
Subject: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista
Posted by [emaren0t](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2000 06:58:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0009_01BF563E.0706A3E0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm>

Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for Vista
it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
MR

-----=_NextPart_000_0009_01BF563E.0706A3E0
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html"; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><A=20
href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe=
nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Vehwee interwesting.&nbsp;<A=20
href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe=
nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
```

-----=_NextPart_000_0009_01BF563E.0706A3E0--

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista Ready
Now..
Posted by [AlexPlasko](#) on Sun, 11 Nov 2007 19:13:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't know about motu, but cubase 4.1 and rme drivers are both vista ready.its going to be a while before everything is though.
"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote in message news:473753e9\$1@linux...

>
> Interesting as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista
> ready!!.
> I gusses there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.
>
> I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
> as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>
> Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
> to Digi and Apple..

> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>

>>

>><http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm>

>>

>>Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for

>>Vista

>>it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.

>>MR

>>

>>

>><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

>><HTML><HEAD>

>><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =

>>charset=3Diso-8859-1">

>><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>

>><STYLE></STYLE>

>></HEAD>

>><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

>><DIV><A=20

>>href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">[http://www.dawbe=](http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm)

>>nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</DIV>

>><DIV> </DIV>

>><DIV>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =

>>surprising=20

>>-until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32 or=20

>>64. </DIV>

>><DIV>MR</DIV></BODY></HTML>

>>

>>

>

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista Ready Now..

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sun, 11 Nov 2007 20:11:37 GMT

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

Interesting as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista ready!!.
I gussess there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.

I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.

Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
to Digi and Apple..

"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:

```
>
>
>http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm
>
>Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for Vista
>it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>MR
>
>
><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
><HTML><HEAD>
><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
><STYLE></STYLE>
></HEAD>
><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><A=20
>href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe=
>nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>
```

```
>surprising=20
>-until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32 or=20

><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>
>
```

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 11 Nov 2007 20:42:40 GMT

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

You might want to read the SOS article on Vista from a couple of months ago. RME was less than enthusiastic about Vista.

Cubase and Nuendo 4.1 are Vista compatible now, and a 64-bit version is out as well.

Vista isn't their fault, it's Microsoft's. It sucks imho, and never will be a great audio app unless it's overhauled or stripped back down to being XP SP3.

German Keys magazine and a few Nuendo users that have tried it, are reporting that Nuendo runs better under bootcamp XP than OSX on the same mac (new core 2 systems), same projects requiring higher latency to run under OSX than bootcamp XP, at least in one case. Not sure how much difference there was in the Keys mag tests.

Seems like XP is the most effective OS for audio at the moment. Not that there is anything good about OSs being significantly different in performance. These are just supposed to be operation systems, nothing more.

Regards,
Dedric

On 11/11/07 1:11 PM, in article 473753e9\$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>
> Interesting as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista ready!!.
> I gusses there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.
>
> I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
> as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>
> Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
> to Digi and Apple..
>
>
>
> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>> <http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm>
>>
>> Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for Vista
>> it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>> MR

```

>>
>>
>> <!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>> <HTML><HEAD>
>> <META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>> charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>> <META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>> <STYLE></STYLE>
>> </HEAD>
>> <BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><A=20
>> href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe=
>> nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>
>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>
>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =
>> surprising=20
>> -until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32 or=20
>> 64. </FONT></DIV>
>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>>
>>
>

```

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista Ready Now..

Posted by [TCB](#) on Mon, 12 Nov 2007 06:38:06 GMT

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

Sorry, Lamont, this is not a developer problem, it's an OS vendor problem. And it supports what I've been saying all along, you'll take a performance hit if you want to use a 64 bit (integer, FP has been more than 64 bit for years) OS, at least for now. The only reason to use a 64 bit OS has nothing to do with 64 bits, it will have to do with things like better multithreading support and such.

Don't, don't, don't . . . don't believe the hype.

TCB

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

```

>
>Interesting as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista ready!!.
>I gusses there's some perks in having MS$ as Advids biggest investor.
>
>I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
>as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>

```

>Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
>to Digi and Apple..
>
>
>
>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm
>>
>>Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for
Vista
>>it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>>MR
>>
>>
>><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>><HTML><HEAD>
>><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>><STYLE></STYLE>
>></HEAD>
>><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>><DIV><A=20
>>href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe=
>>nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</DIV>
>><DIV> </DIV>
>><DIV>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =
>>surprising=20
>>-until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32 or=20
>>64. </DIV>
>><DIV>MR</DIV></BODY></HTML>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 12 Nov 2007 16:08:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Dedric, I saw that article from SOS (Remember the thread I start because
of it). I don't buut. RME and the others need to get off their asses a nd
just give in to Apple & MS\$, or get left behind. It's that simple. Or, stop
whining and come out withtheir own OS..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>You might want to read the SOS article on Vista from a couple of months ago.
>RME was less than enthusiastic about Vista.
>
>Cubase and Nuendo 4.1 are Vista compatible now, and a 64-bit version is out
>as well.
>
>Vista isn't their fault, it's Microsoft's. It sucks imho, and never will be
>a great audio app unless it's overhauled or stripped back down to being XP
>SP3.
>
>German Keys magazine and a few Nuendo users that have tried it, are
>reporting that Nuendo runs better under bootcamp XP than OSX on the same mac
>(new core 2 systems), same projects requiring higher latency to run under
>OSX than bootcamp XP, at least in one case. Not sure how much difference
>there was in the Keys mag tests.
>
>Seems like XP is the most effective OS for audio at the moment. Not that
>there is anything good about OSs being significantly different in
>performance. These are just supposed to be operation systems, nothing more.
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>On 11/11/07 1:11 PM, in article 473753e9\$1@linux, "LaMont"
><jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>>
>> Interesing as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista ready!!.
>> I gussess there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.
>>
>> I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
>> as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>>
>> Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
>> to Digi and Apple..
>>
>>
>>
>> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>> <http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm>
>>>

