

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 18:52:26 GMT

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

---

Mike, if you're drinking Scotch at 3:00 in the afternoon, figuring out direct monitoring is not your real problem.

But if that was just a joke, then look at it like this: certain sound cards/boxes have a built in simple digital mixer, which routes the incoming signals various ways at the same time as it sends it to Cubase, Logic, etc. Because DAWs cannot yet avoid latency in inputting, processing and outputting a signal, this is the only effective way for a soundcard/box to give no-latency monitoring. Just think of it as a mixer.

Mike R. wrote:

> Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not really had to wrap my head  
> around this direct monitoring thing. I've been trying all morning to  
> find some sort of explanation that made sense. The RME site has some  
> info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece of  
> software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for example)??  
> Is the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as  
> functioning like an external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase  
> is routed to an input on the mix board and the signal to be recorded is  
> bussed to a monitor out? I don't know why this is so difficult for me  
> to grasp -probably over thinking it.... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)  
> Thanks.  
> MR

---

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 18:57:47 GMT

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

---

Mike..Direct Monitoring is very important if your running a Native based DAW.. Right now on Nunendo.com there's a Big discusion with high-end users Like Brian T and others along with Steinberg as why they can't can't achive near zero talking .5ms-1.5(rountrip)(latency with the current technology-high speed dual-dual core processors.

Yes, in Paris we have been spoiled with the best DAW latency in the business. But, you know the Paris story. And, most folk are hell bent on a Native based solution that can topple Pro Tools and Paris mixing and routing power..

Having said all of that, the best way (Like BrianT) states to achieve near -zero latency in a native DAW is to add a mixer(analog or Digital) . This would ensure absolutly no latency when tracking. Inthe case of BrianT , his facily uses a Euphonix System 5 mixers(2)..Which Btw does(System 5) most of EQing and Compression chores. So the strain to have the DAW do everthing

is minimal.

Products like Total Mix (RME) Cue mix (Motu) address the Native DAW latency issue by incorporating so clever Mixer routing "outside " of the DAW. In other words, acting as an Digital Mixer with in a PC/MAC , yet able to route audio to and fro to the Native App..

Today Apogee is claming 1.6 ms latency(round trip) when using it's Symphony PCI-E cards. Daisy chaining them up to 96 channels each way (192) total. This a hugh leap in native Land. This put the user back into the Paris , Pro Tools realm of flexibily ..

[http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony\\_performance.p hp](http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony_performance.php)

The Apogee solution is not cheap by know means..

We thought that by now we'd be using 64 bit everything(OS,DAW, Plugins..etc) but, most of DAW companies have not figured it out or liek Steinberg, have balked on a complete re-write of the ASIO /VST code. Now, today they Steinberg realizes it's behind..Way behind.

Apple: Apple who owns Logic Audio decide 4 years ago , to forgo the current 24bit,32 bit float coding techniques of today, and start fresh with a fresh 64 bit OS, along with a fresh 64 bit Pro Audio/Video app with 64 bit plugins. Yes,they've(Apple) taken some PR hits in the last couple of years, but I think their decision to take a step back..look at the BIG picture, will pay dividends and put them in a new NATIVE standard,with near zero 1.6 ms DAW level, on their 8 & 16 core Personal computers(Macs)using the Apogee Symphony setup.

I'm aproud Paris owner and user(even Today) along with Nuendo, Pro Tools and even Logic (PC!@#\$)..

My heart is telling me that as far as the Native race, Apple is going to win out. Even with some issues with core-audio., when they go 64 bit OS and follwoing their APPS (Final Cut Pro, Logic Pro 8). Their strategic partnership with Apogee makes for an force to be reckoned with.

Then again, there's always Digidesign. Who has the lion share of the Pro Auio market.

Ensuring that they not only have grrreat work flow, but great sound I/O..

Sorry for the long response.

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

>

>  
>Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not really had to wrap my head around  
>this direct monitoring thing. I've been trying all morning to find some  
>sort of explanation that made sense. The RME site has some info, but how  
>the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece of software LOWER the  
>latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for example)?? Is the best way to  
>think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning like an external  
>mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an input on the  
mix  
>board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor out? I don't  
>know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over thinking it....  
>(or maybe not enough Scotch?)  
>Thanks.  
>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>Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not  
=  
>really had=20  
  
>trying all=20  
  
>site has=20  
>some info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece  
=  
>of=20  
>software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for =  
  
>the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning  
=  
>like an=20  
>external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an =  
>input on=20  
>the mix board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor =  
  
>don't know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over =  
>thinking=20  
>it.... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)</FONT></DIV>  
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Thanks.</FONT></DIV>  
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>

>  
>

---

Subject: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [emarenot](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 19:08:34 GMT

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

---

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0009\_01C7F2DA.258F7760

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not really had to wrap my head around this direct monitoring thing. I've been trying all morning to find some sort of explanation that made sense. The RME site has some info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece of software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for example)?? Is the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning like an external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an input on the mix board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor out? I don't know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over thinking it... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)

Thanks.

MR

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0009\_01C7F2DA.258F7760

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>Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not =  
really had=20

to wrap my head around this direct monitoring thing.&nbsp; I've been =  
trying all=20

morning to find some sort of explanation that made sense.&nbsp; The RME =  
site has=20

some info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece =

of=20  
software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for =  
example)??&nbsp;Is=20  
the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning =  
like an=20  
external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an =  
input on=20  
the mix board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor =  
out?&nbsp;I=20  
don't know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over =  
thinking=20  
it... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Thanks.</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0009\_01C7F2DA.258F7760--

---

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?  
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 20:25:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Lamont -

On 9/9/07 12:57 PM, in article 46e4422b\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
wrote:

>  
> Mike..Direct Monitoring is very important if your running a Native based DAW..  
> Right now on Nunendo.com there's a Big discusion with high-end users Like  
> Brian T and others along with Steinberg as why they can't can't achive near  
> zero talking .5ms-1.5(rountrip)(latency with the current technology-high  
> speed dual-dual core processors.  
>  
> That has to do with scaling on multiple processors, not the driver, or the  
> direct monitoring concept or implementation. I'll address the reasons why  
> ProTools and Paris have lower latency, but where you pay the price for it in  
> another reply to Mike's post.  
>  
> We thought that by now we'd be using 64 bit everything(OS,DAW, Plugins..etc)  
> but, most of DAW companies have not figured it out or liek Steinberg, have  
> balked on a complete re-write of the ASIO /VST code. Now, today they Steinberg  
> realizes it's behind..Way behind.

>  
> Lamont - you might want to scroll back through the forum a bit and read  
> where Chris Ludwig said that ASIO still runs a bit lower latency and more  
> efficiently than other drivers (Core audio comparable to WDM with Sonar, but  
> ASIO having lower cpu overhead for the same latency). Apogee uses Core

audio, and the last comment I read from a DAW builder wasn't overly impressed with the Symphony solution. ASIO and VST aren't way behind anything. Research a little better please.

> Apple: Apple who owns Logic Audio decide 4 years ago , to forgo the current  
> 24bit,32 bit float coding techniques of today, and start fresh with a fresh  
> 64 bit OS, along with a fresh 64 bit Pro Audio/Video app with 64 bit plugins.  
> Yes,they've(Apple) taken some PR hits in the last couple of years, but I  
> think their decision to take a step back..look at the BIG picture, will pay  
> dividends and put them in a new NATIVE standard,with near zero 1.6 ms DAW  
> level, on their 8 & 16 core Personal computers(Macs)using the Apogee Symphony  
> setup.

I am almost positive Logic is still a 32-bit float audio engine, which is completely independant of a 64-bit OS (memory/data handling, application coding). In SOS Joe Bryan of Univ. Audio stated that there are disadvantages to 64-bit audio esp. for plugins, not just a blanket more bits are better.

Also, regarding the 1.6ms round trip, Steinberg's VSL2020 interface has/had 0.7ms latency years ago, and if you can find one, it still does - that's ASIO. Lynx cards are also running slightly lower latency than RME on some systems (Nuendo, Cubase, etc) and can achieve 1.5ms roundtrip (probably less than another 0.1ms for converters). With Samplitude/Sequoia, RME runs lower than Lynx.

>  
> My heart is telling me that as far as the Native race, Apple is going to  
> win out. Even with some issues with core-audio., when they go 64 bit OS and  
> following their APPS (Final Cut Pro, Logic Pro 8). Their strategic partnership  
> with Apogee makes for an force to be reckoned with.

I wouldn't jump so fast. Certainly Apple has the advantage of the whole package in house, but read the above paragraphs before proclaiming Apogee/Apple as the current king of low latency. The Apogee system was one I have watched in considering a Mac at some point mainly to see if it had any better performance than an RME or Lynx system, being a Core audio system, but so far that doesn't seem to be bearing out in reality, just in marketing.

Dedric

>  
> Then again, there's always Digidesign. Who has the lion share of the Pro  
> Audio market.  
>  
>  
> Ensuring that they not only have great work flow, but great sound I/O..  
>

> Sorry for the long response.  
>  
> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>  
>> Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not really had to wrap my head around  
>> this direct monitoring thing. I've been trying all morning to find some  
>> sort of explanation that made sense. The RME site has some info, but how  
>> the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece of software LOWER the  
>> latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for example)?? Is the best way to  
>> think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning like an external  
>> mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an input on the  
> mix  
>> board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor out? I don't  
>> know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over thinking it....  
>> (or maybe not enough Scotch?)  
>> Thanks.  
>> 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>Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not  
> =  
>> really had=20  
>> to wrap my head around this direct monitoring thing. I've been =  
>> trying all=20  
>> morning to find some sort of explanation that made sense. The RME =  
>> site has=20  
>> some info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece  
> =  
>> of=20  
>> software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for =  
>> example)?? Is=20  
>> the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning  
> =  
>> like an=20  
>> external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an =  
>> input on=20  
>> the mix board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor =  
>> out? I=20  
>> don't know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over =



>> thinking=20  
>> it.... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)</FONT></DIV>  
>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Thanks.</FONT></DIV>  
>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>  
>>  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?  
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 21:13:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> Its so weird, as I guess the Steinway group is noting,  
> that these DAWs can't get the latency down to Paris/Pro Tools levels. Paris  
> was doing it with what has to be, by now, a pretty low tech card.  
> MR

Mike - The reason Paris, Protools, and Soundscape/Mixtreme achieve lower latency than software DAWs (Nuendo, Logic, Sonar, DP, etc) is that these are direct hardware systems, not unlike a digital mixer a la DM2000 etc. The downside, is that you can't run native applications or plugins directly on the hardware itself, and you are limited to what the hardware manufacturer and any 3rd parties develop specifically for it - the technology is also frozen in time and keeping pace with technological advancements (better processors, faster memory, and even better quality I/O is nearly impossible and still maintain backwards compatibility - just ask PT Mix to HD upgraders). Paris only ran it's own mixer and EDS plugins on the EDS cards, but VST plugins are still native, and subject to internal latency and cpu overhead. Hence we only had 16 tracks per EDS card. 100 tracks on a native rig is nothing now.

My general DAW pros and cons response:

Though pretty much everyone here knows most of there, here is my take on all of this since it's been discussed in part in different threads recently, just because I'm bored, and hate to see misinformation distributed in pieces here and there.....

HYBRID-HARDWARE (PT, Paris, Sydec/Soundscape):

The advantage to a hardware system is of course, lower latency and running plugins on the hardware at lower latency (e.g. tracking with plugins).

The disadvantage is the systems are always proprietary (e.g. more costly, including plugins), fixed processing capability (you have to add more DSP



cards to run more plugins, add more I/O, etc), and usually older technology. ProTools is still using Motorola DSP chips, which are fine, but they are ganging a dozen or so together to create processing, and you must divide that dsp between the mixer, I/O and plugins. The plugin counts are about half that for Universal Audio plugins vs. the exact same plugins on a UAD-1 card (e.g. the cost is twice, or more, per plugin to run on a TDM system vs. a native system).

Despite what others say, the cost is in fact significantly higher with a proprietary system unless you are happy with the fixed plugin load you can achieve, I/O count, etc. If you want to expand, you have to upgrade, and that is quite expensive. Digi's trade in program seems to be a decent deal, but it's still quite expensive to get 64 tracks and a decent sized mix, not counting the computer, which if you want to run anything native, needs to be somewhat decent.

#### NATIVE:

One advantage to native is it is quite inexpensive to expand and upgrade, and you choose your software, I/O card, I/O hardware, etc. Plugins are usually 1/2 that of their TDM counterparts, or less. For the cost of an HD card, you can build/buy two dual quad PCs or Macs and one of either will run a higher plugin and track count than a single HD card (I've done the math on this several times, so don't listen to the marketing hype: a single HD card supports up to 96 simultaneous tracks at 44.1/48k - I can run that with plugins on every track on my Nuendo rig - low latency, though I don't recall how low I dropped it).

Hardware interface cards don't run the main DAW mixer or plugins locally - they just pass I/O streams between the DAW software and outside world, so there is a layer of drivers (ASIO, WDM, Coreaudio) between the hardware and DAW.

The downside to native is latency in monitoring during tracking (whether live monitoring for recording bands, or tracking VSTis, etc). During mixing this isn't a big deal. Of course with faster cpus, you can run a more complicated project (more I/O, more plugins), while maintaining low latency, but as noted in a previous response there are multicore scaling issues with Nuendo and Cubase at the moment preventing making use of the full potential of dual quad cores, or to a lesser degree, dual dual cores.

There are tradeoffs both ways that extend far beyond the latency issue: ProTools for composing/production just isn't happening for anyone I know.

It's a cool system, so I'm not knocking it in the least, just stating that like anything, thinking it's the end-all be-all, or worse, proclaiming that publicly is shortsighted, and a disservice to users considering the two options (native or hardware). The reason higher end users are going native,

and the reason I'm running native, is that it affords me a significantly more flexible and cost effective upgrade and compatibility path, and the software I can use is significantly more powerful than any hybrid-hardware solution, bar none. Anyone that says one (hardware or native) is ultimately better than the other for any use either hasn't done their homework, or is selling something. :-)

Use what works best for you of course, be it Paris, ProTools, Soundscape, Nuendo, DP, Cubase, Logic, Sonar, Live, Reaper; Mac or PC; or a console and tape. In the end, what we can accomplish now with very little investment is incredible, no matter how you look at it.

