

---

Subject: Rendered files in Paris

Posted by [Tyrone Corbett](#) on Wed, 21 May 2008 18:40:50 GMT

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

---

Hey guys, typically I print stems the old fashioned way (manual bouncing 2 tracks at a time). For the first time I experimented with rendering the tracks via Paris's "Render Track to Disk". It certainly saved me lots of time and the tracks "0" out which does not happen to that exactness when manually bouncing tracks.

I am now using all the "rendered tracks" and my project is giving me occasional playback error messages such as "adjust playback settings". I never had this happen before. Any thoughts?

Thanks, Tyrone

---

---

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris

Posted by [Tyrone Corbett](#) on Wed, 21 May 2008 20:52:39 GMT

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

---

Resolved. Thanks!

"Tyrone Corbett" <[tyronecorbett@comcast.net](mailto:tyronecorbett@comcast.net)> wrote:

>

>Hey guys, typically I print stems the old fashioned way (manual bouncing 2

>tracks at a time). For the first time I experimented with rendering the tracks

>via Paris's "Render Track to Disk". It certainly saved me lots of time and  
>the tracks "0" out which does not happen to that exactness when manually  
>bouncing tracks.

>

>I am now using all the "rendered tracks" and my project is giving me occasional  
>playback error messages such as "adjust playback settings". I never had  
this

>happen before. Any thoughts?

>

>Thanks, Tyrone

---

---

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Wed, 21 May 2008 21:50:04 GMT

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

---

What was the cause/solution?

(just wondering)

Ted

"Tyrone Corbett" <tyronecorbett@comcast.net> wrote:

>

>Resolved. Thanks!

>

>"Tyrone Corbett" <tyronecorbett@comcast.net> wrote:

>>

>>Hey guys, typically I print stems the old fashioned way (manual bouncing

>2

>>tracks at a time). For the first time I experimented with rendering the

>tracks

>>via Paris's "Render Track to Disk". It certainly saved me lots of time

and

>>the tracks "0" out which does not happen to that exactness when manually

>>bouncing tracks.

>>

>>I am now using all the "rendered tracks" and my project is giving me occasional

>>playback error messages such as "adjust playback settings". I never had

>this

>>happen before. Any thoughts?

>>

>>Thanks, Tyrone

>

---

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris

Posted by [Tyrone Corbett](#) on Wed, 21 May 2008 22:59:52 GMT

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

---

Hey Ted, it seemd that some of the files I rendered were duplicated in the project (not sure how that happened). Once I removed the additional load from the system (the project was pretty massive in size to begin with), all was well and back to normal.

Tyrone

"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:

>

>What was the cause/solution?

>

>(just wondering)

>

>Ted

>

>"Tyrone Corbett" <tyronecorbett@comcast.net> wrote:

>>  
>>Resolved. Thanks!  
>>  
>>"Tyrone Corbett" <tyronecorbett@comcast.net> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>Hey guys, typically I print stems the old fashioned way (manual bouncing  
>>2  
>>>tracks at a time). For the first time I experimented with rendering the  
>>tracks  
>>>via Paris's "Render Track to Disk". It certainly saved me lots of time  
>and  
>>>the tracks "0" out which does not happen to that exactness when manually  
>>>bouncing tracks.  
>>>  
>>>I am now using all the "rendered tracks" and my project is giving me occasional  
>>>playback error messages such as "adjust playback settings". I never had  
>>this  
>>>happen before. Any thoughts?  
>>>  
>>>Thanks, Tyrone  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris  
Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Thu, 22 May 2008 03:28:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thanks Tyrone

I just recently started rendering files with native plugins after testing the rendered against the edited original and flipping the phase (copy channel settings to the new track with the rendered file etc etc) I've been happy with the result. Any prior nudging for latency (with UAD for instance) is accounted for in the newly rendered file and it saves time and horsepower. I hadn't used PARIS for a few years until last summer, and remembered the debate between Sakis and others over whether rendered files - with or without plugins - were as accurate as bounced files. So far so good.

Ted

"Tyrone Corbett" <tyronecorbett@comcast.net> wrote:

>  
>Hey Ted, it seemd that some of the files I rendered were duplicated in the  
>project (not sure how that happened). Once I removed the additional load  
>from the system (the project was pretty massive in size to begin with),

all  
>was well and back to normal.  
>  
>Tyrone  
>  
>"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>What was the cause/solution?  
>>  
>>(just wondering)  
>>  
>>Ted  
>>  
>>"Tyrone Corbett" <tyronecorbett@comcast.net> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>Resolved. Thanks!  
>>>  
>>>"Tyrone Corbett" <tyronecorbett@comcast.net> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>Hey guys, typically I print stems the old fashioned way (manual bouncing  
>>>>2  
>>>>tracks at a time). For the first time I experimented with rendering the  
>>>>tracks  
>>>>via Paris's "Render Track to Disk". It certainly saved me lots of time  
>>and  
>>>>the tracks "0" out which does not happen to that exactness when manually  
>>>>bouncing tracks.  
>>>>  
>>>>I am now using all the "rendered tracks" and my project is giving me  
occasional  
>>>>playback error messages such as "adjust playback settings". I never had  
>>>this  
>>>>happen before. Any thoughts?  
>>>>  
>>>>Thanks, Tyrone  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris  
Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Fri, 23 May 2008 02:08:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ted, If I remember right, rendered files were never in dispute, as Brian T did a 10th generation render and it still canceled out. What was in dispute was disk bounce in 3.0 versus spdif bounce in 3.0. Sakis held the position that disk bounce in 3.0 was not as accurate as spdif bounce.

