
Subject: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discussion) irritating.

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 15:16:46 GMT

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

Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound On Sound -What The Developers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it time for (Them DAW manufacturers) to go 64 bit.

Well, the article featured most of the heavy hitters in the industry (RME, M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steinberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .

As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not needed. But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.

Secondly, They're not impressed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new built-in audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated they would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt the Vista standard..

OK. Rant:

When Apple completely re-coded their OS with a NEW Audio engine standard AUDIO-Units. At that time, ASIO, WDM & MME were the Native standards, but Apple went their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Audio-Unit drivers.

Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU, like Apple's Audio Unit design, their balking.

Next point:

To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!

The problem is that the DAWs are all using 32 bit coding. 32 bit apps on a 64 bit OS and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU, 64 bit plugins we see astounding gains in performance.

I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not the OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies like RME & Steinberg will get left behind if they don't start moving in that 64 bit direction).

To many of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-written version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as well..Choo choooc choo...

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 15:34:36 GMT

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

Two things. First, when Apple built (or stole and modified) OS X they made a quantum leap in the quality of their OS. 9.x was years behind, say, NT 4.0. Apple also basically forced everyone to go with the OS X, and there was a lot of bitching in the hardware and software communities about updating apps and drivers.

Second, where is the evidence that a 64 bit (integer) OS vastly improves audio performance? I haven't seen it, and since FP processing has been capable of using 64 (or 128) bit words for years now I'd be interested to see where the quantum leap in performance comes from.

TCB

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

>
>Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound On Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it time for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>
>Well, the article featured most of the heavy hitters in the industry (RME, M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>
>As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not needed.
>But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new built-in audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt the Vista standard..
>
>OK. Rant:
>When Apple completely re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard AUDIO-Units.
>At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>
>Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like Apple's Audio Unit design, their balking.
>
>Next point:
>To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>

>The problem is that the DAWs are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps on
>a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True
>64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>we we see astouding gains in performance.
>
>I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already
>know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not the
>OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
>like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving in
>that 64 bit direction).
>
>To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
>processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as
well..Chooo
>chooooc choo...
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discussion) irritating.
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 15:47:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides to this:

1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik, just a marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.

2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt to separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from tests I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for the OS, memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can gain some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).

3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being their main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core audio is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone else's protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's. For example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has been slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even Logic doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party audio applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct

vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.

Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to survive - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista, VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's pitch to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one of the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that had no direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for one).

I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>
> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound On
> Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it time
> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>
> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry (RME,
> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>
> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not
> needed.
> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new built-in
> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt
> the Vista standard..
>
> OK. Rant:
> When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
> AUDIO-Units.
> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went
> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>
> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies

> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
> Apple's
> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>
> Next point:
> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>
> The problem is that the DAWs are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps on
> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True
> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>
> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already
> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not the
> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving in
> that 64 bit direction).
>
> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as
> well..Chooo
> chooooc choo...
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [excelav](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 16:40:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides to
>this:
>
>1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik, just
>a
>marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>
>2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt to
>separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from tests
>I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for the
>OS,
>memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can gain
>some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>
>3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio

>developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being their
>main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core audio
>is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone else's
>protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can
>market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.

For

>example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has
been

>slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even Logic
>doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party audio
>applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.

>

>Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to survive
>- most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
>moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's pitch
>to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one of
>the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their
>product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that had
no

>direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned
>from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for one).

>

>I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.

>

>Regards,
>Dedric

Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When MS goes
proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple does
it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software system.

They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices on
a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new plugin
development companies showed up because the new AU format created new opportunities
for start ups. It's all good.

