

---

Subject: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sat, 15 Mar 2008 16:53:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

pretty cool.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=relat ed>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Sat, 15 Mar 2008 18:34:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If I was losing PARIS, assuming this box doesn't sound crappy, this is probably what I'd do since SONAR isn't getting it's hardware/software relationship together.

AA

"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47dc0212@linux...

> pretty cool.

>

> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=relat ed>

>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sat, 15 Mar 2008 19:46:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message news:47dc19b7\$1@linux...

> If I was losing PARIS, assuming this box doesn't sound crappy, this is

> probably what I'd do since SONAR isn't getting it's hardware/software

> relationship together.

>

> AA

>

>

After thinking about it for about 15 seconds, a few thoughts came o mind that are specific to my situation but also important, I believe, to the audio community in general. I think that by the time this is released, the question will be whether or not Cubase software has evolved to the point of really being able to utilize 8 x CPU cores. If so, and CPU's keep evolving at the rate they have been, there will really be no need for dedicated DSP hardware. My RME MAD1 driver will work quite nicely at low enough latency to

serve nicely with the Cubase control room function if enough CPU horsepower is available .....which sorta' begs the following questions:

1. Does this mean that Steinberg has decided to back burner the software rewrite that they say is happening for Cubase that will allow it to more efficiently use multiple cores in order to move users toward buying their hardware?
2. Will this work with Nuendo, or will Steinberg just integrate the code rewrite in Nuendo, thus selectively crippling Cubase and requiring Cubase users to crossgrade to Nuendo, plus their ripoff Cubase addon which gives it the same functionality as Cubase at a considerable expense, in order to take advantage of 3rd party controllers and multiple core CPU's?
3. Where do they come up with the convenient fantasy that mix engineers only use a single fader at a time? That engineer would not be me.
4. Will future rewrites scuttle the functionality of my Houston controller (which does a lot of what their controller does already)?
5. Why do they assume I'm going to want to pay for 8 x Yamaha preamps per interface? This is one reason I don't already own an O2R 96 or DM1000/2000??.....wait.....sorry.....this isn't about me. I'm just a consumer.

Color me disappointed (but not surprised) that they are moving toward the Digidesign model.....unless, of course, they are still moving forward with the software rewrites that will allow native CPU's and 3rd party hardware/drivers to eclipse the performance of their own hardware that they have just announced.

The reason I haven't built a system with 8 cores is because it would be relatively worthless with Steiny software which is what I have chosen to use. Cubase can barely utilize a single socket system with 4 x cores or a dual socket system with 2 x dual cores. Steinberg has been saying that they are working to correct this. I'm just wondering if the new hardware will provide them a convenient excuse to market hardware rather than correct their antiquated software.

Maybe I'm paranoid. We've seen DAW manufacturers do an about face and blatantly lie to their user base.....the EMU acquisition of Ensoniq and the subsequent killing off of the stepchild Paris system, even as they rebranded the proprietary hardware and sold it to us at a premium while assuring this heavily invested user base that they were moving forward with development and upgrades is a classic example.

;o)

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sat, 15 Mar 2008 20:59:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Aaron, Sonar is getting a hardware via ROland (Roland Purchased Cakewalk last year). They have this really cool Digital Mixer that really tied into Sonar. Have a Look.

<http://www.sonicstate.com/news/shownews.cfm?newsid=5308> Called the V-mixer M400.. Really Sweet!!

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>If I was losing PARIS, assuming this box doesn't sound crappy, this is  
>probably what I'd do since SONAR isn't getting it's hardware/software  
>relationship together.  
>  
>AA  
>  
>  
>"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47dc0212@linux...  
>> pretty cool.  
>>  
>> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=related>  
>>  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sat, 15 Mar 2008 21:12:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hey DJ,  
Well my friend, I think you are Right on point with your post.  
The Naive solution is at a cross-road of sorts. Here we have powerful multi core cpus, and crippling operating systems..

Then, you have the Euro vs USA mind set of working.. The Euro way of DAW workflow is to go small (think yammy N12, the new Steing Stuff, 1 fader conrollers). The US DAW users are into 16,24, 32 fader controllers. Big difference in working styles.

Just my Opinion: It seems that ALL of the DAW manufacturers are moving towards a DSP based solution..My my ..

So, like my post a few months ago about Native vs DSP. You can see that for those users who need over 16 channels of i/o, it's going to cost.

However, for those of you who are not familiar with Yamaha's Pres and I/O units, all I have to say is WOW!! Their now discontinued I88x & 01x as well as their digital workhorses DM2000 and 02r96 have some of the best on board Pres in the buisness. These babys can compete with the best. So, those who doe get into these new Yammy/Stienberg units have got a real winner on their hands.

"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>

>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message

>news:47dc19b7\$1@linux...

>> If I was losing PARIS, assuming this box doesn't sound crappy, this is

>> probably what I'd do since SONAR isn't getting it's hardware/software

>> relationship together.

>>

>> AA

>>

>>

>After thinking about it for about 15 seconds, a few thoughts came o mind

>that are specific to my situation but also important, I believe, to the

>audio community in general. I think that by the time this is released, the

>question will be whether or not Cubase software has evolved to the point of

>really being able to utilize 8 x CPU cores. If so, and CPU's keep evolving

>at the rate they have been, there will really be no need for dedicated DSP

>hardware. My RME MADI driver will work quite nicely at low enough latency to

>serve nicely with the Cubase control room function if enough CPU horsepower

>is available .....which sorta' begs the following questions:

>

>1. Does this mean that Steinberg has decided to back burner the software

>rewrite that they say is happening for Cubase that will allow it to more

>efficiently use multiple cores in order to move users toward buying their

>hardware?

>

>2. Will this work with Nuendo, or will Steinberg just integrate the code

>rewrite in Nuendo, thus selectively crippling Cubase and requiring Cubase  
>users to crossgrade to Nuendo, plus their ripoff Cubase addon which gives  
it  
>the same functionality as Cubase at a considerable expense, in order to  
take  
>advantage of 3rd party controllers and multiple core CPU's?  
>  
>3. Where do they come up with the convenient fantasy that mix engineers  
only  
>use a single fader at a time? That engineer would not be me.  
>  
>4. Will future rewrites scuttle the functionality of my Houston controller  
  
>(which does a lot of what their controller does already)?  
>  
>5. Why do they assume I'm going to want to pay for 8 x Yamaha preamps per  
  
>interface? This is one reason I don't already own an 02R 96 or  
>DM1000/2000??.....wait.....sorry.....this isn't about me. I'm just  
a  
>consumer.  
>  
>Color me disappointed (but not surprised) that they are moving toward the  
  
>Digidesign model.....unless, of course, they are still moving forward with  
  
>the software rewrites that will allow native CPU's and 3rd party  
>hardware/drivers to eclipse the performance of their own hardware that they  
  
>have just announced.  
>  
>The reason I haven't built a system with 8 cores is because it would be  
  
>relatively worthless with Steiny software which is what I have chosen to  
  
>use. Cubase can barely utilize a single socket system with 4 x cores or  
a  
>dual socket system with 2 x dual cores. Steinberg has been saying that they  
  
>are working to correct this. I'm just wondering if the new hardware will  
  
>provide them a convenient excuse to market hardware rather than correct  
  
>their antiquated software.  
>  
>Maybe I'm paranoid. We've seen DAW manufacturers do an about face and  
>blatantly lie to their user base.....the EMU acquisition of Ensoniq and

>the subsequent killing off of the stepchild Paris system, even as they  
>rebranded the proprietary hardware and sold it to us at a premium while  
  
>assuring this heavily invested user base that they were moving forward with  
  
>development and upgrades is a classic example.  
>  
>;o)  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sat, 15 Mar 2008 22:07:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hey DJ, although some what pricey, this new SSL Controller does handle HARDware integration really nice..Take a look.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nki8IVUSFPY>

"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>pretty cool.  
>  
> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=related>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sat, 15 Mar 2008 22:13:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DJ and others - the multicore scaling issue has already been pretty much nailed down by Vin at Dawbench - a bios update to some motherboards (a microcode fix from Intel it seems) significantly improved scaling for Nuendo and Cubase (Sonar still suffers though).

It may not be 1:1 as you add cores, but remember that this isn't the same as simply multiplying processing power since there are still some bottlenecks in the system that are common to all cores.

Steinberg is still working to improve Cubase and Nuendo, but with the bios fix, there is only a small margin of room for improvement compared to Reaper, which we assume is currently scaling the best of any audio app - it may also be giving up something that Nuendo and Cubase have in exchange -

that is as yet unknown.

I may have posted this before, but there it is again. There isn't a big rewrite to be done, but they are still working on improving some aspect of this issue, or so has been reported - maybe it will be even faster next rev. Steinberg hasn't abandoned improving Nuendo and Cubase to build hardware. I'm pretty sure this is Steinberg-branded, Yamaha hardware, esp. since the firewire interface has Yamaha pres and looks like a Yamaha design. To my knowledge, Steinberg doesn't even have hardware engineers on staff - everything so far has been rebadged and built elsewhere (Midex, Houston, Nuendo I/O, etc).

Dedric

On 3/15/08 1:46 PM, in article 47dc2a91\$1@linux, "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>  
> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
> news:47dc19b7\$1@linux...  
>> If I was losing PARIS, assuming this box doesn't sound crappy, this is  
>> probably what I'd do since SONAR isn't getting it's hardware/software  
>> relationship together.  
>>  
>> AA  
>>  
>>  
> After thinking about it for about 15 seconds, a few thoughts came o mind  
> that are specific to my situation but also important, I believe, to the  
> audio community in general. I think that by the time this is released, the  
> question will be whether or not Cubase software has evolved to the point of  
> really being able to utilize 8 x CPU cores. If so, and CPU's keep evolving  
> at the rate they have been, there will really be no need for dedicated DSP  
> hardware. My RME MADI driver will work quite nicely at low enough latency to  
> serve nicely with the Cubase control room function if enough CPU horsepower  
> is available .....which sorta' begs the following questions:  
>  
> 1. Does this mean that Steinberg has decided to back burner the software  
> rewrite that they say is happening for Cubase that will allow it to more  
> efficiently use multiple cores in order to move users toward buying their  
> hardware?  
>  
> 2. Will this work with Nuendo, or will Steinberg just integrate the code  
> rewrite in Nuendo, thus selectively crippling Cubase and requiring Cubase  
> users to crossgrade to Nuendo, plus their ripoff Cubase addon which gives it  
> the same functionality as Cubase at a considerable expense, in order to take  
> advantage of 3rd party controllers and multiple core CPU's?  
>

> 3. Where do they come up with the convenient fantasy that mix engineers only  
> use a single fader at a time? That engineer would not be me.  
>  
> 4. Will future rewrites scuttle the functionality of my Houston controller  
> (which does a lot of what their controller does already)?  
>  
> 5. Why do they assume I'm going to want to pay for 8 x Yamaha preamps per  
> interface? This is one reason I don't already own an 02R 96 or  
> DM1000/2000??.....wait.....sorry.....this isn't about me. I'm just a  
> consumer.  
>  
> Color me disappointed (but not surprised) that they are moving toward the  
> Digidesign model.....unless, of course, they are still moving forward with  
> the software rewrites that will allow native CPU's and 3rd party  
> hardware/drivers to eclipse the performance of their own hardware that they  
> have just announced.  
>  
> The reason I haven't built a system with 8 cores is because it would be  
> relatively worthless with Steiny software which is what I have chosen to  
> use. Cubase can barely utilize a single socket system with 4 x cores or a  
> dual socket system with 2 x dual cores. Steinberg has been saying that they  
> are working to correct this. I'm just wondering if the new hardware will  
> provide them a convenient excuse to market hardware rather than correct  
> their antiquated software.  
>  
> Maybe I'm paranoid. We've seen DAW manufacturers do an about face and  
> blatantly lie to their user base.....the EMU acquisition of Ensoniq and  
> the subsequent killing off of the stepchild Paris system, even as they  
> rebranded the proprietary hardware and sold it to us at a premium while  
> assuring this heavily invested user base that they were moving forward with  
> development and upgrades is a classic example.  
>  
> ;o)  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sat, 15 Mar 2008 22:20:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Uh.... dsp based solutions? You mean a firewire interface with EQ, comps and a reverb? We've had Totalmix and Cuemix for years. MOTU added the same to their new interface as well - just another marketing feature.

Fader units? Did you forget Presonus (Baton Rouge, LA) and Frontier Design (Lebanon, NH) - these are US companies, and they pretty much started the 1-fader idea. Also, Euphonix - 4 fader MC Control anyone?



There's no US vs. Europe mindset here - just marketing different approaches to different users. The new Cubase controller's ad blurb even says its designed for people with minimal desk space....

Dedric

On 3/15/08 3:12 PM, in article 47dc2da5\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
> Hey DJ,  
> Well my friend, I think you are Right on point with your post.  
> The Naive solution is at a cross-road of sorts. Here we have powerful multi  
> core cpus, and crippling operating systems..  
>  
> Then, you have the Euro vs USA mind set of working.. The Euro way of DAW  
> workflow is to go small (think yammy N12, the new Steing Stuff, 1 fader  
> conrollers).  
> The US DAW users are into 16,24, 32 fader controllers. Big difference in  
> working styles.  
>  
> Just my Opinion: It seems that ALL of the DAW manufacturers are moving towards  
> a DSP based solution..My my ..  
>  
> So, like my post a few months ago about Native vs DSP. You can see that for  
> those users who need over 16 channels of i/o, it's going to cost.  
>  
> However, for those of you who are not familiar with Yamaha's Pres and I/o  
> units, all I have to say is WOW!! Their now discontinued I88x & 01x as well  
> as their digital workhorses DM2000 and 02r96 have some of the best on board  
> Pres in the buisness. These babys can compete with the best. So, those who  
> doe get into these new Yammy/Stienberg units have got a real winner on their  
> hands.  
>  
> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>>  
>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
>> news:47dc19b7\$1@linux...  
>>> If I was losing PARIS, assuming this box doesn't sound crappy, this is  
>  
>>> probably what I'd do since SONAR isn't getting it's hardware/software  
>  
>>> relationship together.  
>>>  
>>> AA  
>>>  
>>>

>> After thinking about it for about 15 seconds, a few thoughts came o mind  
>  
>> that are specific to my situation but also important, I believe, to the  
>  
>> audio community in general. I think that by the time this is released, the  
>  
>> question will be whether or not Cubase software has evolved to the point  
> of  
>> really being able to utilize 8 x CPU cores. If so, and CPU's keep evolving  
>  
>> at the rate they have been, there will really be no need for dedicated DSP  
>  
>> hardware. My RME MAD1 driver will work quite nicely at low enough latency  
> to  
>> serve nicely with the Cubase control room function if enough CPU horsepower  
>  
>> is available .....which sorta' begs the following questions:  
>>  
>> 1. Does this mean that Steinberg has decided to back burner the software  
>  
>> rewrite that they say is happening for Cubase that will allow it to more  
>  
>> efficiently use multiple cores in order to move users toward buying their  
>  
>> hardware?  
>>  
>> 2. Will this work with Nuendo, or will Steinberg just integrate the code  
>  
>> rewrite in Nuendo, thus selectively crippling Cubase and requiring Cubase  
>  
>> users to crossgrade to Nuendo, plus their ripoff Cubase addon which gives  
> it  
>> the same functionality as Cubase at a considerable expense, in order to  
> take  
>> advantage of 3rd party controllers and multiple core CPU's?  
>>  
>> 3. Where do they come up with the convenient fantasy that mix engineers  
> only  
>> use a single fader at a time? That engineer would not be me.  
>>  
>> 4. Will future rewrites scuttle the functionality of my Houston controller  
>  
>> (which does a lot of what their controller does already)?  
>>  
>> 5. Why do they assume I'm going to want to pay for 8 x Yamaha preamps per  
>  
>> interface? This is one reason I don't already own an 02R 96 or  
>> DM1000/2000??.....wait.....sorry.....this isn't about me. I'm just

> a  
>> consumer.  
>>  
>> Color me disappointed (but not surprised) that they are moving toward the  
>  
>> Digidesign model.....unless, of course, they are still moving forward with  
>  
>> the software rewrites that will allow native CPU's and 3rd party  
>> hardware/drivers to eclipse the performance of their own hardware that they  
>  
>> have just announced.  
>>  
>> The reason I haven't built a system with 8 cores is because it would be  
>  
>> relatively worthless with Steiny software which is what I have chosen to  
>  
>> use. Cubase can barely utilize a single socket system with 4 x cores or  
> a  
>> dual socket system with 2 x dual cores. Steinberg has been saying that they  
>  
>> are working to correct this. I'm just wondering if the new hardware will  
>  
>> provide them a convenient excuse to market hardware rather than correct  
>  
>> their antiquated software.  
>>  
>> Maybe I'm paranoid. We've seen DAW manufacturers do an about face and  
>> blatantly lie to their user base.....the EMU acquisition of Ensoniq and  
>  
>> the subsequent killing off of the stepchild Paris system, even as they  
>> rebranded the proprietary hardware and sold it to us at a premium while  
>  
>> assuring this heavily invested user base that they were moving forward with  
>  
>> development and upgrades is a classic example.  
>>  
>> ;o)  
>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 01:56:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I saw that one. Man, it is sweet. Thing is, it's the same price as a tricked out DM2000. which would you rather have?