Regards,  
Dedric

On 9/9/07 5:07 PM, in article 46e452e6@linux, "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Hey LaMont  
> Thanks for the reply. Very helpful. I appreciate the overview on the state  
> of the DAW world. Its so weird, as I guess the Steinway group is noting,  
> that these DAWs can't get the latency down to Paris/Pro Tools levels. Paris  
> was doing it with what has to be, by now, a pretty low tech card.  
> MR  
>  
> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote in message news:46e4422b\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> Mike..Direct Monitoring is very important if your running a Native based  
> DAW..  
>> Right now on Nunendo.com there's a Big discusion with high-end users Like  
>> Brian T and others along with Steinberg as why they can't can't achive  
> near  
>> zero talking .5ms-1.5(roundtrip)(latency with the current technology-high  
>> speed dual-dual core processors.  
>>  
>> Yes, in Paris we have been spoiled with the best DAW latency in the  
> business.  
>> But, you know the Paris story. And, most folk are hell bent on a Native  
> based  
>> solution that can topple Pro Tools and Paris mixing and routing power..  
>>  
>> Having said all of that, the best way (Like BrianT) states to achieve near  
>> -zero latency in a native DAW is to add a mixer(analog or Digital) . This  
>> would ensure absolutly no latency when tracking. Inthe case of BrianT ,  
> his  
>> facily uses a Euphonix System 5 mixers(2)..Which Btw does(System 5) most  
>> of EQing and Compression chores. So the strain to have the DAW do  
> everthing

>> is minimal.  
>>  
>> Products like Total Mix (RME) Cue mix (Motu) address the Native DAW  
> latency  
>> issue by incorporating so clever Mixer routing "outside " of the DAW. In  
>> other words, acting as an Digital Mixer with in a PC/MAC , yet able to  
> route  
>> audio to and fro to the Native App..  
>>  
>> Today Apogee is claiming 1.6 ms latency(round trip) when using it's  
> Symphony  
>> PCI-E cards. Daisy chaining them up to 96 channels each way (192) total.  
>> This a huge leap in native Land. This put the user back into the Paris ,  
>> Pro Tools realm of flexibility ..  
>>  
>> [http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony\\_performance.p hp](http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony_performance.p hp)  
>>  
>> The Apogee solution is not cheap by know means..  
>>  
>> We thought that by now we'd be using 64 bit everything(OS,DAW,  
> Plugins..etc)  
>> but, most of DAW companies have not figured it out or liek Steinberg, have  
>> balked on a complete re-write of the ASIO /VST code. Now, today they  
> Steinberg  
>> realizes it's behind..Way behind.  
>>  
>> Apple: Apple who owns Logic Audio decide 4 years ago , to forgo the  
> current  
>> 24bit,32 bit float coding techniques of today, and start fresh with a  
> fresh  
>> 64 bit OS, along with a fresh 64 bit Pro Audio/Video app with 64 bit  
> plugins.  
>> Yes,they've(Apple) taken some PR hits in the last couple of years, but I  
>> think their decision to take a step back..look at the BIG picture, will  
> pay  
>> dividends and put them in a new NATIVE standard,with near zero 1.6 ms DAW  
>> level, on their 8 & 16 core Personal computers(Macs)using the Apogee  
> Symphony  
>> setup.  
>>  
>> I'm aproud Paris owner and user(even Today) along with Nuendo, Pro Tools  
>> and even Logic (PC!@#)\$..  
>>  
>> My heart is telling me that as far as the Native race, Apple is going to  
>> win out. Even with some issues with core-audio., when they go 64 bit OS and  
>> following their APPS (Final Cut Pro, Logic Pro 8). Their strategic  
> partnership  
>> with Apogee makes for an force to be reckoned with.

>>  
>> Then again, there's always Digidesign. Who has the lion share of the Pro  
>> Audio market.  
>>  
>>  
>> Ensuring that they not only have great work flow, but great sound I/O..  
>>  
>> Sorry for the long response.  
>>  
>> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not really had to wrap my head around  
>>> this direct monitoring thing. I've been trying all morning to find some  
>>> sort of explanation that made sense. The RME site has some info, but how  
>>> the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece of software LOWER  
>> the  
>>> latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for example)?? Is the best way to  
>>> think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning like an external  
>>> mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an input on the  
>> mix  
>>> board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor out? I don't  
>>> know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over thinking  
>> it....  
>>> (or maybe not enough Scotch?)  
>>> Thanks.  
>>> 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>Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not  
>> =  
>>> really had=20  
>>> to wrap my head around this direct monitoring thing. I've been =  
>>> trying all=20  
>>> morning to find some sort of explanation that made sense. The RME =  
>>> site has=20  
>>> some info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece  
>> =  
>>> of=20  
>>> software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for =

>>> example)?? Is=20  
>>> the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning  
>> =  
>>> like an=20  
>>> external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an =  
>>> input on=20  
>>> the mix board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor =  
>>> out? l=20  
>>> don't know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over =  
>>> thinking=20  
>>> it.... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)</FONT></DIV>  
>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Thanks.</FONT></DIV>  
>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [excelav](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 21:14:51 GMT

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

---

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Lamont -

>

>On 9/9/07 12:57 PM, in article 46e4422b\$1 @linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>

>wrote:

>

>>

>> Mike..Direct Monitoring is very important if your running a Native based DAW..

>> Right now on Nunendo.com there's a Big discussion with high-end users Like

>> Brian T and others along with Steinberg as why they can't can't achive near

>> zero talking .5ms-1.5(rountrip)(latency with the current technology-high

>> speed dual-dual core processors.

>>

>That has to do with scaling on multiple processors, not the driver, or the  
>direct monitoring concept or implementation. I'll address the reasons why  
>ProTools and Paris have lower latency, but where you pay the price for it  
in

>another reply to Mike's post.

>

>> We thought that by now we'd be using 64 bit everything(OS,DAW, Plugins..etc)

>> but, most of DAW companies have not figured it out or liek Steinberg,  
have

>> balked on a complete re-write of the ASIO /VST code. Now, today they Steinberg  
>> realizes it's behind..Way behind.

>>

>Lamont - you might want to scroll back through the forum a bit and read  
>where Chris Ludwig said that ASIO still runs a bit lower latency and more  
>efficiently than other drivers (Core audio comparable to WDM with Sonar,  
but  
>ASIO having lower cpu overhead for the same latency). Apogee uses Core  
>audio, and the last comment I read from a DAW builder wasn't overly  
>impressed with the Symphony solution. ASIO and VST aren't way behind  
>anything. Research a little better please.

That's a bit of a blanket statement, most are not impressed because of the  
price of Synphony, not the performance.

>

>> Apple: Apple who owns Logic Audio decide 4 years ago , to forgo the current  
>> 24bit,32 bit float coding techniques of today, and start fresh with a  
fresh

>> 64 bit OS, along with a fresh 64 bit Pro Audio/Video app with 64 bit plugins.

>> Yes,they've(Apple) taken some PR hits in the last couple of years, but

I

>> think their decision to take a step back..look at the BIG picture, will  
pay

>> dividends and put them in a new NATIVE standard,with near zero 1.6 ms  
DAW

>> level, on their 8 & 16 core Personal computers(Macs)using the Apogee Symphony  
>> setup.

>

>I am almost positive Logic is still a 32-bit float audio engine, which is  
>completely independant of a 64-bit OS (memory/data handling, application  
>coding). In SOS Joe Bryan of Univ. Audio stated that there are  
>disadvantages to 64-bit audio esp. for plugins, not just a blanket more  
bits  
>are better.

The disadvantage is, processing power, space, bandwidth, and the fact that  
they and their hardware are not ready for 64bit yet, just wait.

>

>Also, regarding the 1.6ms round trip, Steinberg's VSL2020 interface has/had  
>0.7ms latency years ago, and if you can find one, it still does - that's

>ASIO. Lynx cards are also running slightly lower latency than RME on some  
>systems (Nuendo, Cubase, etc) and can achieve 1.5ms roundtrip (probably  
less

>than another 0.1ms for converters). With Samplitude/Sequoia, RME runs lower  
>than Lynx.

The Steinberg VSL 2020 was a 32 ch. Adat card, The Symphony system is 1.7 ms. analog to analog. With Symphony it's 192 simultaneous audio ch. at 1.7 MS. To minimize what Symphony can do is not right.

>>  
>> My heart is telling me that as far as the Native race, Apple is going to  
>> win out. Even with some issues with core-audio., when they go 64 bit OS and  
>> following their APPS (Final Cut Pro, Logic Pro 8). Their strategic partnership  
>> with Apogee makes for an force to be reckoned with.  
>  
>I wouldn't jump so fast. Certainly Apple has the advantage of the whole  
>package in house, but read the above paragraphs before proclaiming  
>Apogee/Apple as the current king of low latency. The Apogee system was one  
>I have watched in considering a Mac at some point mainly to see if it had  
>any better performance than an RME or Lynx system, being a Core audio  
>system, but so far that doesn't seem to be bearing out in reality, just  
in  
>marketing.  
>  
>Dedric

Well Dedric, since Apogee's claims are false and nothing more than marketing hype, maybe a lawsuit is in order.

>  
>>  
>> Then again, there's always Digidesign. Who has the lion share of the Pro  
>> Audio market.  
>>  
>>  
>> Ensuring that they not only have great work flow, but great sound I/O..  
>>  
>> Sorry for the long response.  
>>  
>> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not really had to wrap my head around  
>>> this direct monitoring thing. I've been trying all morning to find some  
>>> sort of explanation that made sense. The RME site has some info, but  
how  
>>> the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece of software LOWER  
the  
>>> latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for example)?? Is the best way  
to



>>> think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning like an external  
>>> mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an input on  
the  
>> mix  
>>> board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor out? I don't  
>>> know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over thinking  
it....  
>>> (or maybe not enough Scotch?)  
>>> Thanks.  
>>> 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>Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've  
not  
>> =  
>>> really had=20  
  
>>> trying all=20  
  
>>> site has=20  
>>> some info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece  
>> =  
>>> of=20  
>>> software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for =  
  
>>> the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning  
>> =  
>>> like an=20  
>>> external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an  
=  
>>> input on=20  
>>> the mix board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor =  
  
>>> don't know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over =  
>>> thinking=20  
>>> it.... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)</FONT></DIV>  
>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Thanks.</FONT></DIV>  
>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>  
>>>  
>>>

>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 22:18:40 GMT

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

---

James - my comments on Symphony are simply that the reviews I've read simply counter Lamont's claims that it is leading the audio interface market with lower latency than anything else. 1.6ms roundtrip is great, but only if it is reality under realistic loading - I'm all for it, and the more interfaces running sub 2ms, or better, sub 1ms the better. No one said it's a bad interface, or subpar than anything else, just that it isn't necessarily some remarkable breakthrough technology.

Let's keep the facts straight and refrain from blindly defending anything that relates to Apple (though this was specifically in response to a poster's comments, not Apogee, Symphony, or Apple). The VSL2020 comparison was purely to point out that low latency interfaces aren't breakthrough technology - even RME and Lynx haven't completely reached the level of low latency the 2020 did, regardless of I/O config.

I'm all for a great interface from Apogee, for the Mac, and for Logic. As Jamie often states, competition is good for all. I don't want to be locked into anything, whether it's ProTools or Nuendo, PC or Mac, RME or Apogee.

Please, yet again, don't jump to conclusions and assume that everyone is out to trash anything remotely related to Apple, 3rd party providers, etc. James, there is often more to my comments than you might like to believe - it seems far too easy for you to jump on me assuming I'm somehow slandering Apple, and it's getting really old. Give it a rest.

I have to be honest, my tolerance level for the defensiveness and lack of technical backing for the many tech debates here is wearing quite thin. I like you guys and generally enjoy conversing here, but I'm sure we all have better things to do than wade through constantly flip-flopping hyperbole, misinformation, and replies made with no intent of reading the involved post, much less understanding the poster's point of view.

Dedric

On 9/9/07 3:14 PM, in article 46e4624b\$1@linux, "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

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

>>  
>> On 9/9/07 12:57 PM, in article 46e4422b\$1 @linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>>  
>>> Mike..Direct Monitoring is very important if your running a Native based  
> DAW..  
>>> Right now on Nunendo.com there's a Big discusion with high-end users Like  
>>> Brian T and others along with Steinberg as why they can't can't achive  
> near  
>>> zero talking .5ms-1.5(roundtrip)(latency with the current technology-high  
>>> speed dual-dual core processors.  
>>>  
>> That has to do with scaling on multiple processors, not the driver, or the  
>> direct monitoring concept or implementation. I'll address the reasons why  
>> ProTools and Paris have lower latency, but where you pay the price for it  
> in  
>> another reply to Mike's post.  
>>  
>>> We thought that by now we'd be using 64 bit everything(OS,DAW, Plugins..etc)  
>>> but, most of DAW companies have not figured it out or liek Steinberg,  
> have  
>>> balked on a complete re-write of the ASIO /VST code. Now, today they  
>>> Steinberg  
>>> realizes it's behind..Way behind.  
>>>  
>> Lamont - you might want to scroll back through the forum a bit and read  
>> where Chris Ludwig said that ASIO still runs a bit lower latency and more  
>> efficiently than other drivers (Core audio comparable to WDM with Sonar,  
> but  
>> ASIO having lower cpu overhead for the same latency). Apogee uses Core  
>> audio, and the last comment I read from a DAW builder wasn't overly  
>> impressed with the Symphony solution. ASIO and VST aren't way behind  
>> anything. Research a little better please.  
>  
> That's a bit of a blanket statement, most are not impressed because of the  
> price of Synphony, not the performance.  
>  
>>  
>>> Apple: Apple who owns Logic Audio decide 4 years ago , to forgo the current  
>>> 24bit,32 bit float coding techniques of today, and start fresh with a  
> fresh  
>>> 64 bit OS, along with a fresh 64 bit Pro Audio/Video app with 64 bit  
>>> plugins.  
>>> Yes,they've(Apple) taken some PR hits in the last couple of years, but  
> I  
>>> think their decision to take a step back..look at the BIG picture, will  
> pay

>>> dividends and put them in a new NATIVE standard,with near zero 1.6 ms  
> DAW  
>>> level, on their 8 & 16 core Personal computers(Macs)using the Apogee  
>>> Symphony  
>>> setup.  
>>  
>> I am almost positive Logic is still a 32-bit float audio engine, which is  
>> completely independant of a 64-bit OS (memory/data handling, application  
>> coding). In SOS Joe Bryan of Univ. Audio stated that there are  
>> disadvantages to 64-bit audio esp. for plugins, not just a blanket more  
> bits  
>> are better.  
>  
> The disadvantage is, processing power, space, bandwidth, and the fact that  
> they and their hardware are not ready for 64bit yet, just wait.  
>  
>>  
>> Also, regarding the 1.6ms round trip, Steinberg's VSL2020 interface has/had  
>> 0.7ms latency years ago, and if you can find one, it still does - that's  
>> ASIO. Lynx cards are also running slightly lower latency than RME on some  
>> systems (Nuendo, Cubase, etc) and can achieve 1.5ms roundtrip (probably  
> less  
>> than another 0.1ms for converters). With Samplitude/Sequoia, RME runs lower  
>> than Lynx.  
>  
> The Steinberg VSL 2020 was a 32 ch. Adat card, The Symphony system is 1.7  
> ms. analog to analog. With Symphony it's 192 simultaneous audio ch. at 1.7  
> MS. To minimize what Symphony can do is not right.  
>  
>>>  
>>> My heart is telling me that as far as the Native race, Apple is going  
> to  
>>> win out. Even with some issues with core-audio., when they go 64 bit OS  
> and  
>>> following their APPS (Final Cut Pro, Logic Pro 8). Their strategic  
>>> partnership  
>>> with Apogee makes for an force to be reckoned with.  
>>  
>> I wouldn't jump so fast. Certainly Apple has the advantage of the whole  
>> package in house, but read the above paragraphs before proclaiming  
>> Apogee/Apple as the current king of low latency. The Apogee system was  
> one  
>> I have watched in considering a Mac at some point mainly to see if it had  
>> any better performance than an RME or Lynx system, being a Core audio  
>> system, but so far that doesn't seem to be bearing out in reality, just  
> in  
>> marketing.  
>>

>> Dedric  
>  
> Well Dedric, since Apogee's claims are false and nothing more than marketing  
> hype, maybe a lawsuit is in order.  
>  
>>  
>>>  
>>> Then again, there's always Digidesign. Who has the lion share of the Pro  
>>> Audio market.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Ensuring that they not only have grrreat work flow, but great sound I/O..  
>>>  
>>> Sorry for the long response.  
>>>  
>>> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not really had to wrap my head around  
>>>> this direct monitoring thing. I've been trying all morning to find some  
>>>> sort of explanation that made sense. The RME site has some info, but  
> how  
>>>> the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece of software LOWER  
> the  
>>>> latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for example)?? Is the best way  
> to  
>>>> think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning like an external  
>>>> mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an input on  
> the  
>>> mix  
>>>> board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor out? I don't  
>>>> know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over thinking  
> it....  
>>>> (or maybe not enough Scotch?)  
>>>> Thanks.  
>>>> 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>Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've  
> not

>>> =  
>>>> really had=20  
>>>> to wrap my head around this direct monitoring thing. I've been =  
>>>> trying all=20  
>>>> morning to find some sort of explanation that made sense. The RME =  
>>>> site has=20  
>>>> some info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece  
>>> =  
>>>> of=20  
>>>> software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for =  
>>>> example)?? Is=20  
>>>> the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning  
>>> =  
>>>> like an=20  
>>>> external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an  
> =  
>>>> input on=20  
>>>> the mix board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor =  
>>>> out? I=20  
>>>> don't know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over =  
>>>> thinking=20  
>>>> it.... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)</FONT></DIV>  
>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Thanks.</FONT></DIV>  
>>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [emarenot](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 23:01:45 GMT

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

---

Hey Bill,

Thanks for the reply -and the thought. Your post and LaMont's were very helpful.