Rod

"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:

>  
>I just recently started rendering files with native plugins  
>after testing the rendered against the edited original and  
>flipping the phase (copy channel settings to the new track  
>with the rendered file etc etc) I've been happy with the  
>result. Any prior nudging for latency (with UAD for  
>instance) is accounted for in the newly rendered file and it  
>saves time and horsepower. I hadn't used PARIS for a few years  
>until last summer, and remembered the debate between Sakis and  
>others over whether rendered files - with or without plugins -  
>were as accurate as bounced files. So far so good.  
>  
>Ted  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris

Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Fri, 23 May 2008 13:22:55 GMT

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

---

Hmm, now I am curious, does anyone else hear a diff?  
Is the SPDIF file more open and clear?

"Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:

>  
>Ted, If I remember right, rendered files were never in dispute, as Brian  
T  
>did a 10th generation render and it still canceled out. What was in dispute  
>was disk bounce in 3.0 versus spdif bounce in 3.0. Sakis held the position  
>that disk bounce in 3.0 was not as accurate as spdif bounce.  
>Rod  
>"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>I just recently started rendering files with native plugins  
>>after testing the rendered against the edited original and  
>>flipping the phase (copy channel settings to the new track  
>>with the rendered file etc etc) I've been happy with the  
>>result. Any prior nudging for latency (with UAD for  
>>instance) is accounted for in the newly rendered file and it  
>>saves time and horsepower. I hadn't used PARIS for a few years  
>>until last summer, and remembered the debate between Sakis and  
>>others over whether rendered files - with or without plugins -  
>>were as accurate as bounced files. So far so good.  
>>  
>>Ted

>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris  
Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Fri, 23 May 2008 13:44:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I don't know, I just remember a dispute between Brian T and Sakis over spdif verses Disk bounce. Also (and I can't remember for sure) Sakis held the position that either disk bounce or spdif got screwed up in version 3.x I've done some unsientific listen tests between the two, and I can't tell the difference.

Rod

"Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:

>  
>  
>Hmm, now I am curious, does anyone else hear a diff?  
>Is the SPDIF file more open and clear?

>  
>  
>"Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:

>>  
>>Ted, If I remember right, rendered files were never in dispute, as Brian  
>T  
>>did a 10th generation render and it still canceled out. What was in dispute  
>>was disk bounce in 3.0 verses spdif bounce in 3.0. Sakis held the position  
>>that disk bounce in 3.0 was not as accurate as spdif bounce.

>>Rod  
>>"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:

>>>  
>>>I just recently started rendering files with native plugins  
>>>after testing the rendered against the edited original and  
>>>flipping the phase (copy channel settings to the new track  
>>>with the rendered file etc etc) I've been happy with the  
>>>result. Any prior nudging for latency (with UAD for  
>>>instance) is accounted for in the newly rendered file and it  
>>>saves time and horsepower. I hadn't used PARIS for a few years  
>>>until last summer, and remembered the debate between Sakis and  
>>>others over whether rendered files - with or without plugins -  
>>>were as accurate as bounced files. So far so good.

>>>  
>>>Ted  
>>>  
>>  
>

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris  
Posted by [EK Sound](#) on Fri, 23 May 2008 16:38:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

A SPDIF bounce would put Word Clock into the fray... A disc bounce would use the Paris internal clock and not make use of any external clock. If you had a really high quality clock source, it may make a noticeable difference with a SPDIF bounce.

David.

Cujo wrote:

> Hmm, now I am curious, does anyone else hear a diff?  
> Is the SPDIF file more open and clear?  
>  
>  
> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:  
>> Ted, If I remember right, rendered files were never in dispute, as Brian  
> T  
>> did a 10th generation render and it still canceled out. What was in dispute  
>> was disk bounce in 3.0 versus spdif bounce in 3.0. Sakis held the position  
>> that disk bounce in 3.0 was not as accurate as spdif bounce.  
>> Rod  
>> "Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:  
>>> I just recently started rendering files with native plugins  
>>> after testing the rendered against the edited original and  
>>> flipping the phase (copy channel settings to the new track  
>>> with the rendered file etc etc) I've been happy with the  
>>> result. Any prior nudging for latency (with UAD for  
>>> instance) is accounted for in the newly rendered file and it  
>>> saves time and horsepower. I hadn't used PARIS for a few years  
>>> until last summer, and remembered the debate between Sakis and  
>>> others over whether rendered files - with or without plugins -  
>>> were as accurate as bounced files. So far so good.  
>>>  
>>> Ted  
>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris  
Posted by [Tyrone Corbett](#) on Fri, 30 May 2008 00:32:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