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote in message news:47dc3a89\$1@linux...

>

> Hey DJ, although some what pricey, this new SSL Controller does handle

> HArduare

> integration really nice..Take a look.

>

> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nki8IVUSFPY>

>

> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>>pretty cool.

>>

>> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=related>

>>

>>

>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived

Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 04:50:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I looked at that when the video hit the net last year, but I can't see spending \$6000 for a mixer to front end \$600 software/Sonar. If steiny is able to ASIO nice latency figures I don't understand why cake can't as well but there you have it. The other thing being, granted I haven't heard the VM personally, that I don't particularly like the sound of the Roland pres I have used in the past. Some of the questions I had then still haven't really become clear such as

Up to 40 tracks from mixer to sonar. 40 tracks of what resolution?

Can one choose less tracks at higher res? More tracks at a lower?

Just exactly how are they\are they compressing the audio, and what artifacts? I do NOT like Roland VSxxx recorder compression.

Is computer connection strictly a data dump through a standard NIC, or ?? and how does Sonar see it?

Don't get me wrong, for a live mixer this thing is pretty awesome. I've long since been a fan for the idea of preamps/audio processing staying on stage to be controlled remotely, like the VM series Roland had years back. I absolutely detest latency.

I'm not that sure it's a recordists dream, however.

It's unfortunate and apparant they can't get latency right with WDM/ASIO drivers after years of it. Which is a mind blower, because they were the ones working with Microsoft on the WDM spec. What they really probably ought to do is either expand their 'hardware' line (which is EDIROL already I

believe) to more than the 'power' series of stuff and less than a \$6k REAC mixer. There's a whole lot missing there in the middle, and DSP + more inputs would fix it.

<http://www.cakewalk.com/Products/hardware.asp>

Shame, cause I love how sonar functions, but many won't move to it for semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick. Steiny apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote in message news:47dc2a9a\$1 @linux...

>  
> Hi Aaron, Sonar is getting a hardware via ROland (Roland Purchased  
> Cakewalk  
> last year). They have this really cool Digital Mixer that really tied into  
> Sonar. Have a Look.  
>  
> <http://www.sonicstate.com/news/shownews.cfm?newsid=5308> Called the V-mixer  
> M400.. Really Sweet!!  
>  
> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>If I was losing PARIS, assuming this box doesn't sound crappy, this is  
>>probably what I'd do since SONAR isn't getting it's hardware/software  
>>relationship together.  
>>  
>>AA  
>>  
>>  
>>"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47dc0212@linux...  
>>> pretty cool.  
>>>  
>>> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=related>  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 05:11:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, I don't think it's close to accurate to nationalize the trend since most companies building it are either in the US or Japan. :-)

There are a bazillion more people doing music as a hobby than a profession,

and the US is pretty heavy in that market, so that's where most music gear companies pay the bills for higher priced hardware/software development (except for the SSLs, Neves, Harrison's, and Fairlights of the world).

Imho, there are probably only a few apps that really run full tilt on multiple cores, and they aren't in the audio industry (graphics would be my guess, or even more likely, science/computational apps). If you've seen the numbers on performance, Nuendo is slightly behind Reaper, and Sonar sucks wind way behind either of those. There is way more to the scaling puzzle for audio than just adding 2x, 3x, 4x, 5x, 6x, 7x and 8x the plugin count.

Audio is a streaming data format with timing and sync requirements that may not translate 1:1 to the way multiple cores split processing, and then split that across multiple cpus.

Nuendo/Cubase might need a rewrite, but at what cost? If you look at Vin's graph of Reaper vs. Nuendo 4.1 you'll see a very consistent percentage difference at all latency levels, dual quad and single quad. To me that says there is an overhead in Nuendo that limits the total plugin count slightly below Reaper (average of about 10%), \*not\* a scaling difference. Reaper doesn't have a control room, no score editor (probably not a factor), a custom GUI (it's a windows vector based graphic system, that's butt-ugly imho), etc.

That's not scaling. That's overhead. Within that overhead (Reaper has it's own as well) they both scale equally from what I can tell. Anything more than that may be a hardware issue (and who truly knows what the limits are??) - e.g. perhaps Intel hasn't cracked the multicore load sharing nut in hardware such that it translates to software. That's not in defense of Steinberg - just looking at the numbers and what my intuition of hardware/software development, interaction, and progress of the current computer architecture tells me - it's a single cpu system with multiple cpus tacked on. I would be willing to bet that the original parallel processing and/or transprocessing models are far different and more efficient from what personal computers are using.

The trend to add dsp to I/O units may well be motivated by the lack of movement for lower latency with hardware, but that may well be a stalling of actual lower level access both in cpu designs, memory, buss architecture, and OSs that are getting more and more bloated (Vista and OSX). There is also the draw to push mixer addicts into solving monitoring issues or preferences with built in dsp. Also remember that users are also to blame - I can easily run a pretty serious session at 64 samples and monitor internally, but we are also using higher and higher powered plugins, eating more cpu. It's the speed race - faster systems mean more cpu intensive plugins and user demands on the software. If we backtrack to 5 years ago and only use plugins and expectations of the time, a dual quad core would be plenty of power to keep latency low.

Regarding who's on first.... the answer is "yes". ;-)

My .02 at least.

Dedric

On 3/15/08 11:49 PM, in article 47dca6c6\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
> I don't know Dedric. There seems to be this trend to adhere to the smaller  
> foot-print studio from the DAW manufactuers. And this trned is coming from  
> the EU DAW users. DAW users in the states want 24, 32 fader controllers and  
> at least 16 channels of i/o.

>  
> Also, he trend to add DSP to the hardware i/o units negates the promise  
> of Native's claim.

>  
> Just my Opinion: I don't think Steingberg is close to cracking the Multi-core  
> puzzle. I think a Total Re-write would be required. But, I think they  
> (Steingberg)  
> will duck-tape a solution much like Digidesign has with Pro Tools to keep  
> it going,even tho the market has all this CPU power..

>  
> Even More: These day, I don't know where Steingberg strategic direction is  
> heading. Like,who's on first?

>  
>  
>

> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>> Uh.... dsp based solutions? You mean a firewire interface with EQ, comps  
>> and a reverb? We've had Totalmix and Cuemix for years. MOTU added the  
> same

>> to their new interface as well - just another marketing feature.

>>  
>> Fader units? Did you forget Presonus (Baton Rouge, LA) and Frontier Design  
>> (Lebanon, NH) - these are US companies, and they pretty much started the  
>> 1-fader idea. Also, Euphonix - 4 fader MC Control anyone?

>>  
>> There's no US vs. Europe mindset here - just marketing different approaches  
>> to different users. The new Cubase controller's ad blurb even says its  
>> designed for people with minimal desk space....

>>  
>> Dedric

>>  
>> On 3/15/08 3:12 PM, in article 47dc2da5\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>> wrote:

>>  
>>>  
>>> Hey DJ,  
>>> Well my friend, I think you are Right on point with your post.  
>>> The Naive solution is at a cross-road of sorts. Here we have powerful  
> multi  
>>> core cpus, and crippling operating systems..  
>>>  
>>> Then, you have the Euro vs USA mind set of working.. The Euro way of DAW  
>>> workflow is to go small (think yammy N12, the new Steing Stuff, 1 fader  
>>> conrollers).  
>>> The US DAW users are into 16,24, 32 fader controllers. Big difference  
> in  
>>> working styles.  
>>>  
>>> Just my Opinion: It seems that ALL of the DAW manufacturers are moving  
> towards  
>>> a DSP based solution..My my ..  
>>>  
>>> So, like my post a few months ago about Native vs DSP. You can see that  
> for  
>>> those users who need over 16 channels of i/o, it's going to cost.  
>>>  
>>> However, for those of you who are not familiar with Yamaha's Pres and  
> I/o  
>>> units, all I have to say is WOW!! Their now discontinued I88x & 01x as  
> well  
>>> as their digital workhorses DM2000 and 02r96 have some of the best on  
> board  
>>> Pres in the buisness. These babys can compete with the best. So, those  
> who  
>>> doe get into these new Yammy/Stienberg units have got a real winner on  
> their  
>>> hands.  
>>>  
>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
>>>> news:47dc19b7\$1@linux...  
>>>>> If I was losing PARIS, assuming this box doesn't sound crappy, this  
> is  
>>>>  
>>>>> probably what I'd do since SONAR isn't getting it's hardware/software  
>>>>  
>>>>> relationship together.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> AA  
>>>>>



>>>>  
>>>> After thinking about it for about 15 seconds, a few thoughts came o mind  
>>>  
>>>> that are specific to my situation but also important, I believe, to the  
>>>  
>>>> audio community in general. I think that by the time this is released,  
> the  
>>>  
>>>> question will be whether or not Cubase software has evolved to the point  
>>> of  
>>>> really being able to utilize 8 x CPU cores. If so, and CPU's keep evolving  
>>>  
>>>> at the rate they have been, there will really be no need for dedicated  
> DSP  
>>>  
>>>> hardware. My RME MADI driver will work quite nicely at low enough latency  
>>> to  
>>>> serve nicely with the Cubase control room function if enough CPU horsepower  
>>>  
>>>> is available .....which sorta' begs the following questions:  
>>>>  
>>>> 1. Does this mean that Steinberg has decided to back burner the software  
>>>  
>>>> rewrite that they say is happening for Cubase that will allow it to more  
>>>  
>>>> efficiently use multiple cores in order to move users toward buying their  
>>>  
>>>> hardware?  
>>>>  
>>>> 2. Will this work with Nuendo, or will Steinberg just integrate the code  
>>>  
>>>> rewrite in Nuendo, thus selectively crippling Cubase and requiring Cubase  
>>>  
>>>> users to crossgrade to Nuendo, plus their ripoff Cubase addon which gives  
>>> it  
>>>> the same functionality as Cubase at a considerable expense, in order  
> to  
>>> take  
>>>> advantage of 3rd party controllers and multiple core CPU's?  
>>>>  
>>>> 3. Where do they come up with the convenient fantasy that mix engineers  
>>> only  
>>>> use a single fader at a time? That engineer would not be me.  
>>>>  
>>>> 4. Will future rewrites scuttle the functionality of my Houston controller  
>>>  
>>>> (which does a lot of what their controller does already)?  
>>>>

>>>> 5. Why do they assume I'm going to want to pay for 8 x Yamaha preamps  
> per  
>>>  
>>>> interface? This is one reason I don't already own an 02R 96 or  
>>>> DM1000/2000??.....wait.....sorry.....this isn't about me. I'm just  
>>> a  
>>>> consumer.  
>>>>  
>>>> Color me disappointed (but not surprised) that they are moving toward  
> the  
>>>  
>>>> Digidesign model.....unless, of course, they are still moving forward  
> with  
>>>  
>>>> the software rewrites that will allow native CPU's and 3rd party  
>>>> hardware/drivers to eclipse the performance of their own hardware that  
> they  
>>>  
>>>> have just announced.  
>>>>  
>>>> The reason I haven't built a system with 8 cores is because it would  
> be  
>>>  
>>>> relatively worthless with Steiny software which is what I have chosen  
> to  
>>>  
>>>> use. Cubase can barely utilize a single socket system with 4 x cores  
> or  
>>> a  
>>>> dual socket system with 2 x dual cores. Steinberg has been saying that  
> they  
>>>  
>>>> are working to correct this. I'm just wondering if the new hardware will  
>>>  
>>>> provide them a convenient excuse to market hardware rather than correct  
>>>  
>>>> their antiquated software.  
>>>>  
>>>> Maybe I'm paranoid. We've seen DAW manufacturers do an about face and  
>>>> blatantly lie to their user base.....the EMU acquisition of Ensoniq  
> and  
>>>  
>>>> the subsequent killing off of the stepchild Paris system, even as they  
>>>> rebranded the proprietary hardware and sold it to us at a premium while  
>>>  
>>>> assuring this heavily invested user base that they were moving forward  
> with  
>>>

>>>> development and upgrades is a classic example.  
>>>>  
>>>> ;o)  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 05:24:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick. Steiny  
> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>  
How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?

It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and firewire is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see the new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface, but if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.

So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and get down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio drivers (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples, unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.

Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do anything more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion a few times already. ;-)

Dedric

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 05:40:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Tough call.. I work on a DM2000 from time to time, and it's stellar, to say the least..

I would go for the Dm-2000, due it's great sounding Pre's(24), he ability to mix 96 channels@96k, with Eq/ dynamics..8 Spx-1000 units..6 graphic eqs on the buses..Integration with Steingberg, Pro Tools, Logic and DP..For around 17k o start. Not Bad.

"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>I saw that one. Man, it is sweet. Thing is, it's the same price as a tricked

>out DM2000. which would you rather have?

>

>

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote in message news:47dc3a89\$1 @linux...

>>

>> Hey DJ, although some what pricey, this new SSL Controller does handle

>> HArDware

>> integration really nice..Take a look.

>>

>> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nki8IVUSFPY>

>>

>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>>>pretty cool.

>>>

>>> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=related>

>>>

>>>

>>

>

>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 05:49:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I don't know Dedric. There seems to be this trend to adhere to the smaller foot-print studio from the DAW manufacturers. And this trend is coming from the EU DAW users. DAW users in the states want 24, 32 fader controllers and at least 16 channels of i/o.

Also, the trend to add DSP to the hardware i/o units negates the promise of Native's claim.

Just my Opinion: I don't think Steingberg is close to cracking the Multi-core puzzle. I think a Total Re-write would be required. But, I think they (Steingberg) will duck-tape a solution much like Digidesign has with Pro Tools to keep

it going,even tho the market has all this CPU power..

Even More: These day, I don't know where Steingberg strategic direction is heading. Like,who's on first?

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Uh.... dsp based solutions? You mean a firewire interface with EQ, comps  
>and a reverb? We've had Totalmix and Cuemix for years. MOTU added the  
same

>to their new interface as well - just another marketing feature.

>

>Fader units? Did you forget Presonus (Baton Rouge, LA) and Frontier Design  
>(Lebanon, NH) - these are US companies, and they pretty much started the  
>1-fader idea. Also, Euphonix - 4 fader MC Control anyone?

>

>There's no US vs. Europe mindset here - just marketing different approaches  
>to different users. The new Cubase controller's ad blurb even says its  
>designed for people with minimal desk space....