```

>>> Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for
Vista
>>> it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>>> MR
>>>
>>>
>>> <!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>>> <HTML><HEAD>
>>> <META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>>> charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>>> <META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>>> <STYLE></STYLE>
>>> </HEAD>
>>> <BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><A=20
>>> href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe=
>>> nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>

>>> surprising=20
>>> -until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32
or=20

>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>>>
>>>
>>
>

```

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista Ready Now..

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 12 Nov 2007 16:14:05 GMT

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

Thad, I'm not beating the 64bit drums, only the OS drums. If some Pro Audio vendors have vista working on their new DAWs, then the Audio interface manufacturers needs to be in lock step.

After reading what RME stated in that article makes me not what to purchase any more of their products.

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>Sorry, Lamont, this is not a developer problem, it's an OS vendor problem.

>And it supports what I've been saying all along, you'll take a performance

>hit if you want to use a 64 bit (integer, FP has been more than 64 bit for

>years) OS, at least for now. The only reason to use a 64 bit OS has nothing

>to do with 64 bits, it will have to do with things like better multithreading
>support and such.
>
>Don't, don't, don't . . . don't believe the hype.
>
>TCB
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>Interesting as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista ready!!.
>>I gusess there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.
>>
>>I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
>>as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>>
>>Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
>>to Digi and Apple..
>>
>>
>>
>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>><http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm>
>>>
>>>Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for
>Vista
>>>it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>>>MR
>>>
>>>
>>><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>>><HTML><HEAD>
>>><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>>>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>>><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>>><STYLE></STYLE>
>>></HEAD>
>>><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>>><DIV><A=20
>>>href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">[http://www.dawbe=](http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm)
>>>nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</DIV>
>>><DIV> </DIV>
>>><DIV>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =
>>>surprising=20
>>>-until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32 or=20
>>>64. </DIV>
>>><DIV>MR</DIV></BODY></HTML>

>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista Ready Now..

Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 13 Nov 2007 01:37:41 GMT

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

LaMont, please don't take this personally, but you just don't know what you're talking about. I _know_ the RME guys. I was there the first year they were at the Frankfurt Musikmesse. They are one of a very small group of companies that do all of their driver development in house. And they do better than anyone in the business.

Drivers are extremely arcane pieces of software, it's uber geeky stuff. People talk about 'why can't I use any motherboard I want' when driver guys know things like 'on this implementation of this chipset if I don't wait 15 milliseconds before doing X then Y device is going to completely blow up and I'll panic the kernel or the mouse won't work without a reboot.' Which is why good driver guys are booked years in advance sometimes. RME does this all on their own and their first Mac driver was the most solid Mac driver I ever saw. They're the best there is, they even support linux. If they're not writing Vista drivers it's because they can't or don't think they can provide the quality they want for their products. It takes a special kind of company to say, 'I won't let down someone who pays good money for my stuff because the OS too much of a moving target for me to write a really good driver for it.' That's not sloth, and RME aren't lazy, they're German fer chrissakes.

M\$oft has some work to do on this.

TCB

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

>

>Thad, I'm not beating the64bit drums, only the OS drums. If some Pro Audio
>vendors have vista working on their new DAWs, then the Audio interface manufacturers
>needs to be in lock step.

>

>After reading what RME stated in that article makes me not what to purchase
>any more of their products.