By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>

>

>On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1 @linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>wrote:
>
>>
>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
On
>> Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it
time
>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>
>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
(RME,
>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>
>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not
>> needed.
>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
built-in
>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt
>> the Vista standard..
>>
>> OK. Rant:
>> When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>> AUDIO-Units.
>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went
>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>
>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>> Apple's
>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>
>> Next point:
>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>
>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
on
>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True
>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>
>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already
>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not
the
>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies

>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
in
>> that 64 bit direction).
>>
>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as
>> well..Chooo
>> chooooc choo...
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [excelav](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 16:59:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LaMont, I think your getting a bit of a story. The developers are all working on it, they have to. The only way they can keep selling you software is whiz bang wow factor, and trust me, they will claim 64bit is the shit. They just want you to think their not interested, so you keep buying their current offerings. Just wait, they will have huge ad campaigns when they are ready to release native 64bit software. They will point out, that with the new high capacity hard drives, 64bit files are not a problem anymore either. They'll be calling it the new pro standard. It's all coming, they got to sell you the next big thing. When the time is right, they will make you feel that if you don't jump on the 64bit band wagon you will totally be left behind.

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

>
>Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound On
>Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it time
>for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>
>Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry (RME,
>M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>
>As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not
needed.
>But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new built-in
>audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt
>the Vista standard..
>
>OK. Rant:

>When Apple completely re-coded their OS with a NEW Audio engine standard AUDIO-Units.
>At that time, ASIO, WDM & MME were the Native standards, but Apple went
>their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
>apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Audio-Unit drivers.
>
>Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU, like
Apple's
>Audio Unit design, their balking.
>
>Next point:
>To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
>the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>
>The problem is that the DAWs are all using 32 bit coding. 32 bit apps on
>a 64 bit OS and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True
>64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU, 64 bit plugins
>we see astounding gains in performance.
>
>I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already
>know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not the
>OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
>like RME & Steinberg will get left behind if they don't start moving in
>that 64 bit direction).
>
>To many of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
>processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-written
>version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as
well..Choo
>choooc choo...
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discussion) irritating.
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 17:04:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

James I agree with you with. That's why it's so damn irritating to hear some
these developers take on 64 bit.

Dedric, I agree with some of your points as well, however I don't think that we
should let the developers dictate the pro audio market. They (should work)
hard with the OS vendors.

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

>
>LaMont, I think your getting a bit of a story. The developers are all

working

>on it, they have to. The only way they can keep selling you software is
>whiz bang wow factor, and trust me, they will claim 64bit is the shit.

They

>just want you to think their not interested, so you keep buying their current
>offerings. Just wait, they will have huge ad campaigns when they are ready
>to release native 64bit software. They will point out, that with the new
>high capacity hard drives, 64bit files are not a problem anymore either.
> They'll be calling it the new pro standard. It's all coming, they got
to

>sell you the next big thing. When the time is right, they will make you
>feel that if you don't jump on the 64bit band wagon you will totally be
left

>behind.

>

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

>>

>>Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
>On

>>Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it
time

>>for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.

>>

>>Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry (RME,
>>M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .

>>

>>As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not
>needed.

>>But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.

>> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
built-in

>>audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated they would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt
>>the Vista standard..

>>

>>OK. Rant:

>>When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
AUDIO-Units.

>>At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went
>>their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
>>apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.

>>

>>Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>>are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>Apple's

>>Audio Unit design, their balking.

>>

>>Next point:

>>To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break

>>the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>
>>The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
on
>>a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True
>>64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>
>>I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already
>>know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not
the
>>OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
>>like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving in
>>that 64 bit direction).
>>
>>To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
>>processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>>version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as
>well..Chooo
>>choooooo choo...
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 17:23:41 GMT

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

Dedric Terry wrote:

(good insights deleted so I can nit pick the rest ;^)

> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being their
> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core audio
> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone else's
> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can
> market, control and use to differentiate your product.

I would say Core Audio has worked to the advantage of DAW users.
Everything works and works together. Latency is low. You can cascade
different IO boxes from different companies as a single large IO.

Can't find a reason to criticize it. And I wouldn't leave out the main
reason for Core Audio: Having low latency, high performance audio
capabilities integrated into the OS.

Your reasons are valid, they just overlook the main reason - and yours are icing on the cake.

ASIO is perfectly

- > fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's. For
- > example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
- > software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has been
- > slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even Logic
- > doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party audio
- > applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
- > vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.

In fact, Apple promotes other MAC audio and DAW products and works with their developers.