>

>Dedric

>

>On 3/15/08 3:12 PM, in article 47dc2da5\$1 @linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>wrote:

>

>>

>> Hey DJ,

>> Well my friend, I think you are Right on point with your post.

>> The Naive solution is at a cross-road of sorts. Here we have powerful  
multi

>> core cpus, and crippling operating systems..

>>

>> Then, you have the Euro vs USA mind set of working.. The Euro way of DAW  
>> workflow is to go small (think yammy N12, the new Steing Stuff, 1 fader  
>> conrollers).

>> The US DAW users are into 16,24, 32 fader controllers. Big difference  
in

>> working styles.

>>

>> Just my Opinion: It seems that ALL of the DAW manufacturers are moving  
towards

>> a DSP based solution..My my ..

>>

>> So, like my post a few months ago about Native vs DSP. You can see that  
for

>> those users who need over 16 channels of i/o, it's going to cost.

>>

>> However, for those of you who are not familiar with Yamaha's Pres and I/o  
>> units, all I have to say is WOW!! Their now discontinued I88x & 01x as well  
>> as their digital workhorses DM2000 and 02r96 have some of the best on board  
>> Pres in the buisness. These babys can compete with the best. So, those who  
>> doe get into these new Yammy/Stienberg units have got a real winner on their  
>> hands.  
>>  
>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>>>  
>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
>>> news:47dc19b7\$1@linux...  
>>>> If I was losing PARIS, assuming this box doesn't sound crappy, this is  
>>  
>>>> probably what I'd do since SONAR isn't getting it's hardware/software  
>>  
>>>> relationship together.  
>>>>  
>>>> AA  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>> After thinking about it for about 15 seconds, a few thoughts came o mind  
>>  
>>> that are specific to my situation but also important, I believe, to the  
>>  
>>> audio community in general. I think that by the time this is released, the  
>>  
>>> question will be whether or not Cubase software has evolved to the point  
>> of  
>>> really being able to utilize 8 x CPU cores. If so, and CPU's keep evolving  
>>  
>>> at the rate they have been, there will really be no need for dedicated  
DSP  
>>  
>>> hardware. My RME MAD1 driver will work quite nicely at low enough latency  
>> to  
>>> serve nicely with the Cubase control room function if enough CPU horsepower  
>>  
>>> is available .....which sorta' begs the following questions:  
>>>  
>>> 1. Does this mean that Steinberg has decided to back burner the software  
>>

>>> rewrite that they say is happening for Cubase that will allow it to more  
>>  
>>> efficiently use multiple cores in order to move users toward buying their  
>>  
>>> hardware?  
>>>  
>>> 2. Will this work with Nuendo, or will Steinberg just integrate the code  
>>  
>>> rewrite in Nuendo, thus selectively crippling Cubase and requiring Cubase  
>>  
>>> users to crossgrade to Nuendo, plus their ripoff Cubase addon which gives  
>> it  
>>> the same functionality as Cubase at a considerable expense, in order  
to  
>> take  
>>> advantage of 3rd party controllers and multiple core CPU's?  
>>>  
>>> 3. Where do they come up with the convenient fantasy that mix engineers  
>> only  
>>> use a single fader at a time? That engineer would not be me.  
>>>  
>>> 4. Will future rewrites scuttle the functionality of my Houston controller  
>>  
>>> (which does a lot of what their controller does already)?  
>>>  
>>> 5. Why do they assume I'm going to want to pay for 8 x Yamaha preamps  
per  
>>  
>>> interface? This is one reason I don't already own an 02R 96 or  
>>> DM1000/2000??.....wait.....sorry.....this isn't about me. I'm just  
>> a  
>>> consumer.  
>>>  
>>> Color me disappointed (but not surprised) that they are moving toward  
the  
>>  
>>> Digidesign model.....unless, of course, they are still moving forward  
with  
>>  
>>> the software rewrites that will allow native CPU's and 3rd party  
>>> hardware/drivers to eclipse the performance of their own hardware that  
they  
>>  
>>> have just announced.  
>>>  
>>> The reason I haven't built a system with 8 cores is because it would  
be  
>>

>>> relatively worthless with Steiny software which is what I have chosen  
to  
>>  
>>> use. Cubase can barely utilize a single socket system with 4 x cores  
or  
>> a  
>>> dual socket system with 2 x dual cores. Steinberg has been saying that  
they  
>>  
>>> are working to correct this. I'm just wondering if the new hardware will  
>>  
>>> provide them a convenient excuse to market hardware rather than correct  
>>  
>>> their antiquated software.  
>>>  
>>> Maybe I'm paranoid. We've seen DAW manufacturers do an about face and  
>>> blatantly lie to their user base.....the EMU acquisition of Ensoniq  
and  
>>  
>>> the subsequent killing off of the stepchild Paris system, even as they  
>>> rebranded the proprietary hardware and sold it to us at a premium while  
>>  
>>> assuring this heavily invested user base that they were moving forward  
with  
>>  
>>> development and upgrades is a classic example.  
>>>  
>>> ;o)  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 05:52:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I still haven't heard a Yamaha filter that doesn't hurt my ears.

And it's Rodney Orpheus! Glad he still has a job, I remember him pimping  
the Houston as the best thing since bagels got seeds.

I'll stick with the rig I have for now . . .

TCB

"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:



>pretty cool.

>

> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=related>

>

>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 06:56:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e. I could tell early on there was nothing new here).

Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in and out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system. Nothing different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while it may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\* 0.00000ns.

Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel ;-)  
There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times in the converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about since it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e. systems like Radar, etc).

Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on the planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use different packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try Steiny/Yamaha.

Dedric

On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Dedric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey

> mentioned

> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of "near

> zero " latency.

>

> Look at the video again.

>

>

> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"

>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick. Steiny  
>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>  
>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>  
>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and firewire  
>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see  
> the  
>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
> but  
>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>  
>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and  
> get  
>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio drivers  
>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>  
>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do anything  
>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion  
> a  
>> few times already. ;-)  
>>  
>> Dedic  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 07:45:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Good Post.. With all those factors that you named (OS,buss,Cpu designs, mememory access), it will be interetsing to see what get's worked out first.

I'm staying pat for awhile, until all of this get sorted out. It's too expensive to try and keep up ..

Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>Well, I don't think it's close to accurate to nationalize the trend since  
>most companies building it are either in the US or Japan. :-)  
>  
>There are a bazillion more people doing music as a hobby than a profession,  
>and the US is pretty heavy in that market, so that's where most music gear  
>companies pay the bills for higher priced hardware/software development

>(except for the SSLs, Neves, Harrisons, and Fairlights of the world).  
>  
>Imho, there are probably only a few apps that really run full tilt on  
>multiple cores, and they aren't in the audio industry (graphics would be  
my  
>guess, or even more likely, science/computational apps). If you've seen  
the  
>numbers on performance, Nuendo is slightly behind Reaper, and Sonar sucks  
>wind way behind either of those. There is way more to the scaling puzzle  
>for audio than just adding 2x, 3x, 4x, 5x, 6x, 7x and 8x the plugin count.  
>  
>Audio is a streaming data format with timing and sync requirements that  
may  
>not translate 1:1 to the way multiple cores split processing, and then split  
>that across multiple cpus.  
>  
>Nuendo/Cubase might need a rewrite, but at what cost? If you look at Vin's  
>graph of Reaper vs. Nuendo 4.1 you'll see a very consistent percentage  
>difference at all latency levels, dual quad and single quad. To me that  
>says there is an overhead in Nuendo that limits the total plugin count  
>slightly below Reaper (average of about 10%), \*not\* a scaling difference.  
>Reaper doesn't have a control room, no score editor (probably not a factor),  
>a custom GUI (it's a windows vector based graphic system, that's butt-ugly  
>imho), etc.  
>  
>That's not scaling. That's overhead. Within that overhead (Reaper has it's  
>own as well) they both scale equally from what I can tell. Anything more  
>than that may be a hardware issue (and who truly knows what the limits  
>are??) - e.g. perhaps Intel hasn't cracked the multicore load sharing nut  
in  
>hardware such that it translates to software. That's not in defense of  
>Steinberg - just looking at the numbers and what my intuition of  
>hardware/software development,interaction, and progress of the current  
>computer architecture tells me - it's a single cpu system with multiple  
cpus  
>tacked on. I would be willing to bet that the original parallel processing  
>and/or transprocessing models are far different and more efficient from  
what  
>personal computers are using.  
>  
>The trend to add dsp to I/O units may well be motivated by the lack of  
>movement for lower latency with hardware, but that may well be a stalling  
of  
>actual lower level access both in cpu designs, memory, buss architecture,  
>and OSs that are getting more and more bloated (Vista and OSX). There is  
>also the draw to push mixer addicts into solving monitoring issues or  
>preferences with built in dsp. Also remember that users are also to blame  
-

>I can easily run a pretty serious session at 64 samples and monitor  
>internally, but we are also using higher and higher powered plugins, eating  
>more cpu. It's the speed race - faster systems mean more cpu intensive  
>plugins and user demands on the software. If we backtrack to 5 years ago  
>and only use plugins and expectations of the time, a dual quad core would  
be  
>plenty of power to keep latency low.  
>  
>Regarding who's on first.... the answer is "yes". ;-)  
>  
>My .02 at least.  
>  
>Dedric  
>  
>On 3/15/08 11:49 PM, in article 47dca6c6\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
><jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
>>  
>> I don't know Dedric. There seems to be this trend to adhere to the smaller  
>> foot-print studio from the DAW manufacturers. And this trend is coming  
from  
>> the EU DAW users. DAW users in the states want 24, 32 fader controllers  
and  
>> at least 16 channels of i/o.  
>>  
>> Also, the trend to add DSP to the hardware i/o units negates the promise  
>> of Native's claim.  
>>  
>> Just my Opinion: I don't think Steinberg is close to cracking the Multi-core  
>> puzzle. I think a Total Re-write would be required. But, I think they  
>> (Steinberg)  
>> will duck-tape a solution much like Digidesign has with Pro Tools to keep  
>> it going, even though the market has all this CPU power..  
>>  
>> Even More: These days, I don't know where Steinberg's strategic direction  
is  
>> heading. Like, who's on first?  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>> Uh.... dsp based solutions? You mean a firewire interface with EQ, comps  
>>> and a reverb? We've had Totalmix and Cuemix for years. MOTU added the  
>> same  
>>> to their new interface as well - just another marketing feature.  
>>>  
>>> Fader units? Did you forget Presonus (Baton Rouge, LA) and Frontier  
Design

>>> (Lebanon, NH) - these are US companies, and they pretty much started the  
>>> 1-fader idea. Also, Euphonix - 4 fader MC Control anyone?  
>>>  
>>> There's no US vs. Europe mindset here - just marketing different approaches  
>>> to different users. The new Cubase controller's ad blurb even says its  
>>> designed for people with minimal desk space....  
>>>  
>>> Detric  
>>>  
>>> On 3/15/08 3:12 PM, in article 47dc2da5\$1 @linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Hey DJ,  
>>>> Well my friend, I think you are Right on point with your post.  
>>>> The Naive solution is at a cross-road of sorts. Here we have powerful  
>> multi  
>>>> core cpus, and crippling operating systems..  
>>>>  
>>>> Then, you have the Euro vs USA mind set of working.. The Euro way of  
DAW  
>>>> workflow is to go small (think yammy N12, the new Steing Stuff, 1 fader  
>>>> conrollers).  
>>>> The US DAW users are into 16,24, 32 fader controllers. Big difference  
>> in  
>>>> working styles.  
>>>>  
>>>> Just my Opinion: It seems that ALL of the DAW manufacturers are moving  
>> towards  
>>>> a DSP based solution..My my ..  
>>>>  
>>>> So, like my post a few months ago about Native vs DSP. You can see that  
>> for  
>>>> those users who need over 16 channels of i/o, it's going to cost.  
>>>>  
>>>> However, for those of you who are not familiar with Yamaha's Pres and  
>> I/o  
>>>> units, all I have to say is WOW!! Their now discontinued I88x & 01x  
as  
>> well  
>>>> as their digital workhorses DM2000 and 02r96 have some of the best on  
>> board  
>>>> Pres in the buisness. These babys can compete with the best. So, those  
>> who  
>>>> doe get into these new Yammy/Stienberg units have got a real winner  
on  
>> their

>>>> hands.  
>>>>  
>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:47dc19b7\$1@linux...  
>>>>>> If I was losing PARIS, assuming this box doesn't sound crappy, this  
>> is  
>>>>  
>>>>>> probably what I'd do since SONAR isn't getting it's hardware/software  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> relationship together.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> AA  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> After thinking about it for about 15 seconds, a few thoughts came o  
mind  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> that are specific to my situation but also important, I believe, to  
the  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> audio community in general. I think that by the time this is released,  
>> the  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> question will be whether or not Cubase software has evolved to the  
point  
>>>>>> of  
>>>>>> really being able to utilize 8 x CPU cores. If so, and CPU's keep evolving  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> at the rate they have been, there will really be no need for dedicated  
>> DSP  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> hardware. My RME MADI driver will work quite nicely at low enough latency  
>>>>>> to  
>>>>>> serve nicely with the Cubase control room function if enough CPU horsepower  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> is available .....which sorta' begs the following questions:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> 1. Does this mean that Steinberg has decided to back burner the software  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> rewrite that they say is happening for Cubase that will allow it to  
more  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> efficiently use multiple cores in order to move users toward buying  
their  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> hardware?

>>>>  
>>>> 2. Will this work with Nuendo, or will Steinberg just integrate the  
code  
>>>>  
>>>> rewrite in Nuendo, thus selectively crippling Cubase and requiring  
Cubase  
>>>>  
>>>> users to crossgrade to Nuendo, plus their ripoff Cubase addon which  
gives  
>>>> it  
>>>> the same functionality as Cubase at a considerable expense, in order  
>> to  
>>>> take  
>>>> advantage of 3rd party controllers and multiple core CPU's?  
>>>>  
>>>> 3. Where do they come up with the convenient fantasy that mix engineers  
>>>> only  
>>>> use a single fader at a time? That engineer would not be me.  
>>>>  
>>>> 4. Will future rewrites scuttle the functionality of my Houston controller  
>>>>  
>>>> (which does a lot of what their controller does already)?  
>>>>  
>>>> 5. Why do they assume I'm going to want to pay for 8 x Yamaha preamps  
>> per  
>>>>  
>>>> interface? This is one reason I don't already own an 02R 96 or  
>>>> DM1000/2000??.....wait.....sorry.....this isn't about me. I'm  
just  
>>>> a  
>>>> consumer.  
>>>>  
>>>> Color me disappointed (but not surprised) that they are moving toward  
>> the  
>>>>  
>>>> Digidesign model.....unless, of course, they are still moving forward  
>> with  
>>>>  
>>>> the software rewrites that will allow native CPU's and 3rd party  
>>>> hardware/drivers to eclipse the performance of their own hardware that  
>> they  
>>>>  
>>>> have just announced.  
>>>>  
>>>> The reason I haven't built a system with 8 cores is because it would  
>> be  
>>>>  
>>>> relatively worthless with Steiny software which is what I have chosen

>> to  
>>>>  
>>>>> use. Cubase can barely utilize a single socket system with 4 x cores  
>> or  
>>>> a  
>>>>> dual socket system with 2 x dual cores. Steinberg has been saying that  
>> they  
>>>>  
>>>>> are working to correct this. I'm just wondering if the new hardware  
will  
>>>>  
>>>>> provide them a convenient excuse to market hardware rather than correct  
>>>>  
>>>>> their antiquated software.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Maybe I'm paranoid. We've seen DAW manufacturers do an about face and  
>>>>> blatantly lie to their user base.....the EMU acquisition of Ensoniq  
>> and  
>>>>  
>>>>> the subsequent killing off of the stepchild Paris system, even as they  
>>>>> rebranded the proprietary hardware and sold it to us at a premium while  
>>>>  
>>>>> assuring this heavily invested user base that they were moving forward  
>> with  
>>>>  
>>>>> development and upgrades is a classic example.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> ;o)  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 07:49:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dedric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey mentioned this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of "near zero " latency.