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>Sorry, Lamont, this is not a developer problem, it's an OS vendor problem.

>>And it supports what I've been saying all along, you'll take a performance

>>hit if you want to use a 64 bit (integer, FP has been more than 64 bit
for
>>years) OS, at least for now. The only reason to use a 64 bit OS has nothing
>>to do with 64 bits, it will have to do with things like better multithreading
>>support and such.
>>
>>Don't, don't, don't . . . don't believe the hype.
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Interesting as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista ready!!.
>>>I gusses there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.

>>>
>>>I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
>>>as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>>>
>>>Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
>>>to Digi and Apple..
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>><http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm>
>>>>
>>>>Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for
>>Vista
>>>>it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>>>>MR
>>>>
>>>>
>>>><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>>>><HTML><HEAD>
>>>><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>>>>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>>>><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>>>><STYLE></STYLE>
>>>></HEAD>
>>>><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>>>><DIV><A=20
>>>>href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">[---

Page 11 of 34 ---- Generated from \[The PARIS Forums\]\(#\)](http://www.dawbe=

>>>>nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</DIV>

>>>><DIV> </DIV>

>>>><DIV>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

>>>>surprising=20
>>>>-until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32
or=20
>>>>64. </DIV>
>>>><DIV>MR</DIV></BODY></HTML>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista Ready
Now..
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 13 Nov 2007 03:21:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good essay, Thad... I like RME, and have had only ONE issue with
any of their drivers, and it was a version they
updated/corrected shortly thereafter.

And their convertors fail to suck, as well - in my book, anyway.

Neil

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>LaMont, please don't take this personally, but you just don't know what
you're
>talking about. I _know_ the RME guys. I was there the first year they were
>at the Frankfurt Musikmesse. They are one of a very small group of companies
>that do all of their driver development in house. And they do better than
>anyone in the business.
>
>Drivers are extremely arcane pieces of software, it's uber geeky stuff.
People
>talk about 'why can't I use any motherboard I want' when driver guys know
>things like 'on this implementation of this chipset if I don't wait 15 milliseconds
>before doing X then Y device is going to completely blow up and I'll panic
>the kernel or the mouse won't work without a reboot.' Which is why good
driver
>guys are booked years in advance sometimes. RME does this all on their own
>and their first Mac driver was the most solid Mac driver I ever saw. They're
>the best there is, they even support linux. If they're not writing Vista
>drivers it's because they can't or don't think they can provide the quality
>they want for their products. It takes a special kind of company to say,

>'I won't let down someone who pays good money for my stuff because the OS
>too much of a moving target for me to write a really good driver for it.'
>That's not sloth, and RME aren't lazy, they're German fer chrissakes.
>
>M\$oft has some work to do on this.
>
>TCB
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>Thad, I'm not beating the 64bit drums, only the OS drums. If some Pro Audio
>>vendors have vista working on their new DAWs, then the Audio interface
manufacturers
>>needs to be in lock step.
>>
>>After reading what RME stated in that article makes me not what to purchase
>>any more of their products.
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Sorry, Lamont, this is not a developer problem, it's an OS vendor problem.
>>>And it supports what I've been saying all along, you'll take a performance
>>>hit if you want to use a 64 bit (integer, FP has been more than 64 bit
>for
>>>years) OS, at least for now. The only reason to use a 64 bit OS has nothing
>>>to do with 64 bits, it will have to do with things like better multithreading
>>>support and such.
>>>
>>>Don't, don't, don't . . . don't believe the hype.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Interesing as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista
ready!!.
>>>>I gusses there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.
>
>>>>
>>>>I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
>>>>as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>>>>
>>>>Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
>>>>to Digi and Apple..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:

```

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm
>>>>>
>>>>>Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for
>>>>Vista
>>>>>it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>>>>>MR
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>>>>><HTML><HEAD>
>>>>><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>>>>>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>>>>><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>>>>><STYLE></STYLE>
>>>>></HEAD>
>>>>><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><A=20
>>>>>href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe=
>>>>>nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>
>>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>
>>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =
>>>>>surprising=20
>>>>>-until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32
>>>>>or=20
>>>>>64. </FONT></DIV>
>>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>
>

```

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista
 Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Tue, 13 Nov 2007 03:24:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lamont - they already did:

[http://www.rme-audio.de/en_downloads.php?page=content/downlo ads/en_downloads_driver&subpage=content/downloads/en_downloads_driver_hd spe](http://www.rme-audio.de/en_downloads.php?page=content/downlo%20ads/en_downloads_driver&subpage=content/downloads/en_downloads_driver_hd%20spe)

(See the Vista 32/64 support listing)

The issue isn't that they can't write drivers for Vista - they did,

Nuendo/Cubase are Vista compatible, etc. It's that Vista isn't as efficient at low latency with any drivers - RME, Lynx, etc. Check the dawbench.com Vista vs. Xp performance reports.

Working, and working as effectively as it is on XP32, are two different things.

What is pro audio to do? Hmmm... a trip to Redmond?.... hehe....

You are exactly right from the consumer standpoint - we are in a bit of a pickle at the moment. Audio developers haven't been dragging their feet - there have been issues at the OS level, with OSX and Vista they had to wait for a final decision on before jumping into this. Maybe MS will surprise us and release a really efficient SP1 for Vista, but imho, it would take 4 years to strip the security crap out first. ;-)

Dedric

On 11/12/07 8:55 PM, in article 47391232\$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>
> Hey Thad, I'd be the first to say that I don't have the expertise in Drivers.
> :) But, somethings gotta give. If Digi and Cakewalk can do it, why can't
> RME?
>
> I'm taking off my tech cap, and approaching this from a purely consumer
> standpoint.
> MS\$ is going full- tilt with Vista. No turning back. So, what do the Pro
> Audio market do?
>
> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>> LaMont, please don't take this personally, but you just don't know what
> you're
>> talking about. I _know_ the RME guys. I was there the first year they were
>> at the Frankfurt Musikmesse. They are one of a very small group of companies
>> that do all of their driver development in house. And they do better than
>> anyone in the business.
>>
>> Drivers are extremely arcane pieces of software, it's uber geeky stuff.
> People
>> talk about 'why can't I use any motherboard I want' when driver guys know
>> things like 'on this implementation of this chipset if I don't wait 15
>> milliseconds
>> before doing X then Y device is going to completely blow up and I'll panic
>> the kernel or the mouse won't work without a reboot.' Which is why good
> driver

>> guys are booked years in advance sometimes. RME does this all on their own
>> and their first Mac driver was the most solid Mac driver I ever saw. They're
>> the best there is, they even support linux. If they're not writing Vista
>> drivers it's because they can't or don't think they can provide the quality
>> they want for their products. It takes a special kind of company to say,
>> 'I won't let down someone who pays good money for my stuff because the OS
>> too much of a moving target for me to write a really good driver for it.'
>> That's not sloth, and RME aren't lazy, they're German fer chrissakes.
>>
>> M\$oft has some work to do on this.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> Thad, I'm not beating the 64bit drums, only the OS drums. If some Pro Audio
>>> vendors have vista working on their new DAWs, then the Audio interface
> manufacturers
>>> needs to be in lock step.
>>>
>>> After reading what RME stated in that article makes me not what to purchase
>>> any more of their products.
>>>
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> Sorry, Lamont, this is not a developer problem, it's an OS vendor problem.
>>>> And it supports what I've been saying all along, you'll take a performance
>>>> hit if you want to use a 64 bit (integer, FP has been more than 64 bit
>> for
>>>> years) OS, at least for now. The only reason to use a 64 bit OS has nothing
>>>> to do with 64 bits, it will have to do with things like better
>>>> multithreading
>>>> support and such.
>>>>
>>>> Don't, don't, don't . . . don't believe the hype.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> Interesting as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista
> ready!!.
>>>>> I guesess there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.
>>
>>>>>
>>>>> I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
>>>>> as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>>>>>

```

>>>>> Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
>>>>> to Digi and Apple..
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for
>>>> Vista
>>>>>> it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>>>>>> MR
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> <!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>>>>>> <HTML><HEAD>
>>>>>> <META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>>>>>> charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>>>>>> <META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>>>>>> <STYLE></STYLE>
>>>>>> </HEAD>
>>>>>> <BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>>>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><A=20
>>>>>>
>>>>>> href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe>>>>>>
>>>>>> =
>>>>>> nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>
>>>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>
>>>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =
>>>>>> surprising=20
>>>>>> -until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32
>>> or=20
>>>>>> 64. </FONT></DIV>
>>>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

```

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista Ready Now..

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Tue, 13 Nov 2007 03:55:46 GMT

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

Hey Thad, I'd be the first to say that I don't have the expertise in Drivers.
:) But, somethings gotta give. If Digi and Cakewalk can do it, why can't RME?

I'm taking off my tech cap, and approaching this from a purely consumer standpoint. MS\$ is going full- tilt with Vista. No turning back. So, what do the Pro Audio market do?

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>LaMont, please don't take this personally, but you just don't know what you're

>talking about. I _know_ the RME guys. I was there the first year they were

>at the Frankfurt Musikmesse. They are one of a very small group of companies

>that do all of their driver development in house. And they do better than

>anyone in the business.

>

>Drivers are extremely arcane pieces of software, it's uber geeky stuff.

People

>talk about 'why can't I use any motherboard I want' when driver guys know

>things like 'on this implementation of this chipset if I don't wait 15 milliseconds

>before doing X then Y device is going to completely blow up and I'll panic

>the kernel or the mouse won't work without a reboot.' Which is why good driver

>guys are booked years in advance sometimes. RME does this all on their own

>and their first Mac driver was the most solid Mac driver I ever saw. They're

>the best there is, they even support linux. If they're not writing Vista

>drivers it's because they can't or don't think they can provide the quality

>they want for their products. It takes a special kind of company to say,

>'I won't let down someone who pays good money for my stuff because the OS

>too much of a moving target for me to write a really good driver for it.'

>That's not sloth, and RME aren't lazy, they're German fer chrissakes.

>

>M\$oft has some work to do on this.

>

>TCB

>

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

>>

>>Thad, I'm not beating the64bit drums, only the OS drums. If some Pro Audio

>>vendors have vista working on their new DAWs, then the Audio interface manufacturers

>>needs to be in lock step.

>>

>>After reading what RME stated in that article makes me not what to purchase

>>any more of their products.