MR

"Bill L" <[bill@billlorentzen.com](mailto:bill@billlorentzen.com)> wrote in message <news:46e442b6@linux...>

> Mike, if you're drinking Scotch at 3:00 in the afternoon, figuring out

> direct monitoring is not your real problem.

>

> But if that was just a joke, then look at it like this: certain sound

> cards/boxes have a built in simple digital mixer, which routes the

> incoming signals various ways at the same time as it sends it to Cubase,

> Logic, etc. Because DAWs cannot yet avoid latency in inputting,  
> processing and outputting a signal, this is the only effective way for a  
> soundcard/box to give no-latency monitoring. Just think of it as a mixer.  
>  
> Mike R. wrote:  
> > Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not really had to wrap my head  
> > around this direct monitoring thing. I've been trying all morning to  
> > find some sort of explanation that made sense. The RME site has some  
> > info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece of  
> > software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for example)??  
> > Is the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as  
> > functioning like an external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase  
> > is routed to an input on the mix board and the signal to be recorded is  
> > bussed to a monitor out? I don't know why this is so difficult for me  
> > to grasp -probably over thinking it.... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)  
> > Thanks.  
> > MR

---

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?  
Posted by [emarenot](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 23:07:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hey LaMont

Thanks for the reply. Very helpful. I appreciate the overview on the state of the DAW world. Its so weird, as I guess the Steinway group is noting, that these DAWs can't get the latency down to Paris/Pro Tools levels. Paris was doing it with what has to be, by now, a pretty low tech card.

MR

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote in message news:46e4422b\$1@linux...

>  
> Mike..Direct Monitoring is very important if your running a Native based DAW..  
> Right now on Nunendo.com there's a Big discusion with high-end users Like  
> Brian T and others along with Steinberg as why they can't can't achive  
> near  
> zero talking .5ms-1.5(rountrip)(latency with the current technology-high  
> speed dual-dual core processors.  
>  
> Yes, in Paris we have been spoiled with the best DAW latency in the  
> business.  
> But, you know the Paris story. And, most folk are hell bent on a Native  
> based  
> solution that can topple Pro Tools and Paris mixing and routing power..  
>  
> Having said all of that, the best way (Like BrianT) states to achieve near  
> -zero latency in a native DAW is to add a mixer(analog or Digital) . This



> would ensure absolutely no latency when tracking. In the case of Brian T , his

> facility uses a Euphonix System 5 mixers(2)..Which Btw does(System 5) most of EQing and Compression chores. So the strain to have the DAW do everything

> is minimal.

>

> Products like Total Mix (RME) Cue mix (Motu) address the Native DAW latency issue by incorporating so clever Mixer routing "outside " of the DAW. In other words, acting as an Digital Mixer with in a PC/MAC , yet able to route audio to and fro to the Native App..

>

> Today Apogee is claiming 1.6 ms latency(round trip) when using it's Symphony PCI-E cards. Daisy chaining them up to 96 channels each way (192) total. This a huge leap in native Land. This put the user back into the Paris , Pro Tools realm of flexibility ..

>

> [http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony\\_performance.php](http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony_performance.php)

>

> The Apogee solution is not cheap by know means..

>

> We thought that by now we'd be using 64 bit everything(OS,DAW, Plugins..etc)

> but, most of DAW companies have not figured it out or liek Steinberg, have balked on a complete re-write of the ASIO /VST code. Now, today they Steinberg realizes it's behind..Way behind.

>

> Apple: Apple who owns Logic Audio decide 4 years ago , to forgo the current 24bit,32 bit float coding techniques of today, and start fresh with a fresh 64 bit OS, along with a fresh 64 bit Pro Audio/Video app with 64 bit plugins.

> Yes,they've(Apple) taken some PR hits in the last couple of years, but I think their decision to take a step back..look at the BIG picture, will pay dividends and put them in a new NATIVE standard,with near zero 1.6 ms DAW level, on their 8 & 16 core Personal computers(Macs)using the Apogee Symphony setup.

>

> I'm aproud Paris owner and user(even Today) along with Nuendo, Pro Tools and even Logic (PC!@#)\$)..

>

> My heart is telling me that as far as the Native race, Apple is going to  
> win out. Even with some issues with core-audio., when they go 64 bit OS and  
> following their APPS (Final Cut Pro, Logic Pro 8). Their strategic  
partnership  
> with Apogee makes for an force to be reckoned with.  
>  
> Then again, there's always Digidesign. Who has the lion share of the Pro  
> Audio market.  
>  
>  
> Ensuring that they not only have great work flow, but great sound I/O..  
>  
> Sorry for the long response.  
>  
> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:  
> >  
> >  
> >Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not really had to wrap my head around  
> >this direct monitoring thing. I've been trying all morning to find some  
> >sort of explanation that made sense. The RME site has some info, but how  
> >the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece of software LOWER  
the  
> >latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for example)?? Is the best way to  
> >think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning like an external  
> >mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an input on the  
> mix  
> >board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor out? I don't  
> >know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over thinking  
it....  
> >(or maybe not enough Scotch?)  
> >Thanks.  
> >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>Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not  
> =  
> >really had=20  
> >to wrap my head around this direct monitoring thing. I've been =  
> >trying all=20  
> >morning to find some sort of explanation that made sense. The RME =

> >site has=20  
> >some info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece  
> =  
> >of=20  
> >software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for =  
> >example)?? Is=20  
> >the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning  
> =  
> >like an=20  
> >external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an =  
> >input on=20  
> >the mix board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor =  
> >out? I=20  
> >don't know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over =  
> >thinking=20  
> >it.... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)</FONT></DIV>  
> ><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Thanks.</FONT></DIV>  
> ><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>  
> >  
> >  
>

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?  
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 23:20:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dedric what are you talking about ??

Asio may be the best for Native PC da users, but certainly not for mac users.

All in all , with ASIO getting long winded, Asio has gotten old, and they Steinberg has not figured out how to fix the routing(Mixer) issues that will put it on par with Pro Tool's software controlled hardware.

Your argument about HD plugins is valid, but Digi is throwing the kitchen sink these days with new purchases, not just trade-ins. Suffice it to say, when you purchase a new HD rig, you won't need to make many Plugin Purchases anytime soon.

I totally disagree with you about Native being a Cheaper upgrade path. Since 1999, most semi and high end users have upgraded their systems at least 4 -5 times.. With the intent of gaining more power. Even today, We sterinberg users are still on the upgrade war path with the whole core2 dual, 8 core..yada yada..How much do you think it cost ?? what's the real TCO??

If I'm honest, I'll tell I have spent over 6K over the last 5 years, not

counting software..And thats being kind.

With every mention of a new Processor, comes the dream of Zero latency for the Native. Now, we know our pre-64 bit cpu investments over that last couple of years has been a sham..

Sure we can run a few more plugins, but that's about it..

To me and my circle of producers and engineers, all have or will be going Pro Tool HD.. Depending on the needs, HD 2 acell seems to be the popular choice. Maybe your circle of music friend are going Native, not mine..and these guys are heavy hitters in the game.

I'm not the biggest fan of Pro Tools(AKA Slo-tools), but it has the buzz all the way down to M-powered, LE..to mix(plus).

I truly believe Native can compete with a DSP based system (for Commercial based studios) with the inclusion of a mixer.

It's funny, a lot of Pro Tools based studios have implemented a Mixer. Why??

Like the Nuendo forum discussion pointed out: It seems(like always) that we have different needs. The ITB guys need near or closest to zero latency as possible. Whereas the guys who just edit and mix, run their daw at 1024 and care about zero latency.

I think in the future, it would best(for all) to say what application you work in before making statements or suggestions to anyone. Because everyone has different studio, workflow needs.

Dedric, you mainly work in Post, whereas I work in a more commercial studio. Our needs and opinions will be vastly different.

That's the problem with these kinds of discussions in forums. You have a ITB, one room dude, running Ableton Live( nothing wrong with that), telling a dude who works at a facility that Ableton Live would be good for them ..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Lamont -

>

>On 9/9/07 12:57 PM, in article 46e4422b\$1 @linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>

>wrote:

>

>>

>> Mike..Direct Monitoring is very important if you're running a Native based

DAW..

>> Right now on Nunendo.com there's a Big discussion with high-end users Like  
>> Brian T and others along with Steinberg as why they can't can't achive  
near

>> zero talking .5ms-1.5(roundtrip)(latency with the current technology-high  
>> speed dual-dual core processors.

>>

>That has to do with scaling on multiple processors, not the driver, or the  
>direct monitoring concept or implementation. I'll address the reasons why  
>ProTools and Paris have lower latency, but where you pay the price for it  
in

>another reply to Mike's post.

>

>> We thought that by now we'd be using 64 bit everything(OS,DAW, Plugins..etc)  
>> but, most of DAW companies have not figured it out or liek Steinberg,  
have

>> balked on a complete re-write of the ASIO /VST code. Now, today they Steinberg  
>> realizes it's behind..Way behind.

>>

>Lamont - you might want to scroll back through the forum a bit and read  
>where Chris Ludwig said that ASIO still runs a bit lower latency and more  
>efficiently than other drivers (Core audio comparable to WDM with Sonar,  
but

>ASIO having lower cpu overhead for the same latency). Apogee uses Core  
>audio, and the last comment I read from a DAW builder wasn't overly  
>impressed with the Symphony solution. ASIO and VST aren't way behind  
>anything. Research a little better please.

>

>> Apple: Apple who owns Logic Audio decide 4 years ago , to forgo the current  
>> 24bit,32 bit float coding techniques of today, and start fresh with a  
fresh

>> 64 bit OS, along with a fresh 64 bit Pro Audio/Video app with 64 bit plugins.

>> Yes,they've(Apple) taken some PR hits in the last couple of years, but

|

>> think their decision to take a step back..look at the BIG picture, will  
pay

>> dividends and put them in a new NATIVE standard,with near zero 1.6 ms  
DAW

>> level, on their 8 & 16 core Personal computers(Macs)using the Apogee Symphony  
>> setup.

>

>I am almost positive Logic is still a 32-bit float audio engine, which is  
>completely independant of a 64-bit OS (memory/data handling, application  
>coding). In SOS Joe Bryan of Univ. Audio stated that there are  
>disadvantages to 64-bit audio esp. for plugins, not just a blanket more  
bits

>are better.

>

>Also, regarding the 1.6ms round trip, Steinberg's VSL2020 interface has/had  
>0.7ms latency years ago, and if you can find one, it still does - that's  
>ASIO. Lynx cards are also running slightly lower latency than RME on some  
>systems (Nuendo, Cubase, etc) and can achieve 1.5ms roundtrip (probably  
less  
>than another 0.1ms for converters). With Samplitude/Sequoia, RME runs lower  
>than Lynx.

>>  
>> My heart is telling me that as far as the Native race, Apple is going  
to  
>> win out. Even with some issues with core-audio, when they go 64 bit OS  
and  
>> following their APPS (Final Cut Pro, Logic Pro 8). Their strategic partnership  
>> with Apogee makes for an force to be reckoned with.

>  
>I wouldn't jump so fast. Certainly Apple has the advantage of the whole  
>package in house, but read the above paragraphs before proclaiming  
>Apogee/Apple as the current king of low latency. The Apogee system was  
one

>I have watched in considering a Mac at some point mainly to see if it had  
>any better performance than an RME or Lynx system, being a Core audio  
>system, but so far that doesn't seem to be bearing out in reality, just  
in  
>marketing.

>  
>Dedric

>  
>>  
>> Then again, there's always Digidesign. Who has the lion share of the Pro  
>> Audio market.

>>  
>>  
>> Ensuring that they not only have great work flow, but great sound I/O..

>>  
>> Sorry for the long response.

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

>>>  
>>>  
>>> Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not really had to wrap my head around  
>>> this direct monitoring thing. I've been trying all morning to find some  
>>> sort of explanation that made sense. The RME site has some info, but  
how  
>>> the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece of software LOWER  
the  
>>> latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for example)?? Is the best way  
to  
>>> think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning like an external

>>> mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an input on the  
>> mix  
>>> board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor out? I don't  
>>> know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over thinking it...  
>>> (or maybe not enough Scotch?)  
>>> Thanks.  
>>> 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>Man, I'm so used to Paris that I've not  
>> =  
>>> really had=20  
  
>>> trying all=20  
  
>>> site has=20  
>>> some info, but how the heck does a piece of software, on top of a piece  
>> =  
>>> of=20  
>>> software LOWER the latency (Total Mix "on top of" Cubase for =  
  
>>> the best way to think about it to conceptualize Total Mix as functioning  
>> =  
>>> like an=20  
>>> external mix board: a pre-recorded track from Cubase is routed to an  
=  
>>> input on=20  
>>> the mix board and the signal to be recorded is bussed to a monitor =  
  
>>> don't know why this is so difficult for me to grasp -probably over =  
>>> thinking=20  
>>> it... (or maybe not enough Scotch?)</FONT></DIV>  
>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Thanks.</FONT></DIV>  
>>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>MR</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>



>

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 23:56:40 GMT

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

---

On 9/9/07 5:20 PM, in article 46e47fcf\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

> Dedric what are you talking about ??

>

> Asio may be the best for Native PC da users, but certainly not for mac users.

>

You never separated ASIO/PC from ASIO/Mac - your comments were about latency in general. It is important to be technically accurate when making claims about one platform or gear being better than others.

>

> All in all , with ASIO getting long winded, Asio has gotten old, and they  
> Steinberg has not figured out how to fix the routing(Mixer) issues that  
> will put it on par with Pro Tool's software controlled hardware.

>

Where did you hear that ASIO was getting long winded? What do you base this opinion on? I've already explained the difference between native and hybrid-hardware. There is a full 3rd party operating system between native and the hardware. With hybrid, there is only a bit of assembler code and logic circuitry. Two different animals. Latency comparisons come about as a matter of implementation and function, not direct technical similarities.