Look at the video again.

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:



>On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
><know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick. Steiny  
>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>  
>How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>  
>It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and firewire  
>is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see  
>the  
>new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
>but  
>if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>  
>So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and  
>get  
>down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio drivers  
>(not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>  
>Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do anything  
>more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion  
>a  
>few times already. ;-)  
>  
>Dedric  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [rick](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 09:57:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

bagel seeds??? where do you get them at??? the spring planting season  
is almost here and i'd like to get a jump on the competition.

On 16 Mar 2008 15:52:37 +1000, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>  
>I still haven't heard a Yamaha filter that doesn't hurt my ears.  
>  
>And it's Rodney Orpheus! Glad he still has a job, I remember him pimping  
>the Houston as the best thing since bagels got seeds.  
>

>I'll stick with the rig I have for now . . .  
>  
>TCB  
>  
>"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>>pretty cool.  
>>  
>> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=related>  
>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 13:15:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Go with the Kosher ones:

<http://home.tiac.net/~cri/1998/bagel.html>

The following was seen attached to a plastic zip lock bag containing Cheerios.

#### WHERE TO PLANT BAGEL SEEDS

Any bright sunny location, preferably close to a delicatessen.

#### WHEN TO PLANT

Year around, but onion bagels grow best in winter, while poppy seed and pumpernickel grow well in summer.

#### CARE OF PLANTS

Plant in seven equal rows, running north and south. You may make the middle row longer. Join all rows with one long east-west row, for irrigation and to form a menorah. All seeds must be planted at least four feet deep. Any less depth and the hole in the bagel will not develop properly. Irrigate sparsely, with boiling water only!!

NOTE: Over-irrigation or cold water will cause your growing bagel to become soggy. Soggy bagels are not good for anything. . .

While it is possible to grow bagels topped with cream cheese by sprinkling the blossoms with fresh dairy cream, you should contact a professional bagel grower for expert advice. Some unkosher growers will use fertilizer, but that does affect the taste and texture, even if it does hasten the growth. However, those who like egg bagels have had success using fresh eggs as fertilizer.

#### TO EAT

Cut cross-wise. Never, never cut a bagel vertically. Ladle on lox and cream cheese (you were warned only experts could raise bagels already topped). Use when ripe. While day-old bagels may be toasted and eaten, any older and they tend to fossilize and are only good for missiles. Beware of over-ripe bagels!

#### GUARANTEE

If you are not 100% satisfied, dig up your bagel seeds and return. A BRAND NEW package of seeds will be sent to you.

rick wrote:

> bagel seeds??? where do you get them at??? the spring planting season  
> is almost here and i'd like to get a jump on the competition.  
>  
>  
>  
> On 16 Mar 2008 15:52:37 +1000, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:  
>  
>> I still haven't heard a Yamaha filter that doesn't hurt my ears.  
>>  
>> And it's Rodney Orpheus! Glad he still has a job, I remember him pimping  
>> the Houston as the best thing since bagels got seeds.  
>>  
>> I'll stick with the rig I have for now . . .  
>>  
>> TCB  
>>  
>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>>> pretty cool.  
>>>  
>>> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=related>  
>>>  
>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 14:41:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
news:C4020B2E.131D0%dterry@keyofd.net...  
> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick. Steiny  
>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>  
> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?

>

Yes, it was right up front. No latency. That's the magic bullet. :)

> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
> firewire  
> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see  
> the  
> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
> but  
> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>

> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and  
> get  
> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio drivers  
> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.

Which of course has never happened. I've no reason to think it will anytime soon. Still, I adore my quad core.

>  
> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
> anything  
> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion a  
> few times already. ;-)

IMO that all happened when ISA slots died. That's the moment when I started noting odd failures and crappy MIDI timing because the DSP left the add on cards and went to virtual, otherwise known as a PCI slot.

>  
> Detric  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 14:45:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Detric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e. I  
> could tell early on there was nothing new here).

- >
- > Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in and out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.
- > Nothing
- > different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while it
- > may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*
- > 0.00000ns.

That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole reason why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear though was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of how fast they simply would have to be to be no latency units.

- >
- > Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel ;-)
- > There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times in
- > the
- > converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near
- > zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about since
- > it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which
- > actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.
- > systems like Radar, etc).

very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end to end. And I have no problems living with that.

- >
- > Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on the
- > planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use different
- > packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try Steiny/Yamaha.
- >
- > Detric
- >
- > On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"
- > <jjdpro@gmail.com>
- > wrote:
- >
- >>
- >> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey
- >> mentioned
- >> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of "near
- >> zero " latency.
- >>
- >> Look at the video again.
- >>
- >>

>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>> Steiny  
>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>  
>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>  
>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>> firewire  
>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see  
>> the  
>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
>> but  
>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>  
>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and  
>> get  
>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>> drivers  
>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>  
>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>> anything  
>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion  
>> a  
>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>  
>>> Dedic  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 17:16:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Aaron,

You can stack up to three of them. That's 24 I/O (and unfortunately) 24 preamps that I would have to pay for that I don't really need.

;o(

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
news:47dd3589\$1@linux...

>

> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message

> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...

>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e. I

>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).

>>

>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in and

>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.

>> Nothing

>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while it

>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*

>> 0.00000ns.

>

> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video

> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole reason

> why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear though

> was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of how fast

> they simply would have to be to be no latency units.

>

>>

>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel ;-)

>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times in

>> the

>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near

>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about

>> since

>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which

>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.

>> systems like Radar, etc).

>

> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor

> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end to

> end. And I have no problems living with that.

>

>>

>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on the

>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use different

>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try Steiny/Yamaha.

>>

>> Dedric

>>

>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"

>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>

>> wrote:

>>  
>>>  
>>> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey  
>>> mentioned  
>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of  
>>> "near  
>>> zero " latency.  
>>>  
>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>  
>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>  
>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>>> firewire  
>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see  
>>> the  
>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
>>> but  
>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>  
>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and  
>>> get  
>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>> drivers  
>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>  
>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>>> anything  
>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that  
>>>> discussion  
>>> a  
>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>



>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 17:42:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how exactly they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for questions. How do they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the Cubase channels stuff would be no latency.

If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or '89, I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.

BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not firewire.

Aaron Allen wrote:

> "Dedric Terry" <[dterry@keyofd.net](mailto:dterry@keyofd.net)> wrote in message  
> news:C40220B7.131DC%[dterry@keyofd.net](mailto:dterry@keyofd.net)...  
>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e. I  
>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>  
>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in and  
>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>> Nothing  
>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while it  
>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>> 0.00000ns.  
>  
> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video  
> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole reason  
> why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear though was  
> if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of how fast they  
> simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>  
>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel ;-)  
>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times in  
>> the  
>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about since  
>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.

>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>  
> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end to  
> end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>  
>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on the  
>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use different  
>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>  
>> Dedic  
>>  
>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Dedic, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey  
>>> mentioned  
>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of "near  
>>> zero " latency.  
>>>  
>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>  
>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>  
>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>>> firewire  
>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see  
>>> the  
>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
>>> but  
>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>  
>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and  
>>> get  
>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>> drivers  
>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory

>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>  
>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>>> anything  
>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion  
>>> a  
>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric  
>>>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 17:45:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Bill,

If you look at the ports on the back, they look like FW. Maybe they are for cascading units?

Deej

"Bill L" <[bill@billlorentzen.com](mailto:bill@billlorentzen.com)> wrote in message <news:47dd5efc@linux...>  
> Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how exactly  
> they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for questions. How do  
> they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the Cubase channels stuff  
> would be no latency.  
>  
> If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from  
> the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
> comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
> good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or '89,  
> I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.  
>  
> BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
> firewire.  
>  
> Aaron Allen wrote:  
>> "Detric Terry" <[dterry@keyofd.net](mailto:dterry@keyofd.net)> wrote in message  
>> <news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...>  
>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e.  
>>> I  
>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>  
>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in

>>> and  
>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>>> Nothing  
>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
>>> it  
>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>> 0.00000ns.  
>>  
>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video  
>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole  
>> reason why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear  
>> though was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of  
>> how fast they simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>  
>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
>>> ;-)  
>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times in  
>>> the  
>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>>> since  
>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.  
>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>  
>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end  
>> to end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>  
>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on  
>>> the  
>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use  
>>> different  
>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try  
>>> Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>  
>>> Detric  
>>>  
>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey  
>>>> mentioned  
>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of  
>>>> "near  
>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>

>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>>>> firewire  
>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
>>>>> see  
>>>> the  
>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the  
>>>>> Fireface,  
>>>> but  
>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war  
>>>>> and  
>>>> get  
>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>>> drivers  
>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32  
>>>>> samples,  
>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>>>> anything  
>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that  
>>>>> discussion  
>>>> a  
>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Dedric  
>>>>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 17:50:59 GMT

Here's a link where you can check out a closeup of the ports:

<http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/Steinberg/PR/MR816-FireWire-Interfaces.html>

Also, I'm listening to the video clip again and he specifically states that it connects to the computer via firewire.

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47dd5efc@linux...

> Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how exactly  
> they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for questions. How do  
> they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the Cubase channels stuff  
> would be no latency.

>  
> If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from  
> the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
> comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
> good. Since I have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or '89,  
> I am a pretty big fan of Steinberg too.

>  
> BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
> firewire.

>  
> Aaron Allen wrote:

>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...

>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e.  
>>> I

>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).

>>>

>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in

>>> and

>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.

>>> Nothing

>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while

>>> it

>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*

>>> 0.00000ns.

>>

>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video

>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole

>> reason why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear

>> though was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of

>> how fast they simply would have to be to be no latency units.

>>

>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel

>>> ;-)  
>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times in  
>>> the  
>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>>> since  
>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.  
>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>  
>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end  
>> to end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>  
>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on  
>>> the  
>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use  
>>> different  
>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try  
>>> Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>  
>>> Dedic  
>>>  
>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Dedic, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey  
>>>> mentioned  
>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of  
>>>> "near  
>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>  
>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>>>>> firewire  
>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't

>>>> see  
>>> the  
>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the  
>>>> Fireface,  
>>> but  
>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>  
>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war  
>>>> and  
>>> get  
>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>> drivers  
>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32  
>>>> samples,  
>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>  
>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>>> anything  
>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that  
>>>> discussion  
>>> a  
>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric  
>>>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Detric Terry](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 19:14:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Please don't read my post where I said this is a firewire interface.  
Nothing different going on here from any other fw interface.

On 3/16/08 11:50 AM, in article 47dd6112@linux, "Mr. Simplicity"  
<noway@jose.net> wrote:

> Here's a link where you can check out a closeup of the ports:  
>  
> <http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/Steinberg/PR/MR816-FireWire-Interfaces.html>  
>  
> Also, I'm listening to the video clip again and he specifically states that  
> it connects to the computer via firewire.



>  
>  
> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47dd5efc@linux...  
>> Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how exactly  
>> they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for questions. How do  
>> they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the Cubase channels stuff  
>> would be no latency.  
>>  
>> If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from  
>> the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>> comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
>> good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or '89,  
>> I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.  
>>  
>> BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
>> firewire.  
>>  
>> Aaron Allen wrote:  
>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e.  
>>>> I  
>>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>>  
>>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in  
>>>> and  
>>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>>>> Nothing  
>>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
>>>> it  
>>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>>> 0.00000ns.  
>>>>  
>>>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video  
>>>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole  
>>>> reason why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear  
>>>> though was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of  
>>>> how fast they simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>>>  
>>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
>>>> ;-)  
>>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times in  
>>>> the  
>>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>>>> since  
>>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.

>>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>>  
>>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
>>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end  
>>> to end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>>  
>>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on  
>>>> the  
>>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use  
>>>> different  
>>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try  
>>>> Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric  
>>>>  
>>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey  
>>>>> mentioned  
>>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of  
>>>>> "near  
>>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>>>>>> firewire  
>>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
>>>>>>> see  
>>>>>>> the  
>>>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the  
>>>>>>> Fireface,  
>>>>>>> but  
>>>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO

>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war  
>>>>> and  
>>>>> get  
>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>>> drivers  
>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32  
>>>>> samples,  
>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>>>> anything  
>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that  
>>>>> discussion  
>>>>> a  
>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Detric  
>>>>>  
>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 20:35:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Heheh!!!! OK I won't read that one.  
;o)

I think TC makes some kind of interface with monitoring and FX too don't they?

If Steinberg would lose the preamps (and the probable hefty charge for them), this interface might be a bit more attractive.

Also, I wondering about something. I can enable the functionality of both the Frontier Tranzport and my Houston controller simultaneously. Now if the Houston could be simultaneously be used for multiple fader moves and the the new single fader Steiny controller could also be used for accessing a single fader and the channel strip controls, this might end up being a nice combination of functionalities.

Three of these new interfaces (sans preamps) along with an RME ADI 192-DD and an RME ADI 8-DD would give me 24 analog I/O and allow me to integrate my outboard gear in a way similar to the way I'm doing now with a Multiface, MADI/ADI 648, AES32 and a Pair of ADI 8-DD units.

Basically I would be selling off the MADI/ADI-648, the Multiface, a pair of

ADI 8-DS units (Nuendo branded) and one of my ADI 8-DD units and replacing them with 3 x of the Steiny 816 units and the CC121 controller and an RME ADI 192-DD. the reason for the ADI 192-DD is because it will allow the sample rate conversion of signals received via ADAT I/O whereas the ADI8-DD will not.

What would be the advantage of this?? Well, I could use the Steinberg control room function without needing to drastically upgrade my current computer to use the CR function with low latency with large projects.....and this would allow me to sell the huge Furman HDS-16 system along with the 5 x HRM-16 remote mixers I'm using.

I \*might\* come out of this on a break even or even with some money in my pocket depending on the cost of the Steinberg hardware. Of course, there's also the factor of my liking the RME converters I'd be selling and I don't really know diddly about Yamaha converters. That and I seem to be on the same wavelength most of the time and I have to take into account his opinion of Yamaha converters.

Well.....anyway.....this is probably a few months away from being a possibility anyway.

Deej

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message news:C402CDC9.1326E%dterry@keyofd.net...

> Please don't read my post where I said this is a firewire interface.

> Nothing different going on here from any other fw interface.

>

>

> On 3/16/08 11:50 AM, in article 47dd6112@linux, "Mr. Simplicity"

> <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>

>> Here's a link where you can check out a closeup of the ports:

>>

>> [http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/Steinberg/PR/MR816-FireW](http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/Steinberg/PR/MR816-FireWire-Interfaces.html)

>> ire-Interfaces.html

>>

>> Also, I'm listening to the video clip again and he specifically states

>> that

>> it connects to the computer via firewire.

>>

>>

>> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47dd5efc@linux...