I think Apple bought Logic partly to prevent a large DAW from leaving the Mac; to capture the Logic market and bring it to the Mac (they dropped MSWindows support); and to establish the ecosystem for audio on OSX - demonstrate that it's a good place for audio apps. Logic was the first to support OSX.

Other audio products from other companies help support Apple's interest in selling more Macs. Which is why Apple encourages other developers.

- > Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to survive
- > - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
- > didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
- > moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
- > since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
- > doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
- > VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's pitch
- > to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one of
- > the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their
- > product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that had no
- > direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned
- > from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for one).

I would say they've learned from their VST experience as Apple did. Apple moved a way from a Steinberg controlled standard to their own integrated standard. Review the history there, more than a few developers were a bit impatient with Steinberg.

- > I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
- > developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
- > operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.

The opposite moral is also possible to glean from all of this. Let the OS handle it.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

> Regards,
> Dedic
>
> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
> wrote:
>
>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound On
>> Sound -What The Developers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it time
>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>
>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry (RME,
>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>
>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not
>> needed.
>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>> Secondly, They're not impressed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new built-in
>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt
>> the Vista standard..
>>
>> OK. Rant:
>> When Apple completely re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>> AUDIO-Units.
>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went
>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>
>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>> Apple's
>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>
>> Next point:
>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>
>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps on
>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True

>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>
>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already
>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not the
>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving in
>> that 64 bit direction).
>>
>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as
>> well..Chooo
>> chooooc choo...
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 18:35:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

HI Lamont,

LaMont wrote:

> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound On
> Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it time
> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>
> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry (RME,
> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>
> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not needed.
> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new built-in
> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt
> the Vista standard..
>

Microsoft does not have a standard for audio in Vista. WaveRT has not been fully released or documented in its SDK. The same as WDM never was even to this day. For Microsoft audio only a concern for Home theater and gaming applications. If it works for those markets then all is well. Any mention to do with music production or video production is at best a novelty for Microsoft. The Pro Audio and Pro Video market is barely able to crack the double digit percentage of sale for MS. MS make more money

in a day than the entire Computer based audio market does in a year.

For Apple it is more like 50 percent of their market. So logically Apple has a greater interest in creating a driver model more optimized for these type of applications. Apple developed Core Audio with the some of Steinberg's help. They did not steal it wholesale from Steinberg.

Core audio was in a very similar state in it's first versions. it took a bunch of updates that included updates that made hardware and software developers have to do a bunch a recoding. I many cases Apple did such a poor job documenting the changes they manufacturers had to find out the hard way. The current version of Core Audio is quite robust but still doesn't have all the common features of ASIO. But is also has done some things like driver aggregation(spelling?) that would have been great to see in ASIO.

> OK. Rant:

> When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard AUDIO-Units.
> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went
> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.

Audio Units is a plug in spec not a driver. It took most 3rd party plug in developers months or even years to come out with AU versions and even longer to put out "Intel Binary" versions of everything. Some still haven't...

>

> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like Apple's
> Audio Unit design, their balking.

There no factual information on that being the case other than Microsoft's marketing jargon.

I have not seen any WaveRTs drivers so far (they are all alpha and beta versions at this point) that have performed anywhere near as good than ASIO under XP. Core Audio preforms about as well as good WDM drivers did in Sonar which is very close to ASIO in latency but tends to have a higher CPU load at the lower latencies. Both WDM and Wave RT drivers are considerably more complicated to develop than both ASIO and Core Audio.

>

> Next point:

> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!

>
> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps on
> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True
> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
> we we see astouding gains in performance.

Where is there evidence of that? There are absolutely no 64 bit DAW applications on the market to test that theory.

>
> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already
> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not the
> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving in
> that 64 bit direction).

Yet RME has the drivers that operate better than any one else's under Vista 64 using WDM or ASIO. Matthias is note a fan boy for either Apple or MS and tells it as he sees it. It doesn't always sound a cheerful and exciting as Cakewalk's marketing lies.

>
> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as well..Chooo
> chooooc choo...