> Your argument about HD plugins is valid, but Digi is throwing the kitchen  
> sink these days with new purchases, not just trade-ins. Suffice it to say,  
> when you purchase a new HD rig, you won't need to make many Plugin Purchases  
> anytime soon.

No doubt they see the native writing on the wall or they wouldn't have bought M-Audio to actually support - they would have bought Steinberg and promptly burned the development files and blown out any remaining stock.

>

> I totally disagree with you about Native being a Cheaper upgrade path. Since  
> 1999, most semi and high end users have upgraded their systems at least 4  
> -5 times.. With the intent of gaining more power. Even today, We sterinberg  
> users are still on the upgrade war path with the whole core2 dual, 8  
> core..yada  
> yada..How much do you think it cost ?? what's the real TCO??

You might be on the upgrade war path, but there is no war here - only gaining more and more power for my investment with minimal annual cost.

Since 1999 how many PT users upgraded from Mix to HD? The cost there is thousands, not hundreds - for many it was well over \$10k, \$20k or \$50k.

>

> If I'm honest, I'll tell I have spent over 6K over the last 5 years, not

> counting software..And thats being kind.

But you don't get Digi products free do you? They also cost. You have to buy conversion apps, encoders separately, plugins at double the native cost. That adds up at a much faster rate. With a PT rig, you still have to buy a Mac or PC, Cubase/Nuendo/Logic, etc to run a decent sequencer and VSTi's, where my system is completely integrated and cross-compatible. I could add a Mac, or 3 or 4 and still be cross-compatible, completely linked and synced, and upgrade for a few hundred whenever the mood strikes.

>

> With every mention of a new Processor, comes the dream of Zero latency for the Native. Now, we know our pre-64 bit cpu investments over that last couple of years has been a sham..

> Sure we can run a few more plugins, but that's about it..

You are superimposing your own somewhat extreme reaction and frustration on every other native user, and/or reading a few posts and assuming a handful of computer-compulsive users represent the DAW world. That's about as far from the truth as you could be, Lamont.

>

> To me and my circle of producers and engineers, all have or will be going Pro Tool HD.. Depending on the needs, HD 2 acell seems to be the popular choice. Maybe your circle of music friend are going Native, not mine..and > these guys are heavy hitters in the game.

You are assuming my circle is somehow lowly, inferior light weights. Sorry, but you are generalizing, making erroneous assumptions and apparently think quite highly of your own view of success. Good for you. There is a good bit of complete ignorant crap coming from "heavy hitters" these days, so be careful how you support your views.

> Like the Nuendo forum discussion pointed out: It seems(like always) that we > have different needs. The ITB guys need near or closest to zero latency as > possible. Whereas the guys who just edit and mix, run their daw at 1024 > and care about zero latency.

For one, it is short-sighted to simply segregate native DAW users from Protools users as if there is a superior need within the Protools market. The needs are based on studio function and preference, not superiority. Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy productions, whereas a composer or producer with less gear can easily be working on a much higher quality level, with a much higher level of expertise (for example Steve Tushar producing sound design for Disney films,

etc, all from his basement with Nuendo and an MC; or Hans Zimmer making \$50 million a year scoring films, with a large staff, and racks of computer systems - the PT rig for tracking, but not production). I know the points at which one chooses one solution over another.

- >
- > I think in the future, it would best(for all) to say what application you
- > work in before making statements or suggestions to anyone. Because everyone
- > has differnt studio, workflow needs.

Yes, and to research your comments before reciting marketing or user hype. Not all users with a recording studio gig are well versed in the technical realities of the gear and the market we are in. Let's also include the day gig as well to know who does this daily and who does it in off hours.

- >
- > Detric, you mainly work in Post, where as I work in a more commercial studio.
- > Our needs and opinions will be vastly different.

Lamont, let's be clear, my studio is commercial - I work daily with high paying clients. I just don't hire it out for use by others for recording whatever band wants to come by. My clientele is easily as demanding and high end, and perhaps moreso than larger commercial studios recording bands and artists. Different horses for different courses. The large format studio is a dying breed, so I'm not sure I would tout that as the elite of the creative arts industry at the moment.

- >
- > That's he problem with these kinds of dscusions in forums. You have a ITB,
- > one room dude, running abelton live( nothing wrong with that), telling dude
- > who works at a facility that abelton live would be good for them ..

>  
Are you referring to anyone in particular, or is that a generalization? If the latter, it doesn't really apply here. Recommendations here are always valid as you don't always know what is best for the original poster.

Detric

- >
- >
- >

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 00:59:59 GMT

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

---

Detric, you work in a post enviroemnt ..Not a fulltime tracking facility.

Second, Totally differnt. But, the very high end in your genre have Fairlights, light the facility here in metro detroit (Grace & Wilds)..

Look, I can and have made very good records on VS-880s and Vs1680.. Does not mean that those devices and my (at the time) un-finished basement) was professional.

Your needs and my needs are vastly different> I really need at least 32 channels of I/O for tracking..

To me and many others Asio long in the tooth. It's funny how you don;t state how many users have left Neundo, an went to Pro Tools..Just to be fair, as many have come over to Steinberg, many have went over to Digi.

lastly, I don't recite markeing hype, I acually use Logic(7.2), Nuendo 3.2, Pro Tools (HD, M-Powered, LE7.3) Paris 3.0 Cubase 3,and just last week mixed a project on Sonar 6.. You on the onther hand , just read up on said products.

I'm in the trenches with those DAWS. I know what's their strenghts and weakness's are.

Do you know that 50 percent Protools facilities are still on Mix-Plus rigs?? That's he real reason Digi is making these deals..Has absolutly nothing to do with Native..

They purchased M-audio for 2 reasons..To get a strangle hold of the Low-End market. And, to get a team of killer driver makers for the PC (Windows) platform..

Truth is , there are more Nuendo "crack" users than legit users. I don;t knwo how Steingberg is making any money. Cubase yes, but Nuendo..No..

I guess we are back to our usuall disagreement about wha's considered Pro. That's fine, you can call pro anything you like..I'll refrain form such terms..But, I will use terms as Comercial and Project..even pro project studios. To me, jsut because a person has his PC/Mac in a office building does not make him comercial. There are certain indusry tools you must have to be considered commerical. Even you have high-end clients.

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>On 9/9/07 5:20 PM, in article 46e47fcf\$1@linux, "LaMont"

><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>>

>> Dedric what are you talking about ??

>>

>> Asio may be the best for Native PC da users, but certainly not for mac users.

>>

>You never separated ASIO/PC from ASIO/Mac - your comments were about latency

>in general. It is important to be technically accurate when making claims  
>about one platform or gear being better than others.  
>>  
>> All in all , with ASIO getting long winded, Asio has gotten old, and they  
>> Steinberg has not figured out how to fix the routing(Mixer) issues that  
>> will put it on par with Pro Tool's software controlled hardware.  
>>  
>Where did you hear that ASIO was getting long winded? What do you base  
this  
>opinion on? I've already explained the difference between native and  
>hybrid-hardware. There is a full 3rd party operating system between native  
>and the hardware. With hybrid, there is only a bit of assembler code and  
>logic circuitry. Two different animals. Latency comparisons come about  
as  
>a matter of implementation and function, not direct technical similarities.  
>  
>> Your argument about HD plugins is valid, but Digi is throwing the kitchen  
>> sink these days with new purchases, not just trade-ins. Suffice it to  
say,  
>> when you purchase a new HD rig, you won't need to make many Plugin Purchases  
>> anytime soon.  
>  
>No doubt they see the native writing on the wall or they wouldn't have  
>bought M-Audio to actually support - they would have bought Steinberg and  
>promptly burned the development files and blown out any remaining stock.  
>>  
>> I totally disagree with you about Native being a Cheaper upgrade path.  
Since  
>> 1999, most semi and high end users have upgraded their systems at least  
4  
>> -5 times.. With the intent of gaining more power. Even today, We sterinberg  
>> users are still on the upgrade war path with the whole core2 dual, 8  
>> core..yada  
>> yada..How much do you think it cost ?? what's the real TCO??  
>  
>You might be on the upgrade war path, but there is no war here - only  
>gaining more and more power for my investment with minimal annual cost.  
>Since 1999 how many PT users upgraded from Mix to HD? The cost there is  
>thousands, not hundreds - for many it was well over \$10k, \$20k or \$50k.  
>>  
>> If I'm honest, I'll tell I have spent over 6K over the last 5 years, not  
>> counting software..And thats being kind.  
>  
>But you don't get Digi products free do you? They also cost. You have  
to  
>buy conversion apps, encoders separately, plugins at double the native cost.  
>That adds up at a much faster rate. With a PT rig, you still have to buy  
a

>Mac or PC, Cubase/Nuendo/Logic, etc to run a decent sequencer and VSTi's,  
>where my system is completely integrated and cross-compatible. I could  
add  
>a Mac, or 3 or 4 and still be cross-compatible, completely linked and  
>synced, and upgrade for a few hundred whenever the mood strikes.  
>  
>>  
>> With every mention of a new Processor, comes the dream of Zero latency  
for  
>> the Native. Now, we know our pre-64 bit cpu investments over that last  
couple  
>> of years has been a sham..  
>> Sure we can run a few more plugins, but that's about it..  
>  
>You are superimposing your own somewhat extreme reaction and frustration  
on  
>every other native user, and/or reading a few posts and assuming a handful  
>of computer-compulsive users represent the DAW world. That's about as far  
>from the truth as you could be, Lamont.  
>>  
>> To me and my circle of producers and engineers, all have or will be going  
>> Pro Tool HD.. Depending on the needs, HD 2 acell seems to be the popular  
>> choice. Maybe your circle of music friend are going Native, not mine..and  
>> these guys are heavy hitters in the game.  
>  
>You are assuming my circle is somehow lowly, inferior light weights. Sorry,  
>but you are generalizing, making erroneous assumptions and apparently think  
>quite highly of your own view of success. Good for you. There is a good  
>bit of complete ignorant crap coming from "heavy hitters" these days, so  
be  
>careful how you support your views.  
>  
>> Like the Nuendo forum discussion pointed out: It seems(like always) that  
we  
>> have different needs. The ITB guys need near or closest to zero latency  
as  
>> possible. Whereas the guys who just edit and mix, run their daw at  
1024  
>> and care about zero latency.  
>  
>For one, it is short-sighted to simply segregate native DAW users from  
>Protools users as if there is a superior need within the Protools market.  
>The needs are based on studio function and preference, not superiority.  
>Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy  
>productions, whereas a composer or producer with less gear can easily be  
>working on a much higher quality level, with a much higher level of  
>expertise (for example Steve Tushar producing sound design for Disney films,  
>etc, all from his basement with Nuendo and an MC; or Hans Zimmer making

\$50

>million a year scoring films, with a large staff, and racks of computer  
>systems - the PT rig for tracking, but not production). I know the points  
>at which one chooses one solution over another.

>>

>> I think in the future, it would best(for all) to say what application  
you

>> work in before making statements or suggestions to anyone. Because everyone

>> has differnt studio, workflow needs.

>

>Yes, and to research your comments before reciting marketing or user hype.

>Not all users with a recording studio gig are well versed in the technical

>realities of the gear and the market we are in. Let's also include the  
day

>gig as well to know who does this daily and who does it in off hours.

>>

>> Detric, you mainly work in Post, where as I work in a more commercial  
studio.

>> Our needs and opinions will be vastly different.

>

>Lamont, let's be clear, my studio is commercial - I work daily with high

>paying clients. I just don't hire it out for use by others for recording

>whatever band wants to come by. My clientele is easily as demanding and

>high end, and perhaps moreso than larger commercial studios recording bands

>and artists. Different horses for different courses. The large format  
>studio is a dying breed, so I'm not sure I would tout that as the elite

of

>the creative arts industry at the moment.

>>

>> That's he problem with these kinds of dscusions in forums. You have a  
ITB,

>> one room dude, running abelton live( nothing wrong with that), telling  
dude

>> who works at a facility that abelton live would be good for them ..

>>

>Are you referring to anyone in particular, or is that a generalization?

If

>the latter, it doesn't really apply here. Recommendations here are always

>valid as you don't always know what is best for the original poster.

>

>Detric

>>

>>

>>

>



Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 02:16:58 GMT

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

---

Cont..

You stated:Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy productions"

Of course anybody with some money can go into wold-calss facility say Ocean Way <http://www.oceanwaystudios.com/> . Does not guarantee a great recording. But, that does not deminish the fact that the Facility is world class.

So, your point is not valid. As well as always, regurgitating tech list that listed on a products web site or reciting what someone is said that's linked to the company as Gospel. Those company types lie all the time and mis-state facts and details about thier products. So, you giving your so-called "facts" based on a product media sheet, is weak ..

How about actually taking the product for spin for awhile, then report back.

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>On 9/9/07 5:20 PM, in article 46e47fcf\$1@linux, "LaMont"

><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>>

>> Dedric what are you talking about ??

>>

>> Asio may be the best for Native PC da users, but certainly not for mac users.

>>

>You never separated ASIO/PC from ASIO/Mac - your comments were about latency

>in general. It is important to be technically accurate when making claims

>about one platform or gear being better than others.

>>

>> All in all , with ASIO getting long winded, Asio has gotten old, and they

>> Steinberg has not figured out how to fix the routing(Mixer) issues that

>> will put it on par with Pro Tool's software controlled hardware.

>>

>Where did you hear that ASIO was getting long winded? What do you base this

>opinion on? I've already explained the difference between native and

>hybrid-hardware. There is a full 3rd party operating system between native

>and the hardware. With hybrid, there is only a bit of assembler code and

>logic circuitry. Two different animals. Latency comparisons come about

as

>a matter of implementation and function, not direct technical similarities.

>

>> Your argument about HD plugins is valid, but Digi is throwing the kitchen  
>> sink these days with new purchases, not just trade-ins. Suffice it to  
say,  
>> when you purchase a new HD rig, you won't need to make many Plugin Purchases  
>> anytime soon.  
>  
>No doubt they see the native writing on the wall or they wouldn't have  
>bought M-Audio to actually support - they would have bought Steinberg and  
>promptly burned the development files and blown out any remaining stock.  
>>  
>> I totally disagree with you about Native being a Cheaper upgrade path.  
Since  
>> 1999, most semi and high end users have upgraded their systems at least  
4  
>> -5 times.. With the intent of gaining more power. Even today, We sterinberg  
>> users are still on the upgrade war path with the whole core2 dual, 8  
>> core..yada  
>> yada..How much do you think it cost ?? what's the real TCO??  
>  
>You might be on the upgrade war path, but there is no war here - only  
>gaining more and more power for my investment with minimal annual cost.  
>Since 1999 how many PT users upgraded from Mix to HD? The cost there is  
>thousands, not hundreds - for many it was well over \$10k, \$20k or \$50k.  
>>  
>> If I'm honest, I'll tell I have spent over 6K over the last 5 years, not  
>> counting software..And thats being kind.  
>  
>But you don't get Digi products free do you? They also cost. You have  
to  
>buy conversion apps, encoders separately, plugins at double the native cost.  
>That adds up at a much faster rate. With a PT rig, you still have to buy  
a  
>Mac or PC, Cubase/Nuendo/Logic, etc to run a decent sequencer and VSTi's,  
>where my system is completely integrated and cross-compatible. I could  
add  
>a Mac, or 3 or 4 and still be cross-compatible, completely linked and  
>synced, and upgrade for a few hundred whenever the mood strikes.  
>  
>>  
>> With evey mention of a new Processor, comes the dream of Zero lantency  
for  
>> the Native. Now, we know our pre-64 bit cpu investments over that last  
couple  
>> of years has been a sham..  
>> Sure we can run a few more plugins, but that's about it..  
>  
>You are superimposing your own somewhat extreme reaction and frustration  
on

>every other native user, and/or reading a few posts and assuming a handful  
>of computer-compulsive users represent the DAW world. That's about as far  
>from the truth as you could be, Lamont.