```

>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Sorry, Lamont, this is not a developer problem, it's an OS vendor problem.
>>>And it supports what I've been saying all along, you'll take a performance
>>>hit if you want to use a 64 bit (integer, FP has been more than 64 bit
>for
>>>years) OS, at least for now. The only reason to use a 64 bit OS has nothing
>>>to do with 64 bits, it will have to do with things like better multithreading
>>>support and such.
>>>
>>>Don't, don't, don't . . . don't believe the hype.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Interesting as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista
ready!..
>>>>I guesess there's some perks in having MS$ as Advids biggest investor.
>
>>>>
>>>>I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
>>>>as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>>>>
>>>>Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
>>>>to Digi and Apple..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm
>>>>>
>>>>>Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for
>>>>Vista
>>>>>it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>>>>>MR
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>>>>><HTML><HEAD>
>>>>><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>>>>>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>>>>><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>>>>><STYLE></STYLE>
>>>>></HEAD>

```

```
>>>><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><A=20
>>>>href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe=
>>>>nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =
>>>>surprising=20
>>>>-until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32
>or=20
>>>>64. </FONT></DIV>
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>
>
```

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista Ready Now..

Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 13 Nov 2007 04:05:50 GMT

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

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

>

>Hey Thad, I'd be the first to say that I don't have the expertise in Drivers.

>:) But, somethings gotta give. If Digi and Cakewalk can do it, why can't

>RME?

>

>I'm taking off my tech cap, and approaching this from a purely consumer standpoint.

>MS\$ is going full- tilt with Vista. No turning back. So, what do the Pro

>Audio market do?

The Pro Audio market should say to M\$oft: "This sucks - it's total bloatware & will not allow either of our audio client bases to put their rigs through the heinous shit they need to do on a day-to-day basis in order to make use of a PC for audio - you guys in Redmond need to come up with stripped-down version of what USED to be WinXP, geared towards the millions of audio users out there, and then we'll talk. Otherwise, you can kiss this whole market segment goodbye, and just cede it to Apple."

That's what they should do.

Neil

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Tue, 13 Nov 2007 04:08:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've had Sonar 6 and 7 on both Vista 32 and 64 and PT LE on vista 32.
Neither are performing even close to XP. Until MS corrects things to at least get performance on par with XP it is a waste of time and money for any professional to invest in Vista at this point.
RME are one of the few being honest in the article.

MS is released Vista before even basic component drivers were fully compatible. Most of the common ones still aren't. ATI and Nvidia are still having trouble getting driver solid. Creative Lab are having trouble getting their cards working. Many reports of printer drivers not working right. Many SATA, SCSI and SAS devices not working right. These are some of the many reasons even the main stream business market hasn't has not gotten completely behind Vista. The only people on the Vista band wagon are consumer types that weren't given the choice by the Larger PC makers. But even enough of them demanded XP that MS allowed XP to be offered longer. XP would have been out for the market by the end of this year other wise. When Major PC makers start having people say I want XP on it or I'm not buying it they are gonna make MS offer it.

Chris

LaMont wrote:

> Hey Dedric, I saw that article from SOS (Remember the thread I start because
> of it). I don't buut. RME and the others need to get off their asses a nd
> just give in to Apple & MS\$, or get left behind. It's that simple. Or, stop
> whining and come out withtheir own OS..
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>
>> You might want to read the SOS article on Vista from a couple of months
>>
> ago.
>
>> RME was less than enthusiastic about Vista.
>>
>> Cubase and Nuendo 4.1 are Vista compatible now, and a 64-bit version is
>>
> out
>
>> as well.
>>

>> Vista isn't their fault, it's Microsoft's. It sucks imho, and never will
>>
> be
>
>> a great audio app unless it's overhauled or stripped back down to being
>>
> XP
>
>> SP3.
>>
>> German Keys magazine and a few Nuendo users that have tried it, are
>> reporting that Nuendo runs better under bootcamp XP than OSX on the same
>>
> mac
>
>> (new core 2 systems), same projects requiring higher latency to run under
>> OSX than bootcamp XP, at least in one case. Not sure how much difference
>> there was in the Keys mag tests.
>>
>> Seems like XP is the most effective OS for audio at the moment. Not that
>> there is anything good about OSs being significantly different in
>> performance. These are just supposed to be operation systems, nothing more.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>>
>> On 11/11/07 1:11 PM, in article 473753e9\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>> <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Interesting as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista ready!!
>>> I gusess there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.
>>>
>>> I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
>>> as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>>>
>>> Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more ground
>>> to Digi and Apple..
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> <http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm>
>>>>
>>>> Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized for
>>>>
> Vista