>>> Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how

>>> exactly  
>>> they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for questions. How  
>>> do  
>>> they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the Cubase channels  
>>> stuff  
>>> would be no latency.  
>>>  
>>> If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from  
>>> the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>>> comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
>>> good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or  
>>> '89,  
>>> I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.  
>>>  
>>> BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
>>> firewire.  
>>>  
>>> Aaron Allen wrote:  
>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>>>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that  
>>>>> (i.e.  
>>>>> I  
>>>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in  
>>>>> and  
>>>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>>>>> Nothing  
>>>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
>>>>> it  
>>>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>>>> 0.00000ns.  
>>>>  
>>>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the  
>>>> video  
>>>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole  
>>>> reason why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear  
>>>> though was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because  
>>>> of  
>>>> how fast they simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>>>  
>>>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
>>>>> ;-)  
>>>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times  
>>>>> in  
>>>>> the  
>>>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or

>>>> "near  
>>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>>>> since  
>>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing  
>>>> (which  
>>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it -  
>>>> i.e.  
>>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>>>  
>>>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to  
>>>> convertor  
>>>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end  
>>>> to end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>>>  
>>>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on  
>>>>> the  
>>>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use  
>>>>> different  
>>>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try  
>>>>> Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Detric  
>>>>>  
>>>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing..  
>>>>>> hey  
>>>>>> mentioned  
>>>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of  
>>>>>> "near  
>>>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>>>> apparently has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>>>>>>>> firewire

>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
>>>>>> see  
>>>>>> the  
>>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the  
>>>>>> Fireface,  
>>>>>> but  
>>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with  
>>>>>> ASIO  
>>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war  
>>>>>> and  
>>>>>> get  
>>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>>>> drivers  
>>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32  
>>>>>> samples,  
>>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>>>>> anything  
>>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that  
>>>>>> discussion  
>>>>>> a  
>>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Dedic  
>>>>>>  
>>>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 20:40:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message  
news:47dd8780\$1@linux...

>  
> A few questions. Will it work with other software other than Steinberg?  
> Will it have zero latency with other software? What is the cost?

Sounds like they're sort of pooh poohing the use of other software in the  
video, and the cost is TBA.

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 20:47:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

He may have mis-spoken, but I heard him fo sho say USB.

Mr. Simplicity wrote:

> Bill,

>

> If you look at the ports on the back, they look like FW. Maybe they are for  
> cascading units?

>

> Deej

>

> "Bill L" <[bill@billlorentzen.com](mailto:bill@billlorentzen.com)> wrote in message <news:47dd5efc@linux...>

>> Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how exactly  
>> they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for questions. How do  
>> they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the Cubase channels stuff  
>> would be no latency.

>>

>> If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from  
>> the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>> comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
>> good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or '89,  
>> I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.

>>

>> BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
>> firewire.

>>

>> Aaron Allen wrote:

>>> "Dedric Terry" <[dterry@keyofd.net](mailto:dterry@keyofd.net)> wrote in message  
>>> <news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...>

>>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e.

>>>> I

>>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).

>>>>

>>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in  
>>>> and

>>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.

>>>> Nothing

>>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
>>>> it

>>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*

>>>> 0.00000ns.

>>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video  
>>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole  
>>> reason why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear  
>>> though was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of  
>>> how fast they simply would have to be to be no latency units.



>>>  
>>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
>>>> ;-)  
>>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times in  
>>>> the  
>>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>>>> since  
>>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.  
>>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
>>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end  
>>> to end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>>  
>>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on  
>>>> the  
>>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use  
>>>> different  
>>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try  
>>>> Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric  
>>>>  
>>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey  
>>>>> mentioned  
>>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of  
>>>>> "near  
>>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>>>>>> firewire

>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
>>>>> see  
>>>>> the  
>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the  
>>>>> Fireface,  
>>>>> but  
>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war  
>>>>> and  
>>>>> get  
>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>>> drivers  
>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32  
>>>>> samples,  
>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>>>> anything  
>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that  
>>>>> discussion  
>>>>> a  
>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Dedic  
>>>>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 20:52:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

They indicate use with other s/w, however on Mac I would doubt that Yammy's driver support is as good, from past experience.

James McCloskey wrote:

> A few questions. Will it work with other software other than Steinberg?  
> Will it have zero latency with other software? What is the cost?  
>  
> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>> Here's a link where you can check out a closeup of the ports:  
>>  
>> <http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/Steinberg/PR/MR816-FireWire-Interfaces.html>  
>>

>> Also, I'm listening to the video clip again and he specifically states that  
>  
>> it connects to the computer via firewire.  
>>  
>>  
>> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47dd5efc@linux...  
>>> Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how exactly  
>  
>>> they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for questions. How  
> do  
>>> they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the Cubase channels stuff  
>  
>>> would be no latency.  
>>>  
>>> If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from  
>  
>>> the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>>> comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
>  
>>> good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or  
> '89,  
>>> I am a pretty big fan of Steinberg too.  
>>>  
>>> BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
>  
>>> firewire.  
>>>  
>>> Aaron Allen wrote:  
>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>>>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e.  
>  
>>>>> I  
>>>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in  
>  
>>>>> and  
>>>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>  
>>>>> Nothing  
>>>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
>  
>>>>> it  
>>>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>>>> 0.00000ns.  
>>>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video  
>

>>>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole  
>>>> reason why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear  
>  
>>>> though was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because  
> of  
>>>> how fast they simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>>>  
>>>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
>  
>>>>> ;-)  
>>>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times  
> in  
>>>>> the  
>>>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>>>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>  
>>>>> since  
>>>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>>>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.  
>>>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
>  
>>>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end  
>  
>>>> to end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>>>  
>>>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on  
>  
>>>>> the  
>>>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use  
>>>>> different  
>>>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try  
>>>>> Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Detric  
>>>>>  
>>>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing..  
> hey  
>>>>>> mentioned  
>>>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of  
>  
>>>>>> "near  
>>>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>>>

>>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>  
>>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>  
>>>>>>> firewire  
>>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
>  
>>>>>>> see  
>>>>>>> the  
>>>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the  
>>>>>>> Fireface,  
>>>>>>> but  
>>>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war  
>  
>>>>>>> and  
>>>>>>> get  
>>>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>  
>>>>>>> drivers  
>>>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32  
>>>>>>> samples,  
>>>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>  
>>>>>>> anything  
>>>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that  
>>>>>>> discussion  
>>>>>>> a  
>>>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Dedic  
>>>>>>>

>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 20:58:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hmmm.....Since I'd be interfacing via Firewire, I'd also be selling off a 13 slot Magma chassis that is holding my RME PCI cards and 4 x outboard reverbs that I'm using with my HRM-16 cue remotes so just adding up all the stuff that I would be selling off, I'm looking at around \$6k on the aftermarket, if I priced it to move quick.

I could pick up an ADI 192-DD for aound \$1200.00 US. that would leave around \$4800 for the three interfaces and the controller.

Simplifying my situation and keeping my current DAW which, quite frankly, is the most stable DAW I've ever used that is friendly with 4 x UAD-1 cards and 2 x POCO's which is more DSP that I could ever want, while being able to lose the ADM/Totalmix layer when tracking might be worth the hassle, if the converters were good.

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [excelav](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 21:48:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

A few questions. Will it work with other software other than Steinberg?  
Will it have zero latency with other software? What is the cost?

"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>Here's a link where you han check out a closeup of the ports:

>

> <http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/Steinberg/PR/MR816-FireWire-Interfaces.html>

>

>Also, I'm listening to the video clip again adn he specifically states that

>it connects to the computer via firewire.

>

>

>"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47dd5efc@linux...

>> Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how exactly

>> they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for questions. How do

>> they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the Cubase channels stuff

>> would be no latency.  
>>  
>> If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from  
  
>> the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>> comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
  
>> good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or  
'89,  
>> I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.  
>>  
>> BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
  
>> firewire.  
>>  
>> Aaron Allen wrote:  
>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e.  
  
>>>> I  
>>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>>  
>>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in  
  
>>>> and  
>>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
  
>>>> Nothing  
>>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
  
>>>> it  
>>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>>> 0.00000ns.  
>>>>  
>>>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video  
  
>>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole  
>>> reason why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear  
  
>>> though was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because  
of  
>>> how fast they simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>>>  
>>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
  
>>>> ;-)

>>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times  
in  
>>>> the  
>>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about

>>>> since  
>>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.  
>>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>>  
>>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor

>>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end

>>> to end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>>  
>>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on

>>>> the  
>>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use  
>>>> different  
>>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try  
>>>> Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric  
>>>>  
>>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing..  
hey  
>>>>> mentioned  
>>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of

>>>>> "near  
>>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.

>>>>>>> Steiny



>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
  
>>>>>> firewire  
>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
  
>>>>>> see  
>>>>>> the  
>>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the  
>>>>>> Fireface,  
>>>>>> but  
>>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war  
  
>>>>>> and  
>>>>>> get  
>>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
  
>>>>>> drivers  
>>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32  
>>>>>> samples,  
>>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
  
>>>>>> anything  
>>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that  
>>>>>> discussion  
>>>>>> a  
>>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Detric  
>>>>>>  
>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 22:30:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ever had a poppy or sesame seed bagel? Is this an east coast thing?

TCB

rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:

>bagel seeds??? where do you get them at??? the spring planting season  
>is almost here and i'd like to get a jump on the competition.

>

>

>

>On 16 Mar 2008 15:52:37 +1000, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>>

>>I still haven't heard a Yamaha filter that doesn't hurt my ears.

>>

>>And it's Rodney Orpheus! Glad he still has a job, I remember him pimping  
>>the Houston as the best thing since bagels got seeds.

>>

>>I'll stick with the rig I have for now . . .

>>

>>TCB

>>

>>"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>>>pretty cool.

>>>

>>> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=related>

>>>

>>>

>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived

Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 22:40:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Watch the whole 3 videos..

They say not Zero latency, but No latency .. A non issue as far as they are  
concerned.

Who knows???

Martin H

On 16/03/08 4:24 PM, in article C4020B2E.131D0%dterry@keyofd.net, "Dedric  
Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"

> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:

>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick. Steiny

>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>  
> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>  
> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and firewire  
> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see the  
> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface, but  
> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>  
> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and get  
> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio drivers  
> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>  
> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do anything  
> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion a  
> few times already. ;-)  
>  
> Dedic  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 22:45:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

They said you can stack up to 3 units..

Martin H

On 17/03/08 1:45 AM, in article 47dd3589\$1@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
<know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:

>  
> "Dedic Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e. I  
>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>  
>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in and  
>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>> Nothing  
>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while it  
>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>> 0.00000ns.

>  
> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video  
> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole reason  
> why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear though was  
> if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of how fast they  
> simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>  
>>  
>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel ;-)  
>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times in  
>> the  
>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about since  
>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.  
>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>  
> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end to  
> end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>  
>>  
>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on the  
>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use different  
>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>  
>> Dedic  
>>  
>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>>  
>>> Dedic, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey  
>>> mentioned  
>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of "near  
>>> zero " latency.  
>>>  
>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>> apparently has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>

>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>  
>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>>> firewire  
>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see  
>>> the  
>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
>>> but  
>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>  
>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and  
>>> get  
>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>> drivers  
>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>  
>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>>> anything  
>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion  
>>> a  
>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 23:02:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think your points Are on Point! :)

As for the sound of Yammy's converters, well let me just say this.. Last year , a friend did a project on his then New Yammy DW 1600 portable digital 16 track recorder. Well, to the point, when we flew those tracks he recorded into Nuendo to mix, I was shocked. He used nothing but the 8 on board Pre's. To be honest, we could have mixed the songs on the unit. It was that good. Very wide , opn, big sound.

Another example of Yammys converters can be heard on the AW4416. Whew!! Turns out that Yammy used their 0296 mixers technogoly and converters & pres..

The Newer Aw2400 uses the DM-2000 Pres and converterter.. Heck! Have you every heard the Motif ES/XS Workstations Sampling section?? The 01x? , the 188x(Very in demand).. All these units have the same stellar converters.. That to me.. Are some of the best on the Market. Even sweeter sounding than RME.. They are that good..

So, you're not losing in the sound department, heck, you'd be gaining..

"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>Heheh!!!! OK I won't read that one.

>;o)

> I think TC makes some kind of interface with monitoring and FX too don't

>they?

>

>If Steinberg would lose the preamps (and the probable hefty charge for >them), this interface might be a bit more attractive.

>

>Also, I wondering about something. I can enable the functionality of both

>the Frontier Tranzport and my Houston controller simultaneously. Now if the

>Houston could be simultaneously be used for multiple fader moves and the the

>new single fader Steiny controller could also be used for accessing a single

>fader and the channel strip controls, this might end up being a nice

>combination of functionalities.

>

>Three of these new interfaces (sans preamps) along with an RME ADI 192-DD

>and an RME ADI 8-DD would give me 24 analog I/O and allow me to integrate my

>outboard gear in a way similar to the way I'm doing now with a Multiface,

>MADI/ADI 648, AES32 and a Pair of ADI 8-DD units.

>

>Basically I would be selling off the MADI/ADI-648, the Multiface, a pair of

>ADI 8-DS units (Nuendo branded) and one of my ADI 8-DD units and replacing

>them with 3 x of the Steiny 816 units and the CC121 controler and an RME ADI

>192-DD. the reason for the ADI 192-DD is because it will allow the sample

>rate conversion of signals received via ADAT I/O whereas the ADI8-DD will

>not.

>

>What would be the advantage of this?? Well, I could use the Steinberg  
>control room function without needing to drastically upgrade my current  
  
>computer to use the CR function with low latency with large  
>projects.....and this would allow me to sell the huge Furman HDS-16  
  
>system along with the 5 x HRM-16 remote mixers I'm using.  
>  
>I \*might\* come out of this on a break even or even with some money in my  
  
>pocket depending on the cost of the Steinberg hardware. Of course, there's  
  
>also the factor of my liking the RME converters I'd be selling and I don't  
  
>really know diddly about Yamaha converters. thad and I seem to be on the  
  
>same wavelength most of the time and I have to take into account his opinion  
  
>of Yamaha converters.  
>  
>Well.....anyway.....this is probably a few months away from being a  
  
>possibility anyway.  
>  
>Deej  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>news:C402CDC9.1326E%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>> Please don't read my post where I said this is a firewire interface.  
>> Nothing different going on here from any other fw interface.  
>>  
>>  
>> On 3/16/08 11:50 AM, in article 47dd6112@linux, "Mr. Simplicity"  
>> <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Here's a link where you han check out a closeup of the ports:  
>>>  
>>> <http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/Steinberg/PR/MR816-FireWire-Interfaces.html>  
>>>  
>>> Also, I'm listening to the video clip again adn he specifically states  
  
>>> that  
>>> it connects to the computer via firewire.  
>>>

>>>  
>>> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47dd5efc@linux...  
>>>> Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how  
>>>> exactly  
>>>> they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for questions. How  
  
>>>> do  
>>>> they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the Cubase channels  
  
>>>> stuff  
>>>> would be no latency.  
>>>>  
>>>> If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for  
from  
>>>> the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>>>> comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
>>>> good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or  
  
>>>> '89,  
>>>> I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.  
>>>>  
>>>> BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB,  
not  
>>>> firewire.  
>>>>  
>>>> Aaron Allen wrote:  
>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>>>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that  
  
>>>>>> (i.e.  
>>>>>> I  
>>>>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp  
(in  
>>>>>> and  
>>>>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>>>>>> Nothing  
>>>>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
>>>>>> it  
>>>>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>>>>> 0.00000ns.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the  
  
>>>>>> video  
>>>>>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole



>>>>> reason why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't  
hear  
>>>>> though was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because  
  
>>>>> of  
>>>>> how fast they simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
>>>>>> ;-)  
>>>>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times  
  
>>>>>> in  
>>>>>> the  
>>>>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or  
  
>>>>>> "near  
>>>>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>>>>>> since  
>>>>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing  
>>>>>> (which  
>>>>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it -  
  
>>>>>> i.e.  
>>>>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to  
>>>>>> convertor  
>>>>>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS  
end  
>>>>>> to end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW  
on  
>>>>>>> the  
>>>>>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use  
>>>>>>> different  
>>>>>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try  
>>>>>>> Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Dedic  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>>>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Dedic, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing..  
  