>>

>> To me and my circle of producers and engineers, all have or will be going  
>> Pro Tool HD.. Depending on the needs, HD 2 acell seems to be the popular  
>> choice. Maybe your circle of music friend are going Native, not mine..and  
>> these guys are heavey hitters in he game.

>

>You are assuming my circle is somehow lowly, inferior light weights. Sorry,  
>but your are generalizing, making erroneous assumptions and apparently think  
>quite highly of your own view of success. Good for you. There is a good  
>bit of complete ignorant crap coming from "heavy hitters" these days, so  
be  
>careful how you support your views.

>

>> Like the Nuendo forum discusion pointed out: It seems(like always) that  
we  
>> have different needs. The ITB guys need near or closest to zero latency  
as  
>> possible. Where as the guys who just edits and mix , run their daw at  
1024  
>> and care about zero latency.

>

>For one, it is short-sighted to simply segregate native DAW users from  
>Protools users as if there is a superior need within the Protools market.  
>The needs are based on studio function and preference, not superiority.  
>Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy  
>productions, whereas a composer or producer with less gear can easily be  
>working on a much higher quality level, with a much higher level of  
>expertise (for example Steve Tushar producing sound design for Disney films,  
>etc, all from his basement with Nuendo and an MC; or Hans Zimmer making  
\$50  
>million a year scoring films, with a large staff, and racks of computer  
>systems - the PT rig for tracking, but not production). I know the points  
>at which one chooses one solution over another.

>>

>> I think in the future, it would best(for all) to say what application  
you  
>> work in before making statements or suggestions to anyone. Because everyone  
>> has differnt studio, workflow needs.

>

>Yes, and to research your comments before reciting marketing or user hype.  
>Not all users with a recording studio gig are well versed in the technical  
>realities of the gear and the market we are in. Let's also include the  
day  
>gig as well to know who does this daily and who does it in off hours.

>>

>> Dedic, you mainly work in Post, where as I work in a more commercial studio.  
>> Our needs and opinions will be vastly different.  
>  
>Lamont, let's be clear, my studio is commercial - I work daily with high >paying clients. I just don't hire it out for use by others for recording >whatever band wants to come by. My clientele is easily as demanding and >high end, and perhaps moreso than larger commercial studios recording bands >and artists. Different horses for different courses. The large format >studio is a dying breed, so I'm not sure I would tout that as the elite of >the creative arts industry at the moment.  
>>  
>> That's he problem with these kinds of dscusions in forums. You have a ITB,  
>> one room dude, running abelton live( nothing wrong with that), telling dude >> who works at a facility that abelton live would be good for them ..  
>>  
>Are you referring to anyone in particular, or is that a generalization?  
If >the latter, it doesn't really apply here. Recommendations here are always >valid as you don't always know what is best for the original poster.  
>  
>Dedic  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?  
Posted by [Nei](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 03:15:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Lamont...

That which is "pro" and what's not "pro" by your definition matters to maybe 5% of the population of studio dawgs - the ones that are dealing with the A-list labels, artists & producers. And yeah, for those facilities, you'd better have an HD rig, not ot mention a nice collection of veentaje mics, preamps, guitars, and instrument amps. Oh, and you'd better have a nice well-tuned grand piano, as well - even though it might actually only get used once or twice a year. Add to that 5% perhaps another maybe 5% of artists who have some well-moneyed backing that THINK they need a certain brand of gear or type of facility, and that's your "pro" market in terms of

commercial studios.

That which "works" & makes sense is what matters to the remaining 90%.

Considering the rate at which world-class facilities have been closing down over the past few years, I think it's safe to say that more & more "pro" recordings are going to be made in "not-so-pro" facilities as time goes by.

Just something to think about before you go too far in equating level of end-quality with some fancy starship of a studio.

Neil

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

>

>Cont..

>You stated:Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy >productions"

>

>Of course anybody with some money can go into world-class facility say Ocean >Way <http://www.oceanwaystudios.com/> . Does not guarantee a great recording. >But, that does not diminish the fact that the Facility is world class.

>

>So, your point is not valid. As well as always, regurgitating tech list >that listed on a products web site or reciting what someone is said that's >linked to the company as Gospel. Those company types lie all the time and >mis-state facts and details about their products. So, you giving your so-called >"facts" based on a product media sheet, is weak ..

>

>How about actually taking the product for spin for awhile, then report back.

>

>

>

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

>>On 9/9/07 5:20 PM, in article 46e47fcf\$1 @linux, "LaMont"

>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>

>>>

>>> Dedric what are you talking about ??

>>>

>>> Asio may be the best for Native PC da users, but certainly not for mac >users.

>>>

>>You never separated ASIO/PC from ASIO/Mac - your comments were about latency >>in general. It is important to be technically accurate when making claims

>>about one platform or gear being better than others.  
>>>  
>>> All in all , with ASIO getting long winded, Asio has gotten old, and they  
>>> Steinberg has not figured out how to fix the routing(Mixer) issues that  
>>> will put it on par with Pro Tool's software controlled hardware.  
>>>  
>>Where did you hear that ASIO was getting long winded? What do you base  
>this  
>>opinion on? I've already explained the difference between native and  
>>hybrid-hardware. There is a full 3rd party operating system between native  
>>and the hardware. With hybrid, there is only a bit of assembler code and  
>>logic circuitry. Two different animals. Latency comparisons come about  
>as  
>>a matter of implementation and function, not direct technical similarities.  
>>  
>>> Your argument about HD plugins is valid, but Digi is throwing the kitchen  
>>> sink these days with new purchases, not just trade-ins. Suffice it to  
>say,  
>>> when you purchase a new HD rig, you won't need to make many Plugin Purchases  
>>> anytime soon.  
>>  
>>No doubt they see the native writing on the wall or they wouldn't have  
>>bought M-Audio to actually support - they would have bought Steinberg and  
>>promptly burned the development files and blown out any remaining stock.  
>>>  
>>> I totally disagree with you about Native being a Cheaper upgrade path.  
>Since  
>>> 1999, most semi and high end users have upgraded their systems at least  
>4  
>>> -5 times.. With the intent of gaining more power. Even today, We sterinberg  
>>> users are still on the upgrade war path with the wholo core2 dual, 8  
>>> core..yada  
>>> yada..How much do you think it cost ?? what's the real TCO??  
>>  
>>You might be on the upgrade war path, but there is no war here - only  
>>gaining more and more power for my investment with minimal annual cost.  
>>Since 1999 how many PT users upgraded from Mix to HD? The cost there is  
>>thousands, not hundreds - for many it was well over \$10k, \$20k or \$50k.  
>>>  
>>> If I'm honest, I'll tell I have spent over 6K over the last 5 years,  
not  
>>> counting software..And thats being kind.  
>>  
>>But you don't get Digi products free do you? They also cost. You have  
>to  
>>buy conversion apps, encoders separately, plugins at double the native  
cost.

>>That adds up at a much faster rate. With a PT rig, you still have to buy  
>a  
>>Mac or PC, Cubase/Nuendo/Logic, etc to run a decent sequencer and VSTi's,  
>>where my system is completely integrated and cross-compatible. I could  
>add  
>>a Mac, or 3 or 4 and still be cross-compatible, completely linked and  
>>synced, and upgrade for a few hundred whenever the mood strikes.  
>>  
>>>  
>>> With every mention of a new Processor, comes the dream of Zero latency  
>for  
>>> the Native. Now, we know our pre-64 bit cpu investments over that last  
>couple  
>>> of years has been a sham..  
>>> Sure we can run a few more plugins, but that's about it..  
>>  
>>You are superimposing your own somewhat extreme reaction and frustration  
>on  
>>every other native user, and/or reading a few posts and assuming a handful  
>>of computer-compulsive users represent the DAW world. That's about as  
>far  
>>from the truth as you could be, Lamont.  
>>>  
>>> To me and my circle of producers and engineers, all have or will be going  
>>> Pro Tool HD.. Depending on the needs, HD 2 acell seems to be the popular  
>>> choice. Maybe your circle of music friend are going Native, not mine..and  
>>> these guys are heavy hitters in the game.  
>>  
>>You are assuming my circle is somehow lowly, inferior light weights. Sorry,  
>>but you are generalizing, making erroneous assumptions and apparently  
>think  
>>quite highly of your own view of success. Good for you. There is a good  
>>bit of complete ignorant crap coming from "heavy hitters" these days, so  
>be  
>>careful how you support your views.  
>>  
>>> Like the Nuendo forum discussion pointed out: It seems(like always) that  
>we  
>>> have different needs. The ITB guys need near or closest to zero latency  
>as  
>>> possible. Where as the guys who just edit and mix , run their daw at  
>1024  
>>> and care about zero latency.  
>>  
>>For one, it is short-sighted to simply segregate native DAW users from  
>>Protools users as if there is a superior need within the Protools market.  
>>The needs are based on studio function and preference, not superiority.  
>>Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy



>>productions, whereas a composer or producer with less gear can easily be  
>>working on a much higher quality level, with a much higher level of  
>>expertise (for example Steve Tushar producing sound design for Disney films,  
>>etc, all from his basement with Nuendo and an MC; or Hans Zimmer making  
>\$50  
>>million a year scoring films, with a large staff, and racks of computer  
>>systems - the PT rig for tracking, but not production). I know the points  
>>at which one chooses one solution over another.  
>>>  
>>> I think in the future, it would best(for all) to say what application  
>you  
>>> work in before making statements or suggestions to anyone. Because everyone  
>>> has differnt studio, workflow needs.  
>>  
>>Yes, and to research your comments before reciting marketing or user hype.  
>>Not all users with a recording studio gig are well versed in the technical  
>>realities of the gear and the market we are in. Let's also include the  
>day  
>>gig as well to know who does this daily and who does it in off hours.  
>>>  
>>> Detric, you mainly work in Post, where as I work in a more commercial  
>studio.  
>>> Our needs and opinions will be vastly different.  
>>  
>>Lamont, let's be clear, my studio is commercial - I work daily with high  
>>paying clients. I just don't hire it out for use by others for recording  
>>whatever band wants to come by. My clientele is easily as demanding and  
>>high end, and perhaps moreso than larger commercial studios recording bands  
>>and artists. Different horses for different courses. The large format  
>>studio is a dying breed, so I'm not sure I would tout that as the elite  
>of  
>>the creative arts industry at the moment.  
>>>  
>>> That's he problem with these kinds of dscusions in forums. You have a  
>ITB,  
>>> one room dude, running abelton live( nothing wrong with that), telling  
>dude  
>>> who works at a facility that abelton live would be good for them ..  
>>>  
>>Are you referring to anyone in particular, or is that a generalization?  
> If  
>>the latter, it doesn't really apply here. Recommendations here are always  
>>valid as you don't always know what is best for the original poster.  
>>  
>>Detric  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>

>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 03:45:22 GMT

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

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

>Mike, if you're drinking Scotch at 3:00 in the afternoon, figuring out

>direct monitoring is not your real problem.

Yes, in that case his real problem is that he obviously had a really, really long and arduous session that went nonstop from about noon on Saturday 'til about 2:30pm on Sunday, with a band consisting of a Johnny Rotten wannabee on lead vocals, a bass player with a Sears bass from the 1960's that has a pine neck with no truss rod, a drummer whose heads are half duct tape/half actual head material and he wants that "Phil Collins drum sound, man!", and a guitarist that's convinced he can use his Segovia technique through a Mesa triple rectifier set to "nuke", and his PRS with P90's tuned two steps down & strung with .008's; and when it's finally all over Mike discovers he's only got a couple of snorts of Scotch left to begin with, and the liquor stores are all closed on Sunday.

Now THAT's a problem! lol

:D

Neil

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 04:30:18 GMT

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

Okay..But, but my point was to answer the statement about crappy music being made in so called pro facilities. crappy clients coming in with crappy music can happen at level of studio.

Big buck facility, does not ensure top quality product.

Okay now, on to your points. There is a strange shift occurring these days. The emergence of the Professional Project Studio. That's usually equipped with a DAW setup(Motu, Digi, Stieny, Logic, Sonar)and some vintage gear.

Again, each of our circles our differnt. Here in Detroit, Pro Tools is king..But, in Nashville, Pro Tools is leading, with Nuendo second..

Clients come in asking for Pro Tools. Most of the time, they come with their sessions already completed in Pro Tools, So, all I have to do is mix it.

Since I prefer Nuendo's workflow, I track, edit in Neundo..Consolidate. Import to ProTools Mix and only Mix :)No editing what so ever Or I'll Mix in Paris (If the client is not around)..

"Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote:

>

>Lamont...

>

>That which is "pro" and what's not "pro" by your definition  
>matters to maybe 5% of the population of studio dawgs - the  
>ones that are dealing with the A-list labels, artists &  
>producers. And yeah, for those facilities, you'd better have an  
>HD rig, not ot mention a nice collection of veentaje mics,  
>preamps, guitars, and instrument amps. Oh, and you'd better  
>have a nice well-tuned grand piano, as well - even though it  
>might actually only get used once or twice a year. Add to that  
>5% perhaps another maybe 5% of artists who have some well-  
>moneyed backing that THINK they need a certain brand of gear or  
>type of facility, and that's your "pro" market in terms of  
>commercial studios.

>

>That which "works" & makes sense is what matters to the  
>remaining 90%.

>

>Considering the rate at which world-class facilities have been  
>closing down over the past few years, I think it's safe to say  
>that more & more "pro" recordings are going to be made in "not-  
>so-pro" facilities as time goes by.

>

>Just something to think about before you go too far in equating  
>level of end-quality with some fancy starship of a studio.

>

>Neil

>

>

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

>>

>>Cont..