EK Sound <ask\_me@nospam.net> wrote:

>A SPDIF bounce would put Word Clock into the fray... A disc bounce would  
  
>use the Paris internal clock and not make use of any external clock. If

>you had a really high quality clock source, it may make a noticeable  
>difference with a SPDIF bounce.  
>  
>David.  
>  
>Cujo wrote:  
>> Hmm, now I am curious, does anyone else hear a diff?  
>> Is the SPDIF file more open and clear?  
>>  
>>  
>> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:  
>>> Ted, If I remember right, rendered files were never in dispute, as Brian  
>> T  
>>> did a 10th generation render and it still canceled out. What was in dispute  
>>> was disk bounce in 3.0 versus spdif bounce in 3.0. Sakis held the position  
>>> that disk bounce in 3.0 was not as accurate as spdif bounce.  
>>> Rod  
>>> "Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:  
>>>> I just recently started rendering files with native plugins  
>>>> after testing the rendered against the edited original and  
>>>> flipping the phase (copy channel settings to the new track  
>>>> with the rendered file etc etc) I've been happy with the  
>>>> result. Any prior nudging for latency (with UAD for  
>>>> instance) is accounted for in the newly rendered file and it  
>>>> saves time and horsepower. I hadn't used PARIS for a few years  
>>>> until last summer, and remembered the debate between Sakis and  
>>>> others over whether rendered files - with or without plugins -  
>>>> were as accurate as bounced files. So far so good.  
>>>>  
>>>> Ted  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris

Posted by [Tyrone Corbett](#) on Fri, 30 May 2008 00:39:03 GMT

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

---

As I have listened (not with any great detail mind you) I have not noticed a difference from the rendered files. I was a bit apprehensive as I have always taked the "real time" approach to printing stems. Obviously, from a time consumption stand point it can't be beat.

Tyrone

EK Sound <ask\_me@nospam.net> wrote:



>A SPDIF bounce would put Word Clock into the fray... A disc bounce would

>use the Paris internal clock and not make use of any external clock. If

>you had a really high quality clock source, it may make a noticeable

>difference with a SPDIF bounce.

>

>David.

>

>Cujo wrote:

>> Hmm, now I am curious, does anyone else hear a diff?

>> Is the SPDIF file more open and clear?

>>

>>

>> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:

>>> Ted, If I remember right, rendered files were never in dispute, as Brian

>> T

>>> did a 10th generation render and it still canceled out. What was in dispute

>>> was disk bounce in 3.0 versus spdif bounce in 3.0. Sakis held the position

>>> that disk bounce in 3.0 was not as accurate as spdif bounce.

>>> Rod

>>> "Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:

>>>> I just recently started rendering files with native plugins

>>>> after testing the rendered against the edited original and

>>>> flipping the phase (copy channel settings to the new track

>>>> with the rendered file etc etc) I've been happy with the

>>>> result. Any prior nudging for latency (with UAD for

>>>> instance) is accounted for in the newly rendered file and it

>>>> saves time and horsepower. I hadn't used PARIS for a few years

>>>> until last summer, and remembered the debate between Sakis and

>>>> others over whether rendered files - with or without plugins -

>>>> were as accurate as bounced files. So far so good.

>>>>

>>>> Ted

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

---

Subject: Re: Rendered files in Paris  
Posted by [Tyrone Corbett](#) on Fri, 30 May 2008 00:42:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

As I have listened (not with any great detail mind you) I have not noticed a difference from the rendered files. I was a bit apprehensive as I have always taked the "real time" approach to printing stems. Obviously, from a time consumption stand point it can't be beat.

Tyrone

EK Sound <ask\_me@nospam.net> wrote:

>A SPDIF bounce would put Word Clock into the fray... A disc bounce would

>use the Paris internal clock and not make use of any external clock. If

>you had a really high quality clock source, it may make a noticeable

>difference with a SPDIF bounce.

>

>David.

>

>Cujo wrote:

>> Hmm, now I am curious, does anyone else hear a diff?

>> Is the SPDIF file more open and clear?

>>

>>

>> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:

>>> Ted, If I remember right, rendered files were never in dispute, as Brian

>> T

>>> did a 10th generation render and it still canceled out. What was in dispute

>>> was disk bounce in 3.0 versus spdif bounce in 3.0. Sakis held the position

>>> that disk bounce in 3.0 was not as accurate as spdif bounce.

>>> Rod

>>> "Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:

>>>> I just recently started rendering files with native plugins

>>>> after testing the rendered against the edited original and

>>>> flipping the phase (copy channel settings to the new track

>>>> with the rendered file etc etc) I've been happy with the

>>>> result. Any prior nudging for latency (with UAD for

>>>> instance) is accounted for in the newly rendered file and it

>>>> saves time and horsepower. I hadn't used PARIS for a few years

>>>> until last summer, and remembered the debate between Sakis and

>>>> others over whether rendered files - with or without plugins -

>>>> were as accurate as bounced files. So far so good.

>>>>

>>>> Ted

>>>>

>>