```

>
>>>> it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>>>> MR
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> <!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>>>> <HTML><HEAD>
>>>> <META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>>>> charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>>>> <META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>>>> <STYLE></STYLE>
>>>> </HEAD>
>>>> <BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><A=20
>>>> href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe=
>>>> nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>
>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>
>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =
>>>> surprising=20
>>>> -until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32
>>>>
> or=20
>
>>>> 64. </FONT></DIV>
>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>
>
--
Chris Ludwig
ADK
chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
(859) 635-5762

```

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista Ready Now..

Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 13 Nov 2007 22:13:16 GMT

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

RME_is_ doing what they can, but it's not their fault that M\$oft doesn't (and probably can't) spend any significant time worrying about pro audio. So they release Vista with an unfinished, poorly documented audio hardware spec and (really good) companies like RME do the best they can. And they

tell the truth about the problems they are having.

As a consumer you make like Adam Smith and do whatever you think is best for you. I try to provide some color about the technical issues behind this stuff for people who don't read the lkml for fun. For me, I'd guess I'll look at Vista right about the time I can justify a dual quad core audio box.

TCB

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

>

>Hey Thad, I'd be the first to say that I don't have the expertise in Drivers.

>:) But, somethings gotta give. If Digi and Cakewalk can do it, why can't

>RME?

>

>I'm taking off my tech cap, and approaching this from a purely consumer standpoint.

>MS\$ is going full- tilt with Vista. No turning back. So, what do the Pro

>Audio market do?

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>LaMont, please don't take this personally, but you just don't know what you're

>>talking about. I _know_ the RME guys. I was there the first year they were

>>at the Frankfurt Musikmesse. They are one of a very small group of companies

>>that do all of their driver development in house. And they do better than

>>anyone in the business.

>>

>>Drivers are extremely arcane pieces of software, it's uber geeky stuff.

>People

>>talk about 'why can't I use any motherboard I want' when driver guys know

>>things like 'on this implementation of this chipset if I don't wait 15 milliseconds

>>before doing X then Y device is going to completely blow up and I'll panic

>>the kernel or the mouse won't work without a reboot.' Which is why good

>driver

>>guys are booked years in advance sometimes. RME does this all on their own

>>and their first Mac driver was the most solid Mac driver I ever saw. They're

>>the best there is, they even support linux. If they're not writing Vista

>>drivers it's because they can't or don't think they can provide the quality

>>they want for their products. It takes a special kind of company to say,

>>'I won't let down someone who pays good money for my stuff because the OS

>>too much of a moving target for me to write a really good driver for it.'

>>That's not sloth, and RME aren't lazy, they're German fer chrissakes.

>>
>>MS\$oft has some work to do on this.
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Thad, I'm not beating the64bit drums, only the OS drums. If some Pro Audio
>>>vendors have vista working on their new DAWs, then the Audio interface
>manufacturers
>>>needs to be in lock step.
>>>
>>>After reading what RME stated in that article makes me not what to purchase
>>>any more of their products.
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Sorry, Lamont, this is not a developer problem, it's an OS vendor problem.
>>>>And it supports what I've been saying all along, you'll take a performance
>>>>hit if you want to use a 64 bit (integer, FP has been more than 64 bit
>>for
>>>>years) OS, at least for now. The only reason to use a 64 bit OS has nothing
>>>>to do with 64 bits, it will have to do with things like better multithreading
>>>>support and such.
>>>>
>>>>Don't, don't, don't . . . don't believe the hype.
>>>>
>>>>TCB
>>>>
>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>Interesing as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista
>ready!!.
>>>>>I gusses there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.
>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses
>>>>>as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>>>>>
>>>>>Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more
ground
>>>>>to Digi and Apple..
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>