>>You stated:Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out  
crappy

>>productions"

>>  
>>Of course anybody with some money can go into world-class facility say Ocean  
>>Way <http://www.oceanwaystudios.com/> . Does not guarantee a great recording.  
>>But, that does not diminish the fact that the Facility is world class.  
>>  
>>So, your point is not valid. As well as always, regurgitating tech list  
>>that listed on a products web site or reciting what someone is said that's  
>>linked to the company as Gospel. Those company types lie all the time  
and  
>>mis-state facts and details about their products. So, you giving your so-called  
>>"facts" based on a product media sheet, is weak ..  
>>  
>>How about actually taking the product for spin for awhile, then report  
back.  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>On 9/9/07 5:20 PM, in article 46e47fcf\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Dedric what are you talking about ??  
>>>>  
>>>> Asio may be the best for Native PC da users, but certainly not for mac  
>>users.  
>>>>  
>>>>You never separated ASIO/PC from ASIO/Mac - your comments were about latency  
>>>>in general. It is important to be technically accurate when making claims  
>>>>about one platform or gear being better than others.  
>>>>  
>>>> All in all , with ASIO getting long winded, Asio has gotten old, and  
>they  
>>>> Steinberg has not figured out how to fix the routing(Mixer) issues  
that  
>>>> will put it on par with Pro Tool's software controlled hardware.  
>>>>  
>>>>Where did you hear that ASIO was getting long winded? What do you base  
>>this  
>>>>opinion on? I've already explained the difference between native and  
>>>>hybrid-hardware. There is a full 3rd party operating system between native  
>>>>and the hardware. With hybrid, there is only a bit of assembler code  
and  
>>>>logic circuitry. Two different animals. Latency comparisons come about  
>>as  
>>>>a matter of implementation and function, not direct technical similarities.  
>>>>  
>>>> Your argument about HD plugins is valid, but Digi is throwing the kitchen

>>>> sink these days with new purchases, not just trade-ins. Suffice it to  
>>say,  
>>>> when you purchase a new HD rig, you won't need to make many Plugin Purchases  
>>>> anytime soon.  
>>>  
>>>No doubt they see the native writing on the wall or they wouldn't have  
>>>bought M-Audio to actually support - they would have bought Steinberg  
and  
>>>promptly burned the development files and blown out any remaining stock.  
>>>>  
>>>> I totally disagree with you about Native being a Cheaper upgrade path.  
>>Since  
>>>> 1999, most semi and high end users have upgraded their systems at least  
>>4  
>>>> -5 times.. With the intent of gaining more power. Even today, We sterinberg  
>>>> users are still on the upgrade war path with the wholo core2 dual, 8  
>>>> core..yada  
>>>> yada..How much do you think it cost ?? what's the real TCO??  
>>>  
>>>You might be on the upgrade war path, but there is no war here - only  
>>>gaining more and more power for my investment with minimal annual cost.  
>>>Since 1999 how many PT users upgraded from Mix to HD? The cost there  
is  
>>>thousands, not hundreds - for many it was well over \$10k, \$20k or \$50k.  
>>>>  
>>>> If I'm honest, I'll tell I have spent over 6K over the last 5 years,  
>not  
>>>> counting software..And thats being kind.  
>>>  
>>>But you don't get Digi products free do you? They also cost. You have  
>>to  
>>>buy conversion apps, encoders separately, plugins at double the native  
>cost.  
>>>That adds up at a much faster rate. With a PT rig, you still have to  
buy  
>>a  
>>>Mac or PC, Cubase/Nuendo/Logic, etc to run a decent sequencer and VSTi's,  
>>>where my system is completely integrated and cross-compatible. I could  
>>add  
>>>a Mac, or 3 or 4 and still be cross-compatible, completely linked and  
>>>synced, and upgrade for a few hundred whenever the mood strikes.  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> With evey mention of a new Processor, comes the dream of Zero lantency  
>>for  
>>>> the Native. Now, we know our pre-64 bit cpu investments over that last  
>>couple  
>>>> of years has been a sham..

>>>> Sure we can run a few more plugins, but that's about it..  
>>>  
>>>You are superimposing your own somewhat extreme reaction and frustration  
>>on  
>>>every other native user, and/or reading a few posts and assuming a handful  
>>>of computer-compulsive users represent the DAW world. That's about as  
>far  
>>>from the truth as you could be, Lamont.  
>>>>  
>>>> To me and my circle of producers and engineers, all have or will be  
going  
>>>> Pro Tool HD.. Depending on the needs, HD 2 acell seems to be the popular  
>>>> choice. Maybe your circle of music friend are going Native, not mine..and  
>>>> these guys are heavy hitters in the game.  
>>>  
>>>You are assuming my circle is somehow lowly, inferior light weights.  
Sorry,  
>>>but you are generalizing, making erroneous assumptions and apparently  
>think  
>>>quite highly of your own view of success. Good for you. There is a good  
>>>bit of complete ignorant crap coming from "heavy hitters" these days,  
so  
>>be  
>>>careful how you support your views.  
>>>  
>>>> Like the Nuendo forum discussion pointed out: It seems(like always) that  
>>we  
>>>> have different needs. The ITB guys need near or closest to zero latency  
>>as  
>>>> possible. Where as the guys who just edits and mix , run their daw at  
>>1024  
>>>> and care about zero latency.  
>>>  
>>>>For one, it is short-sighted to simply segregate native DAW users from  
>>>>Protools users as if there is a superior need within the Protools market.  
>>>>The needs are based on studio function and preference, not superiority.  
>>>>Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy  
>>>>productions, whereas a composer or producer with less gear can easily  
be  
>>>>working on a much higher quality level, with a much higher level of  
>>>>expertise (for example Steve Tushar producing sound design for Disney  
films,  
>>>>etc, all from his basement with Nuendo and an MC; or Hans Zimmer making  
>>>\$50  
>>>million a year scoring films, with a large staff, and racks of computer  
>>>systems - the PT rig for tracking, but not production). I know the points  
>>>at which one chooses one solution over another.  
>>>>

>>>> I think in the future, it would best(for all) to say what application  
>>you  
>>>> work in before making statements or suggestions to anyone. Because everyone  
>>>> has differnt studio, workflow needs.  
>>>  
>>>Yes, and to research your comments before reciting marketing or user hype.  
>>>Not all users with a recording studio gig are well versed in the technical  
>>>realities of the gear and the market we are in. Let's also include the  
>>day  
>>>gig as well to know who does this daily and who does it in off hours.  
>>>>  
>>>> Dedric, you mainly work in Post, where as I work in a more commercial  
>>studio.  
>>>> Our needs and opinions will be vastly different.  
>>>  
>>>Lamont, let's be clear, my studio is commercial - I work daily with high  
>>>paying clients. I just don't hire it out for use by others for recording  
>>>whatever band wants to come by. My clientele is easily as demanding and  
>>>high end, and perhaps moreso than larger commercial studios recording  
bands  
>>>and artists. Different horses for different courses. The large format  
>>>studio is a dying breed, so I'm not sure I would tout that as the elite  
>>of  
>>>the creative arts industry at the moment.  
>>>>  
>>>> That's he problem with these kinds of dscusions in forums. You have  
a  
>>ITB,  
>>>> one room dude, running abelton live( nothing wrong with that), telling  
>>dude  
>>>> who works at a facility that abelton live would be good for them ..  
>>>>  
>>>>Are you referring to anyone in particular, or is that a generalization?  
>> If  
>>>the latter, it doesn't really apply here. Recommendations here are always  
>>>valid as you don't always know what is best for the original poster.  
>>>  
>>>Dedric  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?



Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 04:55:44 GMT

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

---

Lamont....

On 9/9/07 8:16 PM, in article 46e4a91a\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>  
> Cont..  
> You stated:Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy  
> productions"  
>  
> Of course anybody with some money can go into wold-calss facilty say Ocean  
> Way <http://www.oceanwaystudios.com/> . Does not guarantee a great recording.  
> But, that does not deminish the fact that the Facility is world class.

Of course it doesn't, but we weren't talking about how large a facility has to be to be considered world class, or even the concept of a world class facility - but rather the fact that gear doesn't make you talented and knowledgeable. There is a wide range of studios around, as well as a wide range of talent going in and coming out. But the question still remains, is your definition of a high end professional one with a lot of high end expensive gear, or a high level of skill? (Note that you changed the discussion to "world class recording facility", not what makes the engineer skilled and knowledgeable, which was the detour branch off of the original native vs. hybrid-hardware discussion).

My studio does professional work for high end clients. Just because it isn't large enough to mix for Dreamworks or Paramount, doesn't make me less skilled in general. You have to be careful how you associate your skill with the facility you work in.

>  
> So, your point is not valid.

My point is valid - great gear doesn't make great talent. Either I'm way pickier than you are, or you don't hear some records the way I do. I can name multi-platinum records that quite frankly, sound terrible by any reasonable sonic standard. I think we've had this discussion before and I'm pretty sure we agreed, so don't defect just to take an opposing viewpoint here. :-)

> As well as always, regurgitating tech list  
> that listed on a products web site or reciting what someone is said that's  
> linked to the company as Gospel. Those company types lie all the time and  
> mis-state facts and details about thier products. So, you giving your so-called  
> "facts" based on a product media sheet, is weak ..

Hmmm... that sounds familiar to what I just said:

>> Yes, and to research your comments before reciting marketing or user hype.  
>> Not all users with a recording studio gig are well versed in the technical  
>> realities of the gear and the market we are in. Let's also include the  
> day  
>> gig as well to know who does this daily and who does it in off hours.

So you are taking my comments and turning them around and saying \*I'm\* the one regurgitating tech lists?? Interesting, considering this conversation was in fact about cost comparisons and viability of native vs. hybrid for different situations. So, whatever argument you think will make you look better is the one you take, even if it means changing the topic of the discussion? Do you think that's really a good way to make a credible point? I hope not, as it isn't.

I only come here for the enjoyment of discussion with other musicians, engineers, and producers, regardless of their level of success and skill - bedroom musician or seasoned pro - doesn't matter to me - everyone is the same. I don't have anything to prove to anyone. Couldn't care less. I love the range of talent and expertise here, enjoy contributing, and enjoy learning too. I'm no better than anyone else, and you aren't either. Maybe you could look past the nice gear around you a little more and stop assuming or hoping it makes you better or more knowledgeable than anyone else. We don't care about the gear around you - it's your input, thoughts and participation here as a person that are most important, right or wrong, expert or novice. Everyone has different experiences, and not all of us relate our bios or past history to back up what we discuss here, no matter how convincing that might be.

You don't know people such as me as well as you think you do, and you don't have to prove anything to me or anyone. I'm happy for you that you have a superb facility to work in - you obviously love what you do as much as I love what I do. I don't expect you to know everything about every piece of gear, or be technically versed in all that is digital or analog audio, but likewise, don't expect me to know less just because my studio has a smaller square footage, and I run Nuendo instead of ProTools (yes, a Fairlight system is in the business plan...along with a bigger place to put it in).

Dedric

>  
> How about actually taking the product for spin for awhile, then report back.  
>  
>  
>  
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>> On 9/9/07 5:20 PM, in article 46e47fcf\$1@linux, "LaMont"

>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>>  
>>> Dedic what are you talking about ??  
>>>  
>>> Asio may be the best for Native PC da users, but certainly not for mac  
> users.  
>>>  
>> You never separated ASIO/PC from ASIO/Mac - your comments were about latency  
>> in general. It is important to be technically accurate when making claims  
>> about one platform or gear being better than others.  
>>>  
>>> All in all , with ASIO getting long winded, Asio has gotten old, and they  
>>> Steinberg has not figured out how to fix the routing(Mixer) issues that  
>>> will put it on par with Pro Tool's software controlled hardware.  
>>>  
>> Where did you hear that ASIO was getting long winded? What do you base  
> this  
>> opinion on? I've already explained the difference between native and  
>> hybrid-hardware. There is a full 3rd party operating system between native  
>> and the hardware. With hybrid, there is only a bit of assembler code and  
>> logic circuitry. Two different animals. Latency comparisons come about  
> as  
>> a matter of implementation and function, not direct technical similarities.  
>>  
>>> Your argument about HD plugins is valid, but Digi is throwing the kitchen  
>>> sink these days with new purchases, not just trade-ins. Suffice it to  
> say,  
>>> when you purchase a new HD rig, you won't need to make many Plugin Purchases  
>>> anytime soon.  
>>  
>> No doubt they see the native writing on the wall or they wouldn't have  
>> bought M-Audio to actually support - they would have bought Steinberg and  
>> promptly burned the development files and blown out any remaining stock.  
>>>  
>>> I totally disagree with you about Native being a Cheaper upgrade path.  
> Since  
>>> 1999, most semi and high end users have upgraded their systems at least  
> 4  
>>> -5 times.. With the intent of gaining more power. Even today, We sterinberg  
>>> users are still on the upgrade war path with the whole core2 dual, 8  
>>> core..yada  
>>> yada..How much do you think it cost ?? what's the real TCO??  
>>  
>> You might be on the upgrade war path, but there is no war here - only  
>> gaining more and more power for my investment with minimal annual cost.  
>> Since 1999 how many PT users upgraded from Mix to HD? The cost there is  
>> thousands, not hundreds - for many it was well over \$10k, \$20k or \$50k.

>>>  
>>> If I'm honest, I'll tell I have spent over 6K over the last 5 years, not  
>>> counting software..And thats being kind.  
>>  
>> But you don't get Digi products free do you? They also cost. You have  
> to  
>> buy conversion apps, encoders separately, plugins at double the native cost.  
>> That adds up at a much faster rate. With a PT rig, you still have to buy  
> a  
>> Mac or PC, Cubase/Nuendo/Logic, etc to run a decent sequencer and VSTi's,  
>> where my system is completely integrated and cross-compatible. I could  
> add  
>> a Mac, or 3 or 4 and still be cross-compatible, completely linked and  
>> synced, and upgrade for a few hundred whenever the mood strikes.  
>>  
>>>  
>>> With every mention of a new Processor, comes the dream of Zero latency  
> for  
>>> the Native. Now, we know our pre-64 bit cpu investments over that last  
> couple  
>>> of years has been a sham..  
>>> Sure we can run a few more plugins, but that's about it..  
>>  
>> You are superimposing your own somewhat extreme reaction and frustration  
> on  
>> every other native user, and/or reading a few posts and assuming a handful  
>> of computer-compulsive users represent the DAW world. That's about as far  
>> from the truth as you could be, Lamont.  
>>>  
>>> To me and my circle of producers and engineers, all have or will be going  
>>> Pro Tool HD.. Depending on the needs, HD 2 acell seems to be the popular  
>>> choice. Maybe your circle of music friend are going Native, not mine..and  
>>> these guys are heavy hitters in the game.  
>>  
>> You are assuming my circle is somehow lowly, inferior light weights. Sorry,  
>> but you are generalizing, making erroneous assumptions and apparently think  
>> quite highly of your own view of success. Good for you. There is a good  
>> bit of complete ignorant crap coming from "heavy hitters" these days, so  
> be  
>> careful how you support your views.  
>>  
>>> Like the Nuendo forum discussion pointed out: It seems(like always) that  
> we  
>>> have different needs. The ITB guys need near or closest to zero latency  
> as  
>>> possible. Where as the guys who just edit and mix , run their daw at  
> 1024  
>>> and care about zero latency.

>>  
>> For one, it is short-sighted to simply segregate native DAW users from  
>> Protools users as if there is a superior need within the Protools market.  
>> The needs are based on studio function and preference, not superiority.  
>> Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy  
>> productions, whereas a composer or producer with less gear can easily be  
>> working on a much higher quality level, with a much higher level of  
>> expertise (for example Steve Tushar producing sound design for Disney films,  
>> etc, all from his basement with Nuendo and an MC; or Hans Zimmer making  
> \$50  
>> million a year scoring films, with a large staff, and racks of computer  
>> systems - the PT rig for tracking, but not production). I know the points  
>> at which one chooses one solution over another.  
>>>  
>>> I think in the future, it would best(for all) to say what application  
> you  
>>> work in before making statements or suggestions to anyone. Because everyone  
>>> has differnt studio, workflow needs.  
>>  
>> Yes, and to research your comments before reciting marketing or user hype.  
>> Not all users with a recording studio gig are well versed in the technical  
>> realities of the gear and the market we are in. Let's also include the  
> day  
>> gig as well to know who does this daily and who does it in off hours.  
>>>  
>>> Detric, you mainly work in Post, where as I work in a more commercial  
> studio.  
>>> Our needs and opinions will be vastly different.  
>>  
>> Lamont, let's be clear, my studio is commercial - I work daily with high  
>> paying clients. I just don't hire it out for use by others for recording  
>> whatever band wants to come by. My clientele is easily as demanding and  
>> high end, and perhaps moreso than larger commercial studios recording bands  
>> and artists. Different horses for different courses. The large format  
>> studio is a dying breed, so I'm not sure I would tout that as the elite  
> of  
>> the creative arts industry at the moment.  
>>>  
>>> That's he problem with these kinds of dscusions in forums. You have a  
> ITB,  
>>> one room dude, running abelton live( nothing wrong with that), telling  
> dude  
>>> who works at a facility that abelton live would be good for them ..  
>>>  
>> Are you referring to anyone in particular, or is that a generalization?  
> If  
>> the latter, it doesn't really apply here. Recommendations here are always  
>> valid as you don't always know what is best for the original poster.