>>>>>>>> hey

>>>>>> mentioned  
>>>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim  
of  
>>>>>> "near  
>>>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc,  
and  
>>>>>>>> firewire  
>>>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
>>>>>>>> see  
>>>>>>>> the  
>>>>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the  
>>>>>>>> Fireface,  
>>>>>>>> but  
>>>>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with  
  
>>>>>>>> ASIO  
>>>>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat  
war  
>>>>>>>> and  
>>>>>>>> get  
>>>>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>>>>>> drivers  
>>>>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32  
>>>>>>>> samples,  
>>>>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to  
do  
>>>>>>>> anything  
>>>>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that  
>>>>>>>> discussion

>>>>>> a  
>>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Dedic  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 23:14:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think this Hardware is "Married" to Cubase 4 . If you look gain at the video 2/3 (2:39-beyond) , they go into great detail how this units "Treats" Cubase and the Hardware as ONE. Meaning, Cubase is just an "Extension" of the unit. ALso, meaning, that this unit must have a big piece of Cubase's software "already" Built-In...!! That's how they can acheive "No -Latency" and do all that clever Monitoring and even record the Builtin FX while monitoring.. Sweet..

I think Yammy & Steiny "re-thought" the Native missing link(Latency) equation, with what seems to be a quasi DSP meets Software .Already built-in the units..

I have admit, having the ability to link 3 of these babys has me geeked!! Because, Yammy & Stein are using Intelligent Firewire called M-Lan.. No other Firewire interface can be daisy chained using the normal Firewire Protocol..

What's really interesting is that this is only the "First' Product from this Marriage. We can can probably bet, that more products like their Sweet N12 Mixer/controller is on the horizon. As it stands, this is a great first step..

Bill L <[bill@billlorentzen.com](mailto:bill@billlorentzen.com)> wrote:

>Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how  
>exactly they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for  
>questions. How do they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the  
>Cubase channels stuff would be no latency.

>

>If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from

>the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
>good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or  
>'89, I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.

>  
>BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
>firewire.  
>  
>Aaron Allen wrote:  
>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e.  
I  
>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>  
>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in  
and  
>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>>> Nothing  
>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
it  
>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>> 0.00000ns.  
>>  
>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video  
  
>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole reason  
  
>> why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear though  
was  
>> if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of how fast  
they  
>> simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>  
>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
;-)  
>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times  
in  
>>> the  
>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
since  
>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.  
>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>  
>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
  
>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end  
to  
>> end. And I have no problems living with that.

>>  
>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on  
the  
>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use different  
>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>  
>>> Dedic  
>>>  
>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Dedic, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing.. hey  
>>>> mentioned  
>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of  
"near  
>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>  
>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
  
>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
  
>>>>>> firewire  
>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
see  
>>>> the  
>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
>>>> but  
>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war  
and  
>>>> get  
>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>>>> drivers  
>>>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,

>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>  
>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do

>>>> anything  
>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion  
>>>> a  
>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric  
>>>>  
>>  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Detric Terry](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 23:28:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
wrote:

> Which?  
>  
> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>  
>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces  
>> that are chain-able.  
>>

RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple units  
in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).

From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could be  
simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give you  
VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase, but  
though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and the  
audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.

I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until the  
units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.

I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCIe gear for a firewire solution... DJ. ;-)

Detric

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [excelav](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 23:38:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
>I think this Hardware is "Married" to Cubase 4 . If you look gain at the  
video  
>2/3 (2:39-beyond) , they go into great detail how this units "Treats" Cubase  
>and the Hardware as ONE. Meaning, Cubase is just an "Extension" of the unit.  
>ALso, meaning, that this unit must have a big piece of Cubase's software  
>"already" Built-In...!! That's how they can acheive "No -Latency" and do  
>all that clever Monitoring and even record the Builtin FX while monitoring..  
>Sweet..  
>  
>I think Yammy & Steiny "re-thought" the Native missing link(Latency) equation,  
>with what seems to be a quasi DSP meets Software .Already built-in the units..  
>  
>  
>I have admit, having the ability to link 3 of these babys has me geeked!!  
>Because, Yammy & Stein are using Intelligent Firewire called M-Lan.. No  
other  
>Firewire interface can be daisy chained using the normal Firewire Protocol..  
>

LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces  
that are chain-able.

>What's really interesting is that this is only the "First' Product from  
this  
>Marriage. We can can probably bet, that more products like their Sweet N12  
>Mixer/controller is on the horizon. As it stands, this is a great first  
step..  
>  
>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:  
>>Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how  
>>exactly they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for  
>>questions. How do they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the  
>>Cubase channels stuff would be no latency.  
>>  
>>If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from  
>  
>>the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>>comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
>>good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or  
>>'89, I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.  
>>  
>>BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not

>  
>>firewire.  
>>  
>>Aaron Allen wrote:  
>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that (i.e.  
>|  
>>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>>  
>>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in  
>and  
>>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.

>>>> Nothing  
>>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
>it  
>>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>>> 0.00000ns.  
>>>  
>>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video  
>  
>>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole reason  
>  
>>> why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear though  
>was  
>>> if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of how fast  
>they  
>>> simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>>  
>>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
>;-)  
>>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times  
>in  
>>>> the  
>>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>since  
>>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it - i.e.  
>>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>>  
>>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
>  
>>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS end  
>to  
>>> end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>>



>>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW on  
>the  
>>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use different  
>>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric  
>>>>  
>>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing..  
hey  
>>>>> mentioned  
>>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of  
>"near  
>>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>  
>>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>  
>>>>>>> firewire  
>>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
>see  
>>>>> the  
>>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
>>>>> but  
>>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war  
>and  
>>>>> get  
>>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
  
>>>>>>> drivers

>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>  
>>>>> anything  
>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion  
>>>>> a  
>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Detric  
>>>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sun, 16 Mar 2008 23:45:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Which?

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>I think this Hardware is "Married" to Cubase 4 . If you look gain at the  
>video

>>2/3 (2:39-beyond) , they go into great detail how this units "Treats" Cubase  
>>and the Hardware as ONE. Meaning, Cubase is just an "Extension" of the  
unit.

>>ALso, meaning, that this unit must have a big piece of Cubase's software  
>>"already" Built-In...!! That's how they can acheive "No -Latency" and do  
>>all that clever Monitoring and even record the Builtin FX while monitoring..  
>>Sweet..

>>

>>I think Yammy & Steiny "re-thought" the Native missing link(Latency) equation,  
>>with what seems to be a quasi DSP meets Software .Already built-in the  
units..

>>

>>

>>I have admit, having the ability to link 3 of these babys has me geeked!!  
>>Because, Yammy & Stein are using Intelligent Firewire called M-Lan.. No  
>other  
>>Firewire interface can be daisy chained using the normal Firewire Protocol..  
>>

>  
>LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces  
>that are chain-able.  
>  
>>What's really interesting is that this is only the "First' Product from  
>this  
>>Marriage. We can probably bet, that more products like their Sweet  
N12  
>>Mixer/controller is on the horizon. As it stands, this is a great first  
>step..  
>>  
>>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:  
>>>Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how  
>>>exactly they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for  
>>>questions. How do they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the  
  
>>>Cubase channels stuff would be no latency.  
>>>  
>>>If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from  
>>  
>>>the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>>>comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
>  
>>>good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or  
  
>>>'89, I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.  
>>>  
>>>BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
>>  
>>>firewire.  
>>>  
>>>Aaron Allen wrote:  
>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>>>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that  
(i.e.  
>>I  
>>>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp (in  
>>and  
>>>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>  
>>>>> Nothing  
>>>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
>>it  
>>>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>>>> 0.00000ns.

>>>>  
>>>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the video  
>>  
>>>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole  
reason  
>>  
>>>> why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear though  
>>was  
>>>> if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of how fast  
>>they  
>>>> simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>>>  
>>>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
>>;-)  
>>>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times  
>>in  
>>>>> the  
>>>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or "near  
>>>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>>since  
>>>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>>>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it -  
i.e.  
>>>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>>>  
>>>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
>>  
>>>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS  
end  
>>to  
>>>> end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>>>  
>>>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW  
on  
>>the  
>>>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use different  
>>>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Detric  
>>>>>  
>>>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing..  
>hey  
>>>>>> mentioned  
>>>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim of

>>"near  
>>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>  
>>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>  
>>>>>>> firewire  
>>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
>>see  
>>>>>>> the  
>>>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
>>>>>>> but  
>>>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with  
ASIO  
>>>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war  
>>and  
>>>>>>> get  
>>>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>  
>>>>>>> drivers  
>>>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>>>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>  
>>>>>>> anything  
>>>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion  
>>>>>>> a  
>>>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Detric  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>

>>>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [excelav](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 00:22:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Some of the MOTU products are expandable like the 828s. I believe I read some where, that another companies FW interfaces are expandable???

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
>Which?  
>  
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>I think this Hardware is "Married" to Cubase 4 . If you look gain at the  
>>>video  
>>>2/3 (2:39-beyond) , they go into great detail how this units "Treats"  
Cubase  
>>>and the Hardware as ONE. Meaning, Cubase is just an "Extension" of the  
>unit.  
>>>ALso, meaning, that this unit must have a big piece of Cubase's software  
>>>"already" Built-In...!! That's how they can acheive "No -Latency" and  
do  
>>>all that clever Monitoring and even record the Builtin FX while monitoring..  
>>>Sweet..  
>>>  
>>>I think Yammy & Steiny "re-thought" the Native missing link(Latency) equation,  
>>>with what seems to be a quasi DSP meets Software .Already built-in the  
>units..  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>I have admit, having the ability to link 3 of these babys has me geeked!!  
>>>Because, Yammy & Stein are using Intelligent Firewire called M-Lan.. No  
>>>other  
>>>Firewire interface can be daisy chained using the normal Firewire Protocol..  
>>>  
>>  
>>LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces  
>>that are chain-able.  
>>  
>>>What's really interesting is that this is only the "First' Product from  
>>this

>>>Marriage. We can probably bet, that more products like their Sweet  
>N12  
>>>Mixer/controller is on the horizon. As it stands, this is a great first  
>>step..  
>>>  
>>>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:  
>>>>Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how  
>>>>exactly they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for  
>>>>questions. How do they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the  
>  
>>>>Cubase channels stuff would be no latency.  
>>>>  
>>>>If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for from  
>>>  
>>>>the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>>>>comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
>>  
>>>>good. Since i have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or  
>  
>>>>'89, I am a pretty big fan of Steiny too.  
>>>>  
>>>>BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
>>>  
>>>>firewire.  
>>>>  
>>>>Aaron Allen wrote:  
>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>>>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that  
>(i.e.  
>>>I  
>>>>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp  
(in  
>>>>and  
>>>>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>>  
>>>>>> Nothing  
>>>>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
>>>>it  
>>>>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>>>>> 0.00000ns.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the  
video  
>>>  
>>>>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole

>reason  
>>>  
>>>> why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't hear though  
>>>was  
>>>> if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because of how fast  
>>>they  
>>>> simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>>>  
>>>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
>>>;-)  
>>>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times  
>>>in  
>>>>> the  
>>>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or  
"near  
>>>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>>>since  
>>>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing (which  
>>>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it -  
>i.e.  
>>>>> systems like Radar, etc).  
>>>>>  
>>>>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to convertor  
>>>  
>>>>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS  
>end  
>>>to  
>>>>> end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW  
>on  
>>>the  
>>>>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use different  
>>>>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Detric  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Detric, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing..  
>>hey  
>>>>>>> mentioned  
>>>>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim  
of  
>>>"near  
>>>>>>> zero " latency.



>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>  
>>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc,  
and  
>>>  
>>>>>>> firewire  
>>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
>>>see  
>>>>>>> the  
>>>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
>>>>>>> but  
>>>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with  
>ASIO  
>>>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat  
war  
>>>and  
>>>>>>> get  
>>>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>  
>>>>>>> drivers  
>>>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>>>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to  
do  
>>>  
>>>>>>> anything  
>>>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion  
>>>>>>> a  
>>>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Dedric  
>>>>>>>

>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 03:19:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I have an i88x and it sounds really nice.

LaMont wrote:

> I think your points Are on Point! :)  
>  
> As for the sound of Yammy's converters, well let me just say this.. LAsT  
> year , a friend did a project on his then New Yammy DW 1600 portable digital  
> 16 track recorder. Well, to the point, when we flew those tracks he recorded  
> into Nuendo to mix, I was shocked. He used nothing but the 8 on board Pre's.  
> To be honest, we could have mixed the songs on the unit. It was that good.  
> Very wide , opn, big sound.  
>  
> Another example of Yammys converters can be heard on the AW4416. Whew!! Turns  
> out that Yammy used their 0296 mixers tecnogoly and converters & pres..  
> The Newer Aw2400 uses the DM-2000 Pres and convererters.. Heck! Have you  
> every heard the Motif ES/XS Workstations Sampling section?? The 01x? , the  
> I88x(Very in demand).. All these units have the same stellar converters..  
> That to me.. Are some of the best on the Market. Even sweeter sounding than  
> RME.. They are that good..  
>  
> So, you're not losing in the sound department, heck, you'd be gaining..  
> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>> Heheh!!!! OK I won't read that one.  
>> ;o)  
>> I think TC makes some kind of interface with monitoring and FX too don't  
>  
>> they?  
>>  
>> If Steinberg would lose the preamps (and the probable hefty charge for  
>> them), this interface might be a bit more attractive.  
>>  
>> Also, I wondering about something. I can enable the functionality of both  
>  
>> the Frontier Tranzport and my Houston controller simultaneously. Now if  
> the  
>> Houston could be simultaneously be used for multiple fader moves and the  
> the

>> new single fader Steiny controller could also be used for accessing a single  
>  
>> fader and the channel strip controls, this might end up being a nice  
>> combination of functionalities.  
>>  
>> Three of these new interfaces (sans preamps) along with an RME ADI 192-DD  
>  
>> and an RME ADI 8-DD would give me 24 analog I/O and allow me to integrate  
> my  
>> outboard gear in a way similar to the way I'm doing now with a Multiface,  
>  
>> MADI/ADI 648, AES32 and a Pair of ADI 8-DD units.  
>>  
>> Basically I would be selling off the MADI/ADI-648, the Multiface, a pair  
> of  
>> ADI 8-DS units (Nuendo branded) and one of my ADI 8-DD units and replacing  
>  
>> them with 3 x of the Steiny 816 units and the CC121 controller and an RME  
> ADI  
>> 192-DD. the reason for the ADI 192-DD is because it will allow the sample  
>  
>> rate conversion of signals received via ADAT I/O whereas the ADI8-DD will  
>  
>> not.  
>>  
>> What would be the advantage of this?? Well, I could use the Steinberg  
>> control room function without needing to drastically upgrade my current  
>  
>> computer to use the CR function with low latency with large  
>> projects.....and this would allow me to sell the huge Furman HDS-16  
>  
>> system along with the 5 x HRM-16 remote mixers I'm using.  
>>  
>> I \*might\* come out of this on a break even or even with some money in my  
>  
>> pocket depending on the cost of the Steinberg hardware. Of course, there's  
>  
>> also the factor of my liking the RME converters I'd be selling and I don't  
>  
>> really know diddly about Yamaha converters. thad and I seem to be on the  
>  
>> same wavelength most of the time and I have to take into account his opinion  
>  
>> of Yamaha converters.  
>>  
>> Well.....anyway.....this is probably a few months away from being a  
>  
>> possibility anyway.