```

>>>>>http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm
>>>>>
>>>>>Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized
for
>>>>Vista
>>>>>it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>>>>>MR
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>>>>><HTML><HEAD>
>>>>><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>>>>>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>>>>><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>>>>><STYLE></STYLE>
>>>>></HEAD>
>>>>><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><A=20
>>>>>href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm">http://www.dawbe=
>>>>>nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>
>>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>
>>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =
>>>>>surprising=20
>>>>>-until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32
>>or=20
>>>>>64. </FONT></DIV>
>>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

```

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista
 Posted by [LaMont](#) on Tue, 13 Nov 2007 22:48:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good points (Dedric & Neil).. Maybe the whole lowtency thing is over. Just
 use a mixer, any mixer is the approach from here on out..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Lamont - they already did:

>

> [http://www.rme-audio.de/en_downloads.php?page=content/downlo](http://www.rme-audio.de/en_downloads.php?page=content/downlo%20ads/en_downloads) ads/en_downloads

> _driver&subpage=content/downloads/en_downloads_driver_hd spe
>
>(See the Vista 32/64 support listing)
>
>The issue isn't that they can't write drivers for Vista - they did,
>Nuendo/Cubase are Vista compatible, etc. It's that Vista isn't as efficient
>at low latency with any drivers - RME, Lynx, etc. Check the dawbench.com
>Vista vs. Xp performance reports.
>
>Working, and working as effectively as it is on XP32, are two different
>things.
>
>What is pro audio to do? Hmmm... a trip to Redmond?.... hehe....
>
>You are exactly right from the consumer standpoint - we are in a bit of
a
>pickle at the moment. Audio developers haven't been dragging their feet
-
>there have been issues at the OS level, with OSX and Vista they had to wait
>for a final decision on before jumping into this. Maybe MS will surprise
>us and release a really efficient SP1 for Vista, but imho, it would take
4
>years to strip the security crap out first. ;-)
>
>Dedric
>
>On 11/12/07 8:55 PM, in article 47391232\$1@linux, "LaMont"
><jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>>
>> Hey Thad, I'd be the first to say that I don't have the expertise in Drivers.
>> :) But, somethings gotta give. If Digi and Cakewalk can do it, why can't
>> RME?
>>
>> I'm taking off my tech cap, and approaching this from a purely consumer
>> standpoint.
>> MS\$ is going full- tilt with Vista. No turning back. So, what do the Pro
>> Audio market do?
>>
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> LaMont, please don't take this personally, but you just don't know what
>> you're
>>> talking about. I _know_ the RME guys. I was there the first year they
were
>>> at the Frankfurt Musikmesse. They are one of a very small group of companies
>>> that do all of their driver development in house. And they do better
than

>>> anyone in the business.

>>>

>>> Drivers are extremely arcane pieces of software, it's uber geeky stuff.

>> People

>>> talk about 'why can't I use any motherboard I want' when driver guys know

>>> things like 'on this implementation of this chipset if I don't wait 15

>>> milliseconds

>>> before doing X then Y device is going to completely blow up and I'll panic

>>> the kernel or the mouse won't work without a reboot.' Which is why good

>> driver

>>> guys are booked years in advance sometimes. RME does this all on their own

>>> and their first Mac driver was the most solid Mac driver I ever saw.

They're

>>> the best there is, they even support linux. If they're not writing Vista

>>> drivers it's because they can't or don't think they can provide the quality

>>> they want for their products. It takes a special kind of company to say,

>>> 'I won't let down someone who pays good money for my stuff because the OS

>>> too much of a moving target for me to write a really good driver for it.'

>>> That's not sloth, and RME aren't lazy, they're German fer chrissakes.

>>>

>>> M\$oft has some work to do on this.

>>>

>>> TCB

>>>

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

>>>>

>>>> Thad, I'm not beating the 64bit drums, only the OS drums. If some Pro Audio

>>>> vendors have vista working on their new DAWs, then the Audio interface

>> manufacturers

>>>> needs to be in lock step.

>>>>

>>>> After reading what RME stated in that article makes me not what to purchase

>>>> any more of their products.

>>>>

>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>> Sorry, Lamont, this is not a developer problem, it's an OS vendor problem.

>>>>> And it supports what I've been saying all along, you'll take a performance

>>>>> hit if you want to use a 64 bit (integer, FP has been more than 64

bit

>>> for

>>>>> years) OS, at least for now. The only reason to use a 64 bit OS has

nothing

>>>>> to do with 64 bits, it will have to do with things like better

>>>>> multithreading

>>>>> support and such.

>>>>>

>>>>> Don't, don't, don't . . . don't believe the hype.

>>>>>

>>>>> TCB

>>>>>

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

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Interesing as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista

>> ready!!.

>>>>>> I gusses there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest investor.

>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>> I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame excuses

>>>>>> as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more

ground

>>>>>> to Digi and Apple..

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> <http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized

for

>>>>> Vista

>>>>>> it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.

>>>>>> MR

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> <!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

>>>>>>> <HTML><HEAD>

>>>>>>> <META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =

>>>>>>> charset=3Diso-8859-1">

>>>>>>> <META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>

>>>>>>> <STYLE></STYLE>

>>>>>>> </HEAD>

>>>>>>> <BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

>>>>>>> <DIV><A=20

>>>>>>>

>href=3D"http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm"><http://www.dawbe>>>>>>>>