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

---

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?  
Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 05:48:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

>  
>Okay..But, but my point was to answer the statement about  
>crappy music being made in so called pro facilities. crappy  
>clients coming in with crappy music can happen at level of  
>studio.  
>Big buck facility,does not ensure top quality product.

Everybody here knows this much: you can make great music with crap gear & crap music with great gear. Ideally, if you can make great music with great gear, then every now & then you get the right blend of luck & skill on both sides of the glass, and everything gels just right. As far as crappy clients go, you CAN do some degree of turd-polishing. Look, this is life, sometimes shit just is a waste of time - bad music, bad players, bad gear, bad engineers... this is probably the majority of what gets recorded! lol

We're talking about practical applications & I think that's what Dedic is trying to say, as well. PTHD is NOT the solution for everybody. I've said here before that if I had a fully-commercial facility, I'd absolutely have an HD rig, but really for the following reasons:

- 1.) Ease of Compatibilty with other facilities.
- 2.) Plain & simple marketing - people want PT? OK, fine, I've got PT! No need to convince someone otherwise until they get in there & you can show 'em the difference if you want.

That's it! No other reason! I do think the HD convertors sound very good (while the 888's sounded like ass), but there are other good-sounding convertors, as well. IOW, there is no sonic-specific reason to go with HD, in my view. None.

BTW, I find it ironic that you espouse PT so much as being the "pro" solution, and talk down to those who do not

agree with you, when you yourself DO NOT OWN IT!!! You have an LE system, do you not? Big fucking difference between the HD-196 convertors & whateverthefuck you're using in your LE rig!

You DO tend to make some empirical statements without really thinking about it, ya know.

Neil

---

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 05:49:41 GMT

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

---

Dedric, we are not alking about Engineering skills, at least I won;t because that debate and deiscusion is truly appls and oranges.

I will say, that even todays top engineers and producers have what ethy term Pro-project studios. Define:

A studio that:

- Hard wired with the gear that producer /engineer uses
- Not flexible to cater to different types of recording session.

The above example is the new norm. Can bad work come out of these Pro \_project studios.. Yes. It happens all the time.

But, around hear, like or not, guys are buying Pro Tools LE before they purchase Cuabase SX/4. As limited as LE is, if they cannot afford HD at the time, they go with LE.

Now I think that's stupid of course, but that's market hear in Michigan. Nuendo/Cuabse base studios, semi, private, Pro-project are Digi first.

See, it's all about perception. It almost like the young guys and Nikes Gym Shoes or Air Jordans. If you are not wearing them , your not in the game. You're lame. Pro Tools anything(M-Powered, LE,etc) is like Air Jordan Shoes. You're cool and in the Game.

I'm a bit of a rebel. But,since I put out good results using whatever, I don't catch the heat. But, most record projects I get asked to work on ususally end up on Pro Tools.

I do disagree with you on Pro Tools not being a compositional tool. These days more and more guys are re-discovering all of that cool midi stuff digi has been throwing in. Since the purchase of Wizoo, they now have the team inm place to deliver all kinds of wonderful virtual instruments..

I will say this.. Digi surpased Cubase /SX in Rewrire implementation. Slick



Slick slick.. Let's say I'm in Protools 7.3 and I want to Rewire in say...Acid Pro ..Okay call up acid pro.. get a loop or 2...Instant synce in PT..Okay nothing new there..BUT...We close the Pro Tools project and close(SAVE) the acid project..

Next time we open up that project in Pro Tools, it launches Acid pro with the correct project and loops..! Lock and ready to go , all by just opening up the project in Pro Tools.

they have some other nice goodie in their new midi implementation. hey will be a major player in this area soon.. Have you noticed those slick Virtual Instruments coming via Digi/Wizoo-aka-Air. With more coming in 08. Soon Slo-Tools will be a one stop shop..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Lamont....

>

>On 9/9/07 8:16 PM, in article 46e4a91a\$1@linux, "LaMont"

><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>>

>> Cont..

>> You stated:Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy

>> productions"

>>

>> Of course anybody with some money can go into world-class facility say Ocean

>> Way <http://www.oceanwaystudios.com/> . Does not guarantee a great recording.

>> But, that does not diminish the fact that the Facility is world class.

>

>Of course it doesn't, but we weren't talking about how large a facility has

>to be to be considered world class, or even the concept of a world class

>facility - but rather the fact that gear doesn't make you talented and

>knowledgeable. There is a wide range of studios around, as well as a wide

>range of talent going in and coming out. But the question still remains,

is

>your definition of a high end professional one with a lot of high end

>expensive gear, or a high level of skill? (Note that you changed the

>discussion to "world class recording facility", not what makes the engineer

>skilled and knowledgeable, which was the detour branch off of the original

>native vs. hybrid-hardware discussion).

>  
>My studio does professional work for high end clients. Just because it  
>isn't large enough to mix for Dreamworks or Paramount, doesn't make me less  
>skilled in general. You have to be careful how you associate your skill  
with  
>the facility you work in.  
>  
>>  
>> So, your point is not valid.  
>  
>My point is valid - great gear doesn't make great talent. Either I'm way  
>pickier than you are, or you don't hear some records the way I do. I can  
>name multi-platinum records that quite frankly, sound terrible by any  
>reasonable sonic standard. I think we've had this discussion before and  
I'm  
>pretty sure we agreed, so don't defect just to take an opposing viewpoint  
>here. :-)  
>  
>> As well as always, regurgitating tech list  
>> that listed on a products web site or reciting what someone is said that's  
>> linked to the company as Gospel. Those company types lie all the time  
and  
>> mis-state facts and details about their products. So, you giving your so-called  
>> "facts" based on a product media sheet, is weak ..  
>  
>Hmmm... that sounds familiar to what I just said:  
>  
>>> Yes, and to research your comments before reciting marketing or user  
hype.  
>>> Not all users with a recording studio gig are well versed in the technical  
>>> realities of the gear and the market we are in. Let's also include the  
>> day  
>>> gig as well to know who does this daily and who does it in off hours.  
>  
>So you are taking my comments and turning them around and saying \*I'm\* the  
>one regurgitating tech lists?? Interesting, considering this conversation  
>was in fact about cost comparisons and viability of native vs. hybrid for  
>different situations. So, whatever argument you think will make you look  
>better is the one you take, even if it means changing the topic of the  
>discussion? Do you think that's really a good way to make a credible point?  
>I hope not, as it isn't.  
>  
>I only come here for the enjoyment of discussion with other musicians,  
>engineers, and producers, regardless of their level of success and skill  
-  
>bedroom musician or seasoned pro - doesn't matter to me - everyone is the  
>same. I don't have anything to prove to anyone. Couldn't care less. I  
>love the range of talent and expertise here, enjoy contributing, and enjoy

>learning too. I'm no better than anyone else, and you aren't either. Maybe  
>you could look past the nice gear around you a little more and stop assuming  
>or hoping it makes you better or more knowledgeable than anyone else. We  
>don't care about the gear around you - it's your input, thoughts and  
>participation here as a person that are most important, right or wrong,  
>expert or novice. Everyone has different experiences, and not all of us  
>relate our bios or past history to back up what we discuss here, no matter  
>how convincing that might be.

>

>You don't know people such as me as well as you think you do, and you don't  
>have to prove anything to me or anyone. I'm happy for you that you have

a

>superb facility to work in - you obviously love what you do as much as I  
>love what I do. I don't expect you to know everything about every piece  
of

>gear, or be technically versed in all that is digital or analog audio, but  
>likewise, don't expect me to know less just because my studio has a smaller  
>square footage, and I run Nuendo instead of ProTools (yes, a Fairlight  
>system is in the business plan...along with a bigger place to put it in).

>

>Dedric

>

>>

>> How about actually taking the product for spin for awhile, then report  
back.

>>

>>

>>

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

>>> On 9/9/07 5:20 PM, in article 46e47fcf\$1@linux, "LaMont"

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

>>>

>>>>

>>>> Dedric what are you talking about ??

>>>>

>>>> Asio may be the best for Native PC da users, but certainly not for mac  
>> users.

>>>>

>>> You never separated ASIO/PC from ASIO/Mac - your comments were about  
latency

>>> in general. It is important to be technically accurate when making claims  
>>> about one platform or gear being better than others.

>>>>

>>>> All in all , with ASIO getting long winded, Asio has gotten old, and  
they

>>>> Steinberg has not figured out how to fix the routing(Mixer) issues  
that

>>>> will put it on par with Pro Tool's software controlled hardware.

>>>>  
>>> Where did you hear that ASIO was getting long winded? What do you base  
>> this  
>>> opinion on? I've already explained the difference between native and  
>>> hybrid-hardware. There is a full 3rd party operating system between  
native  
>>> and the hardware. With hybrid, there is only a bit of assembler code  
and  
>>> logic circuitry. Two different animals. Latency comparisons come about  
>> as  
>>> a matter of implementation and function, not direct technical similarities.  
>>>  
>>>> Your argument about HD plugins is valid, but Digi is throwing the kitchen  
>>>> sink these days with new purchases, not just trade-ins. Suffice it to  
>> say,  
>>>> when you purchase a new HD rig, you won't need to make many Plugin Purchases  
>>>> anytime soon.  
>>>  
>>> No doubt they see the native writing on the wall or they wouldn't have  
>>> bought M-Audio to actually support - they would have bought Steinberg  
and  
>>> promptly burned the development files and blown out any remaining stock.  
>>>>  
>>>> I totally disagree with you about Native being a Cheaper upgrade path.  
>> Since  
>>>> 1999, most semi and high end users have upgraded their systems at least  
>> 4  
>>>> -5 times.. With the intent of gaining more power. Even today, We sterinberg  
>>>> users are still on the upgrade war path with the whole core2 dual, 8  
>>>> core.yada  
>>>> yada..How much do you think it cost ?? what's the real TCO??  
>>>  
>>> You might be on the upgrade war path, but there is no war here - only  
>>> gaining more and more power for my investment with minimal annual cost.  
>>> Since 1999 how many PT users upgraded from Mix to HD? The cost there  
is  
>>> thousands, not hundreds - for many it was well over \$10k, \$20k or \$50k.  
>>>>  
>>>> If I'm honest, I'll tell I have spent over 6K over the last 5 years,  
not  
>>>> counting software..And thats being kind.  
>>>  
>>> But you don't get Digi products free do you? They also cost. You have  
>> to  
>>> buy conversion apps, encoders separately, plugins at double the native  
cost.  
>>> That adds up at a much faster rate. With a PT rig, you still have to  
buy

>> a  
>>> Mac or PC, Cubase/Nuendo/Logic, etc to run a decent sequencer and VSTi's,  
>>> where my system is completely integrated and cross-compatible. I could  
>> add  
>>> a Mac, or 3 or 4 and still be cross-compatible, completely linked and  
>>> synced, and upgrade for a few hundred whenever the mood strikes.  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> With every mention of a new Processor, comes the dream of Zero latency  
>> for  
>>>> the Native. Now, we know our pre-64 bit cpu investments over that last  
>> couple  
>>>> of years has been a sham..  
>>>> Sure we can run a few more plugins, but that's about it..  
>>>  
>>> You are superimposing your own somewhat extreme reaction and frustration  
>> on  
>>> every other native user, and/or reading a few posts and assuming a handful  
>>> of computer-compulsive users represent the DAW world. That's about as  
far  
>>> from the truth as you could be, Lamont.  
>>>>  
>>>> To me and my circle of producers and engineers, all have or will be  
going  
>>>> Pro Tool HD.. Depending on the needs, HD 2 acell seems to be the popular  
>>>> choice. Maybe your circle of music friend are going Native, not mine..and  
>>>> these guys are heavy hitters in the game.  
>>>  
>>> You are assuming my circle is somehow lowly, inferior light weights.  
Sorry,  
>>> but you are generalizing, making erroneous assumptions and apparently  
think  
>>> quite highly of your own view of success. Good for you. There is a  
good  
>>> bit of complete ignorant crap coming from "heavy hitters" these days,  
so  
>> be  
>>> careful how you support your views.  
>>>  
>>>> Like the Nuendo forum discussion pointed out: It seems(like always) that  
>> we  
>>>> have different needs. The ITB guys need near or closest to zero latency  
>> as  
>>>> possible. Whereas the guys who just edit and mix, run their daw at  
>> 1024  
>>>> and care about zero latency.  
>>>  
>>> For one, it is short-sighted to simply segregate native DAW users from

>>> Protools users as if there is a superior need within the Protools market.  
>>> The needs are based on studio function and preference, not superiority.  
>>> Many recording studios with plenty of high end gear put out crappy  
>>> productions, whereas a composer or producer with less gear can easily  
be  
>>> working on a much higher quality level, with a much higher level of  
>>> expertise (for example Steve Tushar producing sound design for Disney  
films,  
>>> etc, all from his basement with Nuendo and an MC; or Hans Zimmer making  
>> \$50  
>>> million a year scoring films, with a large staff, and racks of computer  
>>> systems - the PT rig for tracking, but not production). I know the points  
>>> at which one chooses one solution over another.  
>>>>  
>>>> I think in the future, it would best(for all) to say what application  
>> you  
>>>> work in before making statements or suggestions to anyone. Because everyone  
>>>> has differnt studio, workflow needs.  
>>>  
>>> Yes, and to research your comments before reciting marketing or user  
hype.  
>>> Not all users with a recording studio gig are well versed in the technical  
>>> realities of the gear and the market we are in. Let's also include the  
>> day  
>>> gig as well to know who does this daily and who does it in off hours.  
>>>>  
>>>> Detric, you mainly work in Post, where as I work in a more commercial  
>> studio.  
>>>> Our needs and opinions will be vastly different.  
>>>  
>>> Lamont, let's be clear, my studio is commercial - I work daily with high  
>>> paying clients. I just don't hire it out for use by others for recording  
>>> whatever band wants to come by. My clientele is easily as demanding  
and  
>>> high end, and perhaps moreso than larger commercial studios recording  
bands  
>>> and artists. Different horses for different courses. The large format  
>>> studio is a dying breed, so I'm not sure I would tout that as the elite  
>> of  
>>> the creative arts industry at the moment.  
>>>>  
>>>> That's he problem with these kinds of dscusions in forums. You have  
a  
>> ITB,  
>>>> one room dude, running abelton live( nothing wrong with that), telling  
>> dude  
>>>> who works at a facility that abelton live would be good for them ..  
>>>>

>>> Are you referring to anyone in particular, or is that a generalization?  
>> If  
>>> the latter, it doesn't really apply here. Recommendations here are always  
>>> valid as you don't always know what is best for the original poster.  
>>>  
>>> Dedic  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 06:03:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Neil,I use PT M-Powered at home. HD 3 at the studio(s) where I work in. I do own HD software. Just have not settled on the converters.

