requirements vary when I load a large piano sample vs.
> multiple orchestral instruments).
>> If current machines can't yet do this in one box, that day will come. Of
>> course for anyone willing to freeze tracks as they go, one box should

Page 157 of 159 ---- Generated from   The PARIS Forums

>> handle it already. Continued development of algorithmic emulations will
>> also likely lead to less RAM heavy solutions for orchestrations, some
>> pieces of that puzzle are already available.
>
> But emulations come at the expense of higher cpu usage, and realism. It's
> certainly an interesting approach and does work fairly well in the VSTi's
> I've tried, for what they are, but it still doesn't approach the realism of
> a large sample library.... which itself doesn't completely replace the
> realism of the real thing, though it can be quite convincing.

We've gone from pipe organs taking up the space of a small house to
software plugins inside laptops. An amazing progression of ensemble
emulation tools, and the progression will continue.

I suspect algorithmic emulations will take over eventually. CPU power is
less and less a problem. Potential advantages in performability, low
storage/bandwidth requirements and ever improving accuracy/quality will
tilt the balance at some point.

Meanwhile, speaking of realism, you're right. A great use of these
libraries is as mockups in preparation for directing a real orchestra.
I've also found that combining real instrument tracks with sampled
tracks aids greatly in producing a convincing piece.

>> Next time I'm heading your way I'll stop in. I can see advantages and
>> disadvantages to the EWQLSO approach and it will be nice to hear how
>> you're using it.
>
> Please do! Seeing and hearing is the easiest way to get a feel for why many
> composers go this route.   But don't anticipate benching GPO for EWQLSO
> though - the whole goal is to maximize creativity, and when you have a setup
> you are excited about working with and are productive with, I think it's
> best to stick with it.

Good advice. Whenever I add a new approach I usually keep the existing
ones around and integrate the new approach gradually, and only where it
makes sense.

Cheers,
 -Jamie
 www.JamieKrutz.com

> Regards,
> Dedric
>
>> PS. Just saw a report of the emergency radio system test in the Springs.
>> Did the air force jam your garage door? "When a secretive Air Force

>> installation in Colorado Springs began testing the radio signal, it
>> knocked out remote control garage door openers around the area. The
>> communication system, intended to reach first responders, uses the same
>> frequency as an estimated 50 million garage door openers." -AP
>
> PS: Our garage door opener is working - maybe it's in the Navy radio band.
> :-)
>
>>
>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>>> I also keep a violin handy when I need complete control of articulation. :^)
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>> PS. The groom was also a Mac user, although not exclusively. :^)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>