```

>=
>>>>>> nch.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm</A></FONT></DIV>
>>>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>
>>>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Vehwee interwesting. Not too =
>>>>>> surprising=20
>>>>>> -until apps are optimized for Vista it seems best to stick with xp32
>>> or=20
>>>>>> 64. </FONT></DIV>
>>>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

```

Subject: Re: DAW Benchmarks for XP32, 64 and Vista..Pro Tools 7.4 Vista
 Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Tue, 13 Nov 2007 23:00:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's not over - just not necessarily happening for Vista for now.

Dedric

"LaMont" <jjdpro@proaudio.com> wrote in message news:473a1ba9\$1@linux...
 >
 > Good points (Dedric & Neil).. Maybe the whole lowtency thing is over. Just
 > use a mixer, any mixer is the approach from here on out..
 >
 >
 > Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
 >>Lamont - they already did:
 >>
 >> http://www.rme-audio.de/en_downloads.php?page=content/downlo ads/en_downloads
 >> _driver&subpage=content/downloads/en_downloads_driver_hd spe
 >>
 >>(See the Vista 32/64 support listing)
 >>
 >>The issue isn't that they can't write drivers for Vista - they did,
 >>Nuendo/Cubase are Vista compatible, etc. It's that Vista isn't as
 >>efficient
 >>at low latency with any drivers - RME, Lynx, etc. Check the dawbench.com
 >>Vista vs. Xp performance reports.
 >>

>>Working, and working as effectively as it is on XP32, are two different
>>things.
>>
>>What is pro audio to do? Hmmm... a trip to Redmond?.... hehe....
>>
>>You are exactly right from the consumer standpoint - we are in a bit of
> a
>>pickle at the moment. Audio developers haven't been dragging their feet
> -
>>there have been issues at the OS level, with OSX and Vista they had to
>>wait
>>for a final decision on before jumping into this. Maybe MS will surprise
>>us and release a really efficient SP1 for Vista, but imho, it would take
> 4
>>years to strip the security crap out first. ;-)
>>
>>Dedric
>>
>>On 11/12/07 8:55 PM, in article 47391232\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>><jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> Hey Thad, I'd be the first to say that I don't have the expertise in
>>> Drivers.
>>> :) But, somethings gotta give. If Digi and Cakewalk can do it, why
>>> can't
>>> RME?
>>>
>>> I'm taking off my tech cap, and approaching this from a purely consumer
>>> standpoint.
>>> MS\$ is going full- tilt with Vista. No turning back. So, what do the Pro
>>> Audio market do?
>>>
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> LaMont, please don't take this personally, but you just don't know what
>>>> you're
>>>> talking about. I _know_ the RME guys. I was there the first year they
> were
>>>> at the Frankfurt Musikmesse. They are one of a very small group of
>>>> companies
>>>> that do all of their driver development in house. And they do better
> than
>>>> anyone in the business.
>>>>
>>>> Drivers are extremely arcane pieces of software, it's uber geeky stuff.
>>> People
>>>> talk about 'why can't I use any motherboard I want' when driver guys

> know
 >>>> things like 'on this implementation of this chipset if I don't wait 15
 >>>> milliseconds
 >>>> before doing X then Y device is going to completely blow up and I'll
 > panic
 >>>> the kernel or the mouse won't work without a reboot.' Which is why good
 >>> driver
 >>>> guys are booked years in advance sometimes. RME does this all on their
 > own
 >>>> and their first Mac driver was the most solid Mac driver I ever saw.
 > They're
 >>>> the best there is, they even support linux. If they're not writing
 >>>> Vista
 >>>> drivers it's because they can't or don't think they can provide the
 >>>> quality
 >>>> they want for their products. It takes a special kind of company to
 >>>> say,
 >>>> 'I won't let down someone who pays good money for my stuff because the
 > OS
 >>>> too much of a moving target for me to write a really good driver for
 > it.'
 >>>> That's not sloth, and RME aren't lazy, they're German fer chrissakes.
 >>>>
 >>>> M\$oft has some work to do on this.
 >>>>
 >>>> TCB
 >>>>
 >>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
 >>>>>
 >>>>> Thad, I'm not beating the 64bit drums, only the OS drums. If some Pro
 > Audio
 >>>>> vendors have vista working on their new DAWs, then the Audio interface
 >>> manufacturers
 >>>>> needs to be in lock step.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> After reading what RME stated in that article makes me not what to
 >>>>> purchase
 >>>>> any more of their products.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Sorry, Lamont, this is not a developer problem, it's an OS vendor
 >>>>>> problem.
 >>>>>> And it supports what I've been saying all along, you'll take a
 >>>>>> performance
 >>>>>> hit if you want to use a 64 bit (integer, FP has been more than 64
 > bit
 >>>> for

>>>>> years) OS, at least for now. The only reason to use a 64 bit OS has
> nothing
>>>>> to do with 64 bits, it will have to do with things like better
>>>>> multithreading
>>>>> support and such.
>>>>>
>>>>> Don't, don't, don't . . . don't believe the hype.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Interesting as well, is that Digidesign has their 7.4 Pro Tools Vista
>>> ready!!.
>>>>>> I gusses there's some perks in having MS\$ as Advids biggest
>>>>>> investor.
>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I really want to see and hear the RME's, Motus, Steinberg's lame
>>>>>> excuses
>>>>>> as to why they can't deliver the goods on Vista.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Either they get their vista acts together (soon), or lose even more
> ground
>>>>>> to Digi and Apple..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> <http://www.dawbench.com/blofelds-xp-v-vista.htm>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Vehwee interwesting. Not too surprising -until apps are optimized
> for
>>>>>> Vista
>>>>>>> it seems best to stick with xp32 or 64.
>>>>>>> MR
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> <!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>>>>>>>> <HTML><HEAD>
>>>>>>>> <META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>>>>>>>> charset=3Diso-8859-1">
>>>>>>>> <META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1555" name=3DGENERATOR>
>>>>>>>> <STYLE></STYLE>
>>>>>>>> </HEAD>
>>>>>>>> <BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