>>  
>> Deej  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>> news:C402CDC9.1326E%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>> Please don't read my post where I said this is a firewire interface.  
>>> Nothing different going on here from any other fw interface.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On 3/16/08 11:50 AM, in article 47dd6112@linux, "Mr. Simplicity"  
>>> <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Here's a link where you can check out a closeup of the ports:  
>>>>  
>>>> <http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/Steinberg/PR/MR816-FireWire-Interfaces.html>  
>>>>  
>>>> Also, I'm listening to the video clip again and he specifically states  
>  
>>>> that  
>>>> it connects to the computer via firewire.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47dd5efc@linux...  
>>>>> Yeah, I was a little surprised no one asked the question about how  
>>>>> exactly  
>>>>> they achieved no latency at the end when they asked for questions. How  
>  
>>>>> do  
>>>>> they do that I wonder? He specifically said all the Cubase channels  
>  
>>>>> stuff  
>>>>> would be no latency.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> If they have that, then this has truly lived up to what I hoped for  
> from  
>>>>> the merger. I will say this: Yamaha is overall the finest and most  
>>>>> comprehensive large music manufacturer and their products always sound  
>>>>> good. Since I have used Cubase from the early Atari version in '88 or  
>  
>>>>> '89,  
>>>>> I am a pretty big fan of Steinberg too.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB,  
> not

>>>> firewire.  
>>>>  
>>>> Aaron Allen wrote:  
>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:C40220B7.131DC%dterry@keyofd.net...  
>>>>>> I only watched part due to time constraints so I didn't catch that  
>  
>>>>>> (i.e.  
>>>>>> I  
>>>>>> could tell early on there was nothing new here).  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Yes of course latency is \*effectively\* "zero" for the builtin dsp  
> (in  
>>>>>> and  
>>>>>> out of the onboard mixer), but not in and out of the native system.  
>>>>>> Nothing  
>>>>>> different from what Totalmix, Cuemix, Soundscape and TDM do, and while  
>>>>>> it  
>>>>>> may be a few nanoseconds faster than others, it's still not \*really\*  
>>>>>> 0.00000ns.  
>>>>>> That's not what I took away from what he was saying. Check out the  
>  
>>>>>> video  
>>>>>> again when you get time dude, I think you may have missed the whole  
>>>>>> reason why I'd choose this system if I dumped Paris. What I didn't  
> hear  
>>>>>> though was if I could stack these units, but I'm guessing not because  
>  
>>>>>> of  
>>>>>> how fast they simply would have to be to be no latency units.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Of course we all know absolute zero is impossible without time travel  
>>>>>> ;-)  
>>>>>> There is always at least a few nanoseconds for gate setup/hold times  
>  
>>>>>> in  
>>>>>> the  
>>>>>> converters, and in the dsp chips, etc, so regardless of "zero" or  
>  
>>>>>> "near  
>>>>>> zero" latency claims, they are all lower than most people care about  
>>>>>> since  
>>>>>> it's hardware based routing, rather than latent software routing  
>>>>>> (which  
>>>>>> actually could be nearly as fast if the OS were optimized for it -  
>  
>>>>>> i.e.  
>>>>>> systems like Radar, etc).

>>>>> very true, and what I wanted to hear about. Actual convertor to  
>>>>> convertor  
>>>>> latency cannot possibly be zero/none. Even Paris is hitting 1.5 mS  
> end  
>>>>> to end. And I have no problems living with that.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Marketing.... it's all marketing.... in reality, every single DAW  
> on  
>>>>>> the  
>>>>>> planet adheres to the same physical limitations - they just use  
>>>>>> different  
>>>>>> packaging and emphasis of hardware vs. software. Good try  
>>>>>> Steiny/Yamaha.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Dedic  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> On 3/16/08 1:49 AM, in article 47dcc2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Dedic, they are stating 'No' Latency as in Nada..zilch..Nothing..  
>  
>>>>>>> hey  
>>>>>>> mentioned  
>>>>>>> this at least 5 times. They even criticize other companies claim  
> of  
>>>>>>> "near  
>>>>>>> zero " latency.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Look at the video again.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>>>>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>>>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>>>>>> Steiny  
>>>>>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc,  
> and  
>>>>>>>> firewire  
>>>>>>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't  
>>>>>>>> see  
>>>>>>>> the  
>>>>>>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the

>>>>>>>> Fireface,  
>>>>>>>> but  
>>>>>>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with  
>  
>>>>>>>> ASIO  
>>>>>>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat  
> war  
>>>>>>>> and  
>>>>>>>> get  
>>>>>>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>>>>>>> drivers  
>>>>>>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32  
>>>>>>>> samples,  
>>>>>>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>>>>>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to  
> do  
>>>>>>>> anything  
>>>>>>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that  
>>>>>>>> discussion  
>>>>>>>> a  
>>>>>>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Dedic  
>>>>>>>>  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 03:27:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Sounded like marketing double talk. Zero and no latency are the same thing, right? I just want to know if/how they are achieving it. We'll find out eventually.

Either way it looks like a very nice interface with a lot of features. If they bring it in at a reasonable price, it should be a winner.

Martin Harrington wrote:

> Watch the whole 3 videos..  
> They say not Zero latency, but No latency .. A non issue as far as they are  
> concerned.  
> Who knows???

>  
> Martin H  
>  
>  
> On 16/03/08 4:24 PM, in article C4020B2E.131D0%dterry@keyofd.net, "Dedric  
> Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>  
>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick. Steiny  
>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>  
>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>  
>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and firewire  
>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see the  
>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface, but  
>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>  
>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and get  
>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio drivers  
>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>  
>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do anything  
>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion a  
>> few times already. ;-)  
>>  
>> Dedric  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 03:58:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yes - you should see a list of ASIO ports for all three units with 2-3x the I/O.

On 3/16/08 11:01 PM, in article 47dded19\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
<jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
> So, If I had 2 or 3 Fireface 800, they could run in paralle and Cubase or  
> Nuendo, Logic would see the 3 units ?



>  
> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>> On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Which?  
>>>  
>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces  
>>>> that are chain-able.  
>>>>  
>>  
>> RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple units  
>> in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).  
>>  
>> From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could  
> be  
>> simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give  
> you  
>> VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase, but  
>> though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and  
> the  
>> audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.  
>>  
>> I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until  
> the  
>> units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.  
>>  
>> I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCle gear for a firewire solution... DJ.  
> ;-)  
>>  
>> Dedic  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 04:06:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The only way I see this happening is for Cubase to control DSP onboard of each unit, probably via mLAN if I were guessing. In this way there is no tax on the host CPU, and the software becomes nothing more than a remote.

AA

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47dde806@linux...  
> Sounded like marketing double talk. Zero and no latency are the same  
> thing, right? I just want to know if/how they are achieving it. We'll find  
> out eventually.  
>  
> Either way it looks like a very nice interface with a lot of features. If  
> they bring it in at a reasonable price, it should be a winner.  
>  
> Martin Harrington wrote:  
>> Watch the whole 3 videos..  
>> They say not Zero latency, but No latency .. A non issue as far as they  
>> are  
>> concerned.  
>> Who knows???

>>  
>> Martin H  
>>  
>>  
>> On 16/03/08 4:24 PM, in article C4020B2E.131D0%dterry@keyofd.net, "Dedric  
>> Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 3/15/08 10:50 PM, in article 47dcaa29@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
>>> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>>>> semi-pro/pro work because of the latency they can't seem to lick.  
>>>> Steiny  
>>>> apparantly has beat that now with the Yammy interface.  
>>>>  
>>> How so? Was there mention of lower latencies I didn't see?  
>>>  
>>> It's a firewire interface just like the Fireface, Firepod, etc, and  
>>> firewire  
>>> is inherently limited due to the extra buffering overhead. I can't see  
>>> the  
>>> new Steinberg interface running at any lower latency than the Fireface,  
>>> but  
>>> if they've beat that limit, kudos to Yamaha.  
>>>  
>>> So far, imho RME seems to lead the low latency race overall with ASIO  
>>> drivers. Imho, until operating systems drop the consumer bloat war and  
>>> get  
>>> down to really running lean and mean with true kernel level audio  
>>> drivers  
>>> (not the facade of core audio), we may never see lower than 32 samples,  
>>> unless Intel multiplies the number of cores and general buss/memory  
>>> processing exponentially to outpace the growing OS demands.  
>>>  
>>> Still have to wonder what got us to the point that an OS had to do  
>>> anything

>>> more than boot and access the hardware.... but we've had that discussion  
>>> a  
>>> few times already. ;-)  
>>>  
>>> Dedic  
>>>  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Dedic Terry](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 04:38:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Do these other units access the dsp within the host mixer for native mixing, or just controlled by the host mixer for use in the dsp mixer if you either mix there after mixing natively, or for monitor feeds, etc (a la the Yammy DSP2416 from a few years ago - cool in a way, but a big pain to use since you either mixed natively, or on the DSP2416).

We've been wanting Fairlight to release their CC-1 card for general VST use and access from any host, but of course it's only developed for Fairlight consoles, so no really joy there for other apps.

Dedic

On 3/16/08 11:27 PM, in article 47ddf319\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
<jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
> "That part could be tied to Cubase, but  
> though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and  
> the audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it."  
>  
> Yes, any vst/asio can use the dsp via it's separate mixer(ala total mix and  
> the like). However, In Cubase, it has a direct route into Cubase's mixer  
> adn smoothly integrating with COnTrol Room..Bypassing the the units own  
> separate  
> mixer.  
>  
> So, lets see, we have Motu's new unit with onboard dso, TC's units with dsp,  
> M-audio's new unit, EMU and now Yammy. Is this a trend? Will these type of  
> units get more powerful DSPs? We'll have to wait and see. But, these kinds  
> of units does solve a lot a common DAW problems.  
> BTW: Yammys plugins (REV-X and their Vinatge Comps and EQS)found on the  
> DM-2000  
> MII and their Motif XS keyboards are really top notch. So, I guess these  
> will be trickling downward into the VST realm. Nice..  
>

>  
>  
> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>> On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Which?  
>>>  
>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces  
>>>> that are chain-able.  
>>>>  
>>  
>> RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple units  
>> in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).  
>>  
>> From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could  
> be  
>> simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give  
> you  
>> VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase, but  
>> though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and  
> the  
>> audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.  
>>  
>> I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until  
> the  
>> units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.  
>>  
>> I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCIe gear for a firewire solution... DJ.  
> ;-)  
>>  
>> Dedic  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 05:01:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So, If I had 2 or 3 Fireface 800, they could run in paralle and Cubase or  
Nuendo, Logic would see the 3 units ?

Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>wrote:

>  
>> Which?  
>>  
>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces  
>>> that are chain-able.  
>>>  
>  
>RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple units  
>in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).  
>  
>From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could  
be  
>simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give  
you  
>VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase, but  
>though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and  
the  
>audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.  
>  
>I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until  
the  
>units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.  
>  
>I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCle gear for a firewire solution... DJ.  
;-)  
>  
>Dedric  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 05:08:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thanks Dedric , you are right, you can chain 3 Fireface's. And James you are right as well. Motu uses their proprietary Firewire protocol with their interfaces..So, yes you can chain up to 4 units.

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
>So, If I had 2 or 3 Fireface 800, they could run in paralle and Cubase or  
>Nuendo, Logic would see the 3 units ?  
>  
>Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>wrote:

>>  
>>> Which?  
>>>  
>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces  
>>>> that are chain-able.  
>>>>  
>>  
>>RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple  
units  
>>in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).  
>>  
>>From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could  
>be  
>>simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give  
>you  
>>VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase,  
but  
>>though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and  
>the  
>>audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.  
>>  
>>I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until  
>the  
>>units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.  
>>  
>>I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCle gear for a firewire solution... DJ.

>:-)  
>>  
>>Dedric  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 05:27:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"That part could be tied to Cubase, but  
though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and  
the audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it."

Yes, any vst/asio can use the dsp via it's separate mixer(ala total mix and  
the like). However, In Cubase, it has a direct route into Cubase's mixer  
adn smoothly integrating with COntrOl Room..Bypassing the the units own separate  
mixer.

So, lets see, we have Motu's new unit with onboard dso, TC's units with dsp, M-audio's new unit, EMU and now Yammy. Is this a trend? Will these type of units get more powerful DSPs? We'll have to wait and see. But, these kinds of units does solve a lot a common DAW problems.

BTW: Yammys plugins (REV-X and their Vinatge Comps and EQS)found on the DM-2000 MII and their Motif XS keyboards are really top notch. So, I guess these will be trickling downward into the VST realm. Nice..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>

>wrote:

>

>> Which?

>>

>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>>

>>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces

>>> that are chain-able.

>>>

>

>RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple units

>in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).

>

>From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could be

>simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give you

>VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase, but

>though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and the

>audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.

>

>I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until the

>units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.

>

>I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCle gear for a firewire solution... DJ.

; -)

>

>Dedric

>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived

Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 06:03:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I've never even used the Cubase CR function...not even once, but I can't see any reason you couldn't use a digitally interfaced outboard reverb unit during tracking. Wouldn't this be possible? When I ping my digitally interfaced Quantec or PCM-91, I get something less than 0.25ms. As far as printing compression and EQ,.....errrrr.....I sorta' thought analog processors chained in series could accomplish this, if need be.....and if I need advice on presets (or \*\*\*\*morphing or whateverTF they are calling presets these days), I can always ask here.

;o)

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message  
news:C40351EC.1330F%dterry@keyofd.net...

> Do these other units access the dsp within the host mixer for native  
> mixing,  
> or just controlled by the host mixer for use in the dsp mixer if you  
> either  
> mix there after mixing natively, or for monitor feeds, etc (a la the Yammy  
> DSP2416 from a few years ago - cool in a way, but a big pain to use since  
> you either mixed natively, or on the DSP2416).

>  
> We've been wanting Fairlight to release their CC-1 card for general VST  
> use  
> and access from any host, but of course it's only developed for Fairlight  
> consoles, so no really joy there for other apps.

>  
> Dedric

>  
> On 3/16/08 11:27 PM, in article 47ddf319\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
> <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
>>  
>> "That part could be tied to Cubase, but  
>> though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and  
>> the audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it."

>>  
>> Yes, any vst/asio can use the dsp via it's separate mixer(ala total mix  
>> and  
>> the like). However, In Cubase, it has a direct route into Cubase's mixer  
>> adn smoothly integrating with COnTrol Room..Bypassing the the units own  
>> separate  
>> mixer.  
>>



>> So, lets see, we have Motu's new unit with onboard dso, TC's units with  
>> dsp,  
>> M-audio's new unit, EMU and now Yammy. Is this a trend? Will these type  
>> of  
>> units get more powerful DSPs? We'll have to wait and see. But, these  
>> kinds  
>> of units does solve a lot a common DAW problems.  
>> BTW: Yammys plugins (REV-X and their Vinatge Comps and EQS)found on the  
>> DM-2000  
>> MII and their Motif XS keyboards are really top notch. So, I guess these  
>> will be trickling downward into the VST realm. Nice..  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>> On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Which?  
>>>>  
>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire  
>>>>> interfaces  
>>>>> that are chain-able.  
>>>>>  
>>>  
>>> RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple  
>>> units  
>>> in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).  
>>>  
>>> From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could  
>> be  
>>> simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give  
>> you  
>>> VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase,  
>>> but  
>>> though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and  
>> the  
>>> audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.  
>>>  
>>> I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until  
>> the  
>>> units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.  
>>>  
>>> I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCle gear for a firewire solution... DJ.  
>> ;-)

>>>  
>>> Dedic  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [excelav](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 06:37:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
>Thanks Dedic , you are right, you can chain 3 Fireface's. And James you  
are  
>right as well. Motu uses their proprietary Firewire protocol with their interfaces..So,  
>yes you can chain up to 4 units.

I believe the MOTU 828mk3 and the MOTU 896HD use standard FireWire ports  
and are expandable.

Anyways, it will be interesting to see how the Steinberg stuff is. If there  
claim of no latency is true, that would be great. The Yamaha mic pres are  
vary good, IMO. I have a feeling the Steinberg stuff is going to be expensive  
though.