HD is a more flexible routing solution for studios that need to integrate hardware, easily with minimal latency. I'm sorry, but HD is one Hell of a Digital Mixer.Even BrianT will say so.

Paris's patch bay was on it's way..Nuendo/SX okay.. To be honest, I think that teh guys who invented VST never imagined that engineers,, not msuicians, but engineers would get so invloved with Wanting to integrated their Hardware into Cubase.

This ahs thrown them for a complet loop(Steinberg).VST by it's very definition, Virtual STudio Technology,was meant to be jsut that..Virtual. Software only.. Not, adding Hardware devices.

It will remains to be scene if they pull it off without dedicated Hardware.

Personally Ilove DSP based systems. If Paris were to make a comaback , even under another name company, I'd jump in a heart beat..

Now that Lynx's have the digi mod , that migh be the way I'll go.

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>

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

>>

>>Okay..But, but my point was to answer the statement about  
>>crappy music being made in so called pro facilities. crappy  
>>clients coming in with crappy music can happen at level of



>>studio.  
>>Big buck facility, does not ensure top quality product.  
>  
>Everybody here knows this much: you can make great music with  
>crap gear & crap music with great gear. Ideally, if you can  
>make great music with great gear, then every now & then you get  
>the right blend of luck & skill on both sides of the glass, and  
>everything gels just right. As far as crappy clients go, you  
>CAN do some degree of turd-polishing. Look, this is life,  
>sometimes shit just is a waste of time - bad music, bad  
>players, bad gear, bad engineers... this is probably the  
>majority of what gets recorded! lol  
>  
>We're talking about practical applications & I think that's  
>what Dedic is trying to say, as well. PTHD is NOT the solution  
>for everybody. I've said here before that if I had a fully-  
>commercial facility, I'd absolutely have an HD rig, but really  
>for the following reasons:  
>1.) Ease of Compatibility with other facilities.  
>2.) Plain & simple marketing - people want PT? OK, fine, I've  
>got PT! No need to convince someone otherwise until they get in  
>there & you can show 'em the difference if you want.  
>  
>That's it! No other reason! I do think the HD convertors sound  
>very good (while the 888's sounded like ass), but there are  
>other good-sounding convertors, as well. IOW, there is no sonic-  
>specific reason to go with HD, in my view. None.  
>  
>BTW, I find it ironic that you espouse PT so much as  
>being the "pro" solution, and talk down to those who do not  
>agree with you, when you yourself DO NOT OWN IT!!! You have an  
>LE system, do you not? Big fucking difference between the HD-  
>196 convertors & whateverthefuck you're using in your LE rig!  
>  
>You DO tend to make some empirical statements without really  
>thinking about it, ya know.  
>  
>Neil

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?  
Posted by [Dedic Terry](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 15:32:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lamont - instead of just replying to your latest post, I've copied sections from a couple of posts to address at once, then leave the topic alone for now:

On 9/9/07 6:59 PM, in article 46e4970f\$1@linux, "LaMont"

<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

> I guess we are back to our usual disagreement about what's considered Pro.  
> That's fine, you can call pro anything you like..I'll refrain from such  
> terms..But,  
> I will use terms as Commercial and Project..even pro project studios. To me,  
> just because a person has his PC/Mac in an office building does not make him  
> commercial. There are certain industry tools you must have to be considered  
> commercial. Even you have high-end clients.

Usual disagreement? Okay.... My point has simply been that working in a large studio doesn't make you more knowledgeable than someone who owns their own music/audio business. We were talking about native vs. hardware hybrid, not commercial vs. project studio. Commercial is a broad description. Project has a part time/semi-pro connotation, but that's beside the point... just fyi.

Also, be careful - your comments at times come across as condescending. It puts you in a position of someday having to really back it up with a serious level of credibility. Maybe not what you intended.

> Your needs and my needs are vastly different> I really need at least 32  
> channels  
> of I/O for tracking..

Great - the more the merrier. :-)) 32+ is fine for tracking bands, etc.

.... wouldn't be enough for my work though, oddly enough. I run 48 now and will be doubling that in the very near future. :-)) No, it isn't a pissing match at all - just having a little fun with the notion that I/O count was a distinction between our needs. I'm also pointing out that technical requirements and knowledge aren't directly related to the size of a console, inputs, etc. I know the point you were making - you track bands, I don't - the differences in needs are obvious, but the technical differences and requirements aren't as diverse as you might think. I need studios like yours to track in from time to time, so I'm happy to support that market when the need arises. Large studios aren't somehow superior to other areas of the audio industry. They are however large investments that are difficult to keep profitable. There are more lucrative areas of the music industry.

> I do disagree with you on Pro Tools not being a compositional tool. These  
> days more and more guys are re-discovering all of that cool midi stuff digi  
> has been throwing in. Since the purchase of Wizoo, they now have the team  
> in place to deliver all kinds of wonderful virtual instruments..

I know of no serious, established composers using ProTools itself for composition. ProTools is used by many for tracking and stems transfers to post/mixing, but not composition. For production work in other markets where the composing element is less demanding, I'm sure ProTools midi may be fine - Digi does seem to be going for the one-stop shop, as is everyone. Just be careful to qualify your comments - too often you make blanket statements that sound like you consider your perception to be the last word on the subject for everyone. It is just your perception or opinion though, not reality in other markets or areas, much less the absolute truth for the industry.

Lastly...

>Truth is , there are more Nuendo "crack" users than legit users. I don;t  
>knwo how Steingberg is making any money. Cubase yes, but Nuendo..No..

Hmm...interesting that you say there are more crack users of Nuendo on the market than paid copies - not of the users I know, and I don't think you know that to be the truth. It doesn't sound like a very high integrity user base you use as a measuring stick for Nuendo, so that also changes how one should view your perception of the product itself.

Just out of curiosity, do you work at the church studio full time now?  
Didn't you work IT at one time?

Regards,  
Dedric

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?  
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 23:58:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Just out of curiosity, do you work at the church studio full time now? Didn't you work IT at one time?"

The answer is yes to both. I'm a fulltime Producer/Engineer at my Church. I also, head the IT department.

I don't make blanket statements, just my opinions.

You tend to have a "Napoleon Complex" when it comes to discussing Nuendo and Native vs Dsp. As well, you're overly sensitive to anyone who has a negative thing to say about it.

You say that James M is overly sensative abut any Mac criticism, but so are you.

Look, we come in here to answer question, ask questions and give gear opinions. I really don't understand how it is that you can take my "opinions" and as blanket statements?

I'm a consumer in this game like yourself. I use the products, and I have a right to say what I think about a product that I spent my or the company/client I work for.  
That's all.

Lastly, I very much respect your vast knowledge on DAWs. I too learn from your post and your way of getting down to the nitty-gritty of a said technical problem..

P.s. Let me know when you get your Euphonix MC or maybe the DM2000. :) Take care..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Lamont - instead of just replying to your latest post, I've copied sections  
>from a couple of posts to address at once, then leave the topic alone for  
>now:

>  
>On 9/9/07 6:59 PM, in article 46e4970f\$1@linux, "LaMont"

>  
><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>  
>> I guess we are back to our usual disagreement about what's considered  
Pro.

>> That's fine, you can call pro anything you like..I'll refrain from such  
>> terms..But,

>> I will use terms as Commercial and Project..even pro project studios. To  
me,

>> just because a person has his PC/Mac in an office building does not make  
him

>> commercial. There are certain industry tools you must have to be considered  
>> commercial. Even you have high-end clients.

>  
>Usual disagreement? Okay.... My point has simply been that working in  
a

>large studio doesn't make you more knowledgeable than someone who owns their  
>own music/audio business. We were talking about native vs. hardware hybrid,

>not commercial vs. project studio. Commercial is a broad description.

>Project has a part time/semi-pro connotation, but that's beside the point...  
>just fyi.

>  
>Also, be careful - your comments at times come across as condescending.  
It

>puts you in a position of someday having to really back it up with a serious  
>level of credibility. Maybe not what you intended.  
>  
>> Your needs and my needs are vastly different> I really need at least 32  
>> channels  
>> of I/O for tracking..  
>  
>Great - the more the merrier. :-)) 32+ is fine for tracking bands, etc.  
>  
>... wouldn't be enough for my work though, oddly enough. I run 48 now and  
>will be doubling that in the very near future. :-)) No, it isn't a pissing  
>match at all - just having a little fun with the notion that I/O count was  
a  
>distinction between our needs. I'm also pointing out that technical  
>requirements and knowledge aren't directly related to the size of a console,  
>inputs, etc. I know the point you were making - you track bands, I don't  
-  
>the differences in needs are obvious, but the technical differences and  
>requirements aren't as diverse as you might think. I need studios like  
>yours to track in from time to time, so I'm happy to support that market  
>when the need arises. Large studios aren't somehow superior to other areas  
>of the audio industry. They are however large investments that are  
>difficult to keep profitable. There are more lucrative areas of the music  
>industry.  
>  
>> I do disagree with you on Pro Tools not being a compositional tool. These  
>> days more and more guys are re-discovering all of that cool midi stuff  
digi  
>> has been throwing in. Since the purchase of Wizoo, they now have the team  
>> in place to deliver all kinds of wonderful virtual instruments..  
>  
>I know of no serious, established composers using ProTools itself for  
>composition. ProTools is used by many for tracking and stems transfers  
to  
>post/mixing, but not composition. For production work in other markets  
>where the composing element is less demanding, I'm sure ProTools midi may  
be  
>fine - Digi does seem to be going for the one-stop shop, as is everyone.  
>Just be careful to qualify your comments - too often you make blanket  
>statements that sound like you consider your perception to be the last word  
>on the subject for everyone. It is just your perception or opinion though,  
>not reality in other markets or areas, much less the absolute truth for  
the  
>industry.  
>  
>Lastly...  
>  
>>Truth is , there are more Nuendo "crack" users than legit users. I don;t

>>knwo how Steingberg is making any money. Cubase yes, but Nuendo..No..  
>  
>Hmm...interesting that you say there are more crack users of Nuendo on the  
>market than paid copies - not of the users I know, and I don't think you  
>know that to be the truth. It doesn't sound like a very high integrity  
user  
>base you use as a measuring stick for Nuendo, so that also changes how one  
>should view your perception of the product itself.  
>  
>Just out of curiosity, do you work at the church studio full time now?  
>Didn't you work IT at one time?  
>  
>Regards,  
>Dedric  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Would someone please explain direct monitoring?  
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 01:12:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:46e5da33\$1@linux...  
>  
> I don't make blanket statements, just my opinions.  
>  
> You tend to have a "Napoleon Complex" when it comes to discussing Nuendo  
> and Native vs Dsp. As well, you're overly sensitive to anyone who has a  
> negative  
> thing to say about it.

Lol - no, you just never really understood what I was saying, or at least  
trying to without being too blunt, but it doesn't matter - just not worth  
it, and never really was. ;-)

I know the pros and cons of both very well (been there, used and considered  
PT longterm a few times, and always keep it as an option), and when I  
recommend a system to a client or other user, I give them the pros and cons  
of both and tell them to try both and decide for themselves what works best.

> P.s. Let me know when you get your Euphonix MC or maybe the DM2000. :)  
> Take  
> care..

The DM is very nice, and a bit more cost effective than the MC, but the  
integration on the MC with  
Nuendo and other apps (including switching between apps) is a beautiful  
thing. Euphonix did a nice job on this unit.  
Add in Nuendo 4's Euphonix style automation (some say it's even better), and

it should be a rocking pair.

Best of luck,  
Dedric

>  
>  
>  
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>Lamont - instead of just replying to your latest post, I've copied  
>>sections  
>>from a couple of posts to address at once, then leave the topic alone for  
>>now:  
>>  
>>On 9/9/07 6:59 PM, in article 46e4970f\$1@linux, "LaMont"  
>>  
>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> I guess we are back to our usual disagreement about what's considered  
> Pro.  
>>> That's fine, you can call pro anything you like..I'll refrain from such  
>>> terms..But,  
>>> I will use terms as Commercial and Project..even pro project studios. To  
> me,  
>>> just because a person has his PC/Mac in an office building does not make  
> him  
>>> commercial. There are certain industry tools you must have to be  
>>> considered  
>>> commercial. Even you have high-end clients.  
>>  
>>Usual disagreement? Okay.... My point has simply been that working in  
> a  
>>large studio doesn't make you more knowledgeable than someone who owns  
>>their  
>>own music/audio business. We were talking about native vs. hardware  
>>hybrid,  
>>not commercial vs. project studio. Commercial is a broad description.  
>>Project has a part time/semi-pro connotation, but that's beside the  
>>point...  
>>just fyi.  
>>  
>>Also, be careful - your comments at times come across as condescending.  
> It  
>>puts you in a position of someday having to really back it up with a  
>>serious  
>>level of credibility. Maybe not what you intended.  
>>  
>>> Your needs and my needs are vastly different> I really need at least 32



>>> channels  
>>> of I/O for tracking..  
>>  
>>Great - the more the merrier. :-)) 32+ is fine for tracking bands, etc.  
>>  
>>... wouldn't be enough for my work though, oddly enough. I run 48 now and  
>>will be doubling that in the very near future. :-)) No, it isn't a  
>>pissing  
>>match at all - just having a little fun with the notion that I/O count was  
> a  
>>distinction between our needs. I'm also pointing out that technical  
>>requirements and knowledge aren't directly related to the size of a  
>>console,  
>>inputs, etc. I know the point you were making - you track bands, I don't  
> -  
>>the differences in needs are obvious, but the technical differences and  
>>requirements aren't as diverse as you might think. I need studios like  
>>yours to track in from time to time, so I'm happy to support that market  
>>when the need arises. Large studios aren't somehow superior to other  
>>areas  
>>of the audio industry. They are however large investments that are  
>>difficult to keep profitable. There are more lucrative areas of the music  
>>industry.  
>>  
>>> I do disagree with you on Pro Tools not being a compositional tool.  
>>> These  
>>> days more and more guys are re-discovering all of that cool midi stuff  
> digi  
>>> has been throwing in. Since the purchase of Wizoo, they now have the  
>>> team  
>>> in place to deliver all kinds of wonderful virtual instruments..  
>>  
>>I know of no serious, established composers using ProTools itself for  
>>composition. ProTools is used by many for tracking and stems transfers  
> to  
>>post/mixing, but not composition. For production work in other markets  
>>where the composing element is less demanding, I'm sure ProTools midi may  
> be  
>>fine - Digi does seem to be going for the one-stop shop, as is everyone.  
>>Just be careful to qualify your comments - too often you make blanket  
>>statements that sound like you consider your perception to be the last  
>>word  
>>on the subject for everyone. It is just your perception or opinion  
>>though,  
>>not reality in other markets or areas, much less the absolute truth for  
> the  
>>industry.  
>>

>>Lastly...

>>

>>>Truth is , there are more Nuendo "crack" users than legit users. I don;t  
>>>knwo how Steingberg is making any money. Cubase yes, but Nuendo..No..

>>

>>Hmm...interesting that you say there are more crack users of Nuendo on the  
>>market than paid copies - not of the users I know, and I don't think you  
>>know that to be the truth. It doesn't sound like a very high integrity

> user

>>base you use as a measuring stick for Nuendo, so that also changes how one  
>>should view your perception of the product itself.

>>

>>Just out of curiosity, do you work at the church studio full time now?

>>Didn't you work IT at one time?

>>

>>Regards,

>>Dedric

>>

>

---