All the new stuff that is coming out is great, but I feel like a dog that  
is chasing my tail sometimes. I'm cutting back and selling off. I'd like  
to get off the money tread mill for a while. I have Paris and a few other  
systems that do what I need. I think I'm going to sit tight for the rest  
of this year to see where it's all going.

Because of the low cost, I'm considering the Alesis Master control. It won't  
be out for a while and I want to hear some user reviews and hear how it sounds  
before I buy. The same for the new Presonus studio stuff. The StudioLive  
mixer and the Monitor Station both look promising. If the Steinberg stuff  
is reasonably priced and will work well with other software I may go that  
way. For now I'm cutting back.

Alesis Master control video (Watch the whole video)  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hym2a0VDgF0>

Video  
<http://www.presonus.com/products/Detail.aspx?ProductId=47>

<http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/PreSonus/PR/Monitor-Station-.html>

<http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/PreSon>

us/PR/StudioLive-Digital-Mixer.html

[http://www.presonus.com/media/manuals/studiolive-brochure\\_web.pdf](http://www.presonus.com/media/manuals/studiolive-brochure_web.pdf)

```
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>So, If I had 2 or 3 Fireface 800, they could run in parallel and Cubase
or
>>Nuendo, Logic would see the 3 units ?
>>
>>Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>>>wrote:
>>>
>>>> Which?
>>>>
>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces
>>>>> that are chain-able.
>>>>>
>>>
>>>RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple
>units
>>>in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).
>>>
>>>From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could
>>be
>>>simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give
>>you
>>>VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase,
>but
>>>though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and
>>the
>>>audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.
>>>
>>>I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until
>>the
>>>units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.
>>>
>>>I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCIe gear for a firewire solution... DJ.
>
>>;-)
```

>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [erlilo](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 06:53:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I believe he said it was the controller box that's using USB, the other box was using Firewire.

It's really interesting but yet a half year away, as I can see here:

[http://www.steinberg.net/1671\\_1.html](http://www.steinberg.net/1671_1.html)

Erling

"Bill L" <[bill@billlorentzen.com](mailto:bill@billlorentzen.com)> skrev i en meddelelse  
[news:47dd5efc@linux...](mailto:news:47dd5efc@linux...)

>  
> BTW he did say you could cascade 3 units, and he said they are USB, not  
> firewire.  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 08:07:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Aww Yes.. The all Powerful CC-1 form Fairlight. It would seem that those guys at Fairlight have hit a snag of sorts..No new developemnt on such promising technology.

Dedric Terry <[dterry@keyofd.net](mailto:dterry@keyofd.net)> wrote:

>Yes - you should see a list of ASIO ports for all three units with 2-3x  
the  
>/O.

>  
>On 3/16/08 11:01 PM, in article [47dded19\\$1@linux](mailto:47dded19$1@linux), "LaMont"  
><[jjdpro@gmail.com](mailto:jjdpro@gmail.com)> wrote:

>  
>>  
>> So, If I had 2 or 3 Fireface 800, they could run in paralle and Cubase  
or

>> Nuendo, Logic would see the 3 units ?

>>

>> Dedric Terry <[dterry@keyofd.net](mailto:dterry@keyofd.net)> wrote:

>>> On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Which?  
>>>>  
>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces  
>>>>> that are chain-able.  
>>>>>  
>>>  
>>> RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple  
units  
>>> in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).  
>>>  
>>> From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could  
>> be  
>>> simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give  
>> you  
>>> VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase,  
but  
>>> though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST,  
and  
>> the  
>>> audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.  
>>>  
>>> I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until  
>> the  
>>> units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.  
>>>  
>>> I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCle gear for a firewire solution... DJ.  
>> ;-)  
>>>  
>>> Detric  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [rick](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 09:20:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

got em here in muddle america too...

On 17 Mar 2008 08:30:04 +1000, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>  
>Ever had a poppy or sesame seed bagel? Is this an east coast thing?  
>  
>TCB  
>  
>rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>bagel seeds??? where do you get them at??? the spring planting season  
>>is almost here and i'd like to get a jump on the competition.  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>On 16 Mar 2008 15:52:37 +1000, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>>  
>>>I still haven't heard a Yamaha filter that doesn't hurt my ears.  
>>>  
>>>And it's Rodney Orpheus! Glad he still has a job, I remember him pimping  
>>>the Houston as the best thing since bagels got seeds.  
>>>  
>>>I'll stick with the rig I have for now . . .  
>>>  
>>>TCB  
>>>  
>>>"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:  
>>>>pretty cool.  
>>>>  
>>>> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDZbfGOdufo&feature=related>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 13:07:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
>Aww Yes.. The all Powerful CC-1 form Fairlight. It would seem that those  
guys  
>at Fairlight have hit a snag of sorts..No new developemnt on such promising  
>technology.

That's because they only seem to want to build stuff for the  
still-shrinking super high-end market... hard to get cash  
influx when your target market is on the wane. Kinda like  
making super expensive buggy whips right as Henry Ford had

just finished building his first assembly line.

Neil

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 14:51:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I agree. The products their putting out for this super-duper card is pitiful at best. But, they think they have a market for it. Oh well. Can we say NED(Synclavier)..

"Neil" <OIOI@OI.com> wrote:

>

>"LaMontt" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>Aww Yes.. The all Powerful CC-1 form Fairlight. It would seem that those

>guys

>>at Fairlight have hit a snag of sorts..No new developemnt on such promising

>>technology.

>

>That's because they only seem to want to build stuff for the

>still-shrinking super high-end market... hard to get cash

>influx when your target market is on the wane. Kinda like

>making super expensive buggy whips right as Henry Ford had

>just finished building his first assembly line.

>

>Neil

>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 14:55:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

True.. But, with CR, a person does not have to have a separate fold-back/talk back setup. As well as easliy setting up different monitor mixes With fx all within the app.

"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>I've never even used the Cubase CR function...not even once, but I can't see

>any reason you couldn't use a digitally interfaced outboard reverb unit

>during tracking. Wouldn't this be possible? When I ping my digitally

>interfaced Quantec or PCM-91, I get something less than 0.25ms. As far as

>printing compression and EQ,.....errrrr.....I sorta' thought analog

>processors chained in series could accomplish this, if need be.....and if I

>need advice on presets (or \*\*\*\*morphing or whateverTF they are calling >presets these days), I can always ask here.

>

>;o)

>

>

>

>

>"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message >news:C40351EC.1330F%dterry@keyofd.net...

>> Do these other units access the dsp within the host mixer for native >> mixing,

>> or just controlled by the host mixer for use in the dsp mixer if you >> either

>> mix there after mixing natively, or for monitor feeds, etc (a la the Yammy >> DSP2416 from a few years ago - cool in a way, but a big pain to use since >> you either mixed natively, or on the DSP2416).

>>

>> We've been wanting Fairlight to release their CC-1 card for general VST

>> use

>> and access from any host, but of course it's only developed for Fairlight >> consoles, so no really joy there for other apps.

>>

>> Dedric

>>

>> On 3/16/08 11:27 PM, in article 47ddf319\$1@linux, "LaMont" >> <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>>

>>> "That part could be tied to Cubase, but

>>> though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST, and

>>> the audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it."

>>>

>>> Yes, any vst/asio can use the dsp via it's separate mixer(ala total mix

>>> and

>>> the like). However, In Cubase, it has a direct route into Cubase's mixer >>> adn smoothly integrating with COntrOl Room..Bypassing the the units own >>> separate

>>> mixer.

>>>

>>> So, lets see, we have Motu's new unit with onboard dso, TC's units with



>>> dsp,  
>>> M-audio's new unit, EMU and now Yammy. Is this a trend? Will these type

>>> of  
>>> units get more powerful DSPs? We'll have to wait and see. But, these

>>> kinds  
>>> of units does solve a lot a common DAW problems.  
>>> BTW: Yammys plugins (REV-X and their Vinatge Comps and EQS)found on the  
>>> DM-2000  
>>> MII and their Motif XS keyboards are really top notch. So, I guess these  
>>> will be trickling downward into the VST realm. Nice..  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>> On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> Which?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire  
>>>>>> interfaces  
>>>>>> that are chain-able.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple

>>>> units  
>>>> in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).  
>>>>  
>>>> From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could  
>>> be  
>>>> simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give  
>>> you  
>>>> VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase,

>>>> but  
>>>> though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST,  
and  
>>> the  
>>>> audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.  
>>>>  
>>>> I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until

>>> the  
>>>> units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.  
>>>>  
>>>> I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCle gear for a firewire solution... DJ.  
>>> ;-)  
>>>>  
>>>> Dedic  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 15:02:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote in message news:47de7860\$1@linux...  
>  
> True.. But, with CR, a person does not have to have a separate  
> fold-back/talk  
> back setup. As well as easliy setting up different monitor mixes With fx  
> all within the app.  
>

My Furman HDS-16/HRM-16 lets the talent do most of this anyway. Once they get their heads around it (which takes about 5 minutes) each of up to 5 performers can have his/her own custom mix. All I do is set the routing. since Totalmix routes everyting in stereo pairs, I just set it up 1:1 and do the routing instead to both stereo and mono mixer channels of the HRM-16 remotes.

---

---

Subject: Re: Cubase may have finally arrived  
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Mon, 17 Mar 2008 15:52:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I've actually got one of the Steinberg folks responding to questions online which is a rarity on the Cubase.net forum.

I believe it is probably this fellow.  
<http://www.steinberg.net/>

Here's the link to a thread I started yesterday, similar to shat I posted here:  
<http://forum.cubase.net/phpbb2/viewtopic.php?p=712708#712708>

If we're nice to him, we might be able to keep him engaged in conversation and we might learn something useful.....before the hoardes of assholes on that forum slag him to the point where he bails.

;o)

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote in message news:47de7860\$1@linux...

>

> True.. But, with CR, a person does not have to have a separate

> fold-back/talk

> back setup. As well as easliy setting up different monitor mixes With fx

> all within the app.

>

> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>>I've never even used the Cubase CR function...not even once, but I can't

> see

>>any reason you couldn't use a digitally interfaced outboard reverb unit

>

>>during tracking. Wouldn't this be possible? When I ping my digitally

>>interfaced Quantec or PCM-91, I get something less than 0.25ms. As far

> as

>>printing compression and EQ,.....errrrr.....I sorta' thought analog

>

>>processors chained in series could accomplish this, if need be.....and

> if I

>>need advice on presets (or \*\*\*\*morphing or whateverTF they are calling

>>presets these days), I can always ask here.

>>

>>;o)

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message

>>news:C40351EC.1330F%dterry@keyofd.net...

>>> Do these other units access the dsp within the host mixer for native

>>> mixing,

>>> or just controlled by the host mixer for use in the dsp mixer if you

>>> either

>>> mix there after mixing natively, or for monitor feeds, etc (a la the

>>> Yammy

>>> DSP2416 from a few years ago - cool in a way, but a big pain to use

>>> since

>>> you either mixed natively, or on the DSP2416).

>>>

>>> We've been wanting Fairlight to release their CC-1 card for general VST

>

>>> use  
>>> and access from any host, but of course it's only developed for  
>>> Fairlight  
>>> consoles, so no really joy there for other apps.  
>>>  
>>> Detric  
>>>  
>>> On 3/16/08 11:27 PM, in article 47ddf319\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "That part could be tied to Cubase, but  
>>>> though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST,  
> and  
>>>> the audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it."  
>>>>  
>>>> Yes, any vst/asio can use the dsp via it's separate mixer(ala total mix  
>  
>>>> and  
>>>> the like). However, In Cubase, it has a direct route into Cubase's  
>>>> mixer  
>>>> adn smoothly integrating with COntrOl Room..Bypassing the the units own  
>>>> separate  
>>>> mixer.  
>>>>  
>>>> So, lets see, we have Motu's new unit with onboard dso, TC's units with  
>  
>>>> dsp,  
>>>> M-audio's new unit, EMU and now Yammy. Is this a trend? Will these type  
>  
>>>> of  
>>>> units get more powerful DSPs? We'll have to wait and see. But, these  
>  
>>>> kinds  
>>>> of units does solve a lot a common DAW problems.  
>>>> BTW: Yammys plugins (REV-X and their Vinatge Comps and EQS)found on the  
>>>> DM-2000  
>>>> MII and their Motif XS keyboards are really top notch. So, I guess  
>>>> these  
>>>> will be trickling downward into the VST realm. Nice..  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>> On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>



Same here James. I'm sitting standig pat. The PC's and Macs I have are more than doing the job.

I too want to see where all of this is going before forking over good money into half-baked, half-supported DAW inititives.

I am reminded of an Old O'Jays song..'Got to Give the People, Give the People want...." :)

...

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>Thanks Dedric , you are right, you can chain 3 Fireface's. And James you >are

>>right as well. Motu uses their proprietary Firewire protocol with their interfaces..So,

>>yes you can chain up to 4 units.

>

>I believe the MOTU 828mk3 and the MOTU 896HD use standard FireWire ports >and are expandable.

>

>Anyways, it will be interesting to see how the Steinberg stuff is. If there >claim of no latency is true, that would be great. The Yamaha mic pres are >vary good, IMO. I have a feeling the Steinberg stuff is going to be expensive >though.

>

>All the new stuff that is coming out is great, but I feel like a dog that >is chasing my tail sometimes. I'm cutting back and selling off. I'd like >to get off the money tread mill for a while. I have Paris and a few other >systems that do what I need. I think I'm going to sit tight for the rest >of this year to see where it's all going.

>

>Because of the low cost, I'm considering the Alesis Master control. It won't >be out for a while and I want to hear some user reviews and hear how it sounds

>before I buy. The same for the new Presonus studio stuff. The StudioLive >mixer and the Monitor Station both look promising. If the Steinberg stuff >is reasonably priced and will work well with other software I may go that >way. For now I'm cutting back.

>

>Alesis Master control video (Watch the whole video)

><http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hym2a0VDgF0>

>

>Video

><http://www.presonus.com/products/Detail.aspx?ProductId=47>

>

> <http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/PreSonus/PR/Monitor-Station-.html>  
>  
> <http://messe.harmony-central.com/Musikmesse08/Content/PreSonus/PR/StudioLive-Digital-Mixer.html>  
>  
> [http://www.presonus.com/media/manuals/studiolive-brochure\\_web.pdf](http://www.presonus.com/media/manuals/studiolive-brochure_web.pdf)  
>  
>  
>>  
>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>So, If I had 2 or 3 Fireface 800, they could run in parallel and Cubase  
>or  
>>>Nuendo, Logic would see the 3 units ?  
>>>  
>>>Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>On 3/16/08 5:45 PM, in article 47dda2fd\$1 @linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>>>>wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> Which?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> LaMont, I believe this is incorrect, there are other fireWire interfaces  
>>>>>> that are chain-able.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>RME Fireface for one - it has a second FW400 port for running multiple  
>>units  
>>>>in parallel (FW800 connection to the PC/Mac side required).  
>>>>  
>>>>From the ad blurbs it says the dsp is available in Cubase - which could  
>>>>be  
>>>>simply like other firewire dsp boxes (Powercore, Duende, etc) that give  
>>>>you  
>>>>VST access to onboard dsp plugins. That part could be tied to Cubase,  
>>but  
>>>>though it doesn't say so, so my guess is the dsp is most likely VST,  
>>and  
>>>>the  
>>>>audio is ASIO, so any VST/ASIO app should be able to use it.  
>>>>  
>>>>I wouldn't go by a product demonstration as the final word. Wait until  
>>>>the  
>>>>units hit the streets and/or more info shows up on it.  
>>>>  
>>>>I also wouldn't sell your PCI/PCIe gear for a firewire solution... DJ.  
>>

>>>;-)  
>>>>  
>>>>Dedric  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>

---