Sounds like you should get a MAC. :)

>
>

--

Chris Ludwig

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

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discussion) irritating.
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 18:43:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dedric Terry wrote:

> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides to

> this:

>

> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik, just a marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.

Yep

>

> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt to separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from tests I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for the OS, memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can gain some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).

Sonar is not a 64 bit app despite what Cakewalk claims.

Perhaps when all the of the 3rd party plug in developers rewrite all their software in a fully 64 bit code and Cakewalk can finally remove the "bit Bridge" then you might see some performance gains.

>

> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being their main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core audio is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone else's protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's. For example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has been slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even Logic doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party audio applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.

>

> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to survive - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista, VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's pitch to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one of the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that had no direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for one).

Totally dead on.

>
> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>
Sad but true.

--
Chris Ludwig

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

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 18:53:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K wrote:

> I would say they've learned from their VST experience as Apple did.
> Apple moved a way from a Steinberg controlled standard to their own
> integrated standard. Review the history there, more than a few
> developers were a bit impatient with Steinberg.

An the best part is if Steinberg didn't develop ASIO and VST none of
this discussion would be happening.

>
>
>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>
> The opposite moral is also possible to glean from all of this. Let the
> OS handle it.

I'd have to agree in Apples case sense the Pro Audio/Pro Video market is
a large chunk of their user base so they must cater to them. For MS that
market has no impact at all on their income so why spend much time on
it. Wave RT is a idea thrown in at the last minute into Vista just so
they can say hey look we can do it too.

>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKruz.com
>
>
>
>>

--
Chris Ludwig

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

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 18:56:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi James,

LOI so true.
Ah crap I just agreed with a Apple guy..... :(

James McCloskey wrote:

> LaMont, I think your getting a bit of a story. The developers are all working
> on it, they have to. The only way they can keep selling you software is
> whiz bang wow factor, and trust me, they will claim 64bit is the shit. They
> just want you to think their not interested, so you keep buying their current
> offerings. Just wait, they will have huge ad campaigns when they are ready
> to release native 64bit software. They will point out, that with the new
> high capacity hard drives, 64bit files are not a problem anymore either.
> They'll be calling it the new pro standard. It's all coming, they got to
> sell you the next big thing. When the time is right, they will make you
> feel that if you don't jump on the 64bit band wagon you will totally be left
> behind.
>

--
Chris Ludwig

ADK Pro Audio

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

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 20:02:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

James and Jamie,

Well I'll reply to you and Jamie together to conserve electrons... ;-)

I think you both missed my point, and assumed this was a slight against Apple. It wasn't.

The thread was actually about Vista and the article in which few developers showed any enthusiasm for it, and in several cases almost outright rejection. I don't blame them. OS developers really don't, and sadly, can't put the interests of professional audio users at the forefront. Their first customers are consumers.

Core audio is cool (great compared to other OS-embedded audio protocols, unless we bring BeOS back) and Apple seems to have done a respectable job by including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However, the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones, or operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have no choice.

Truly Apple has made 100x the effort vs. MS in supporting the pro audio/video market (well, 100 x 0 would be 0, but you get the point ;-). The point was that it wasn't developed for Steinberg's best interests, or Digidesign's, or MOTU's (where is MAS?), but Apple's. Logic was the first to support OSX because it was an Apple product, Jamie. Does Apple really release full SDKs to 3rd parties when they start developing their apps for that new design, or do they wait until they release their app, then forward the SDKs... ;-)

Just don't assume that because I include Apple in a general discussion that I'm bashing Macs. Let's also not poo poo Steinberg just because ASIO and VST weren't developed by Apple. They really did make native DAWs a reality (moreso than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs. MAS or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...). Steinberg is far from perfect, but that doesn't make Apple the sudden defender of the pro audio world by default. ;-)

If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is

Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)

Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation. But that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are as good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger fish.

James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey, who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for MS and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it looks cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think it sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices when I could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).

Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug - that was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly; not so cool of MS to make Vista the next stop in the roadmap to 64 bit and where we would have no more need for it).

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides to
>> this:
>>
>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik, just
> a
>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>>
>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt to
>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from tests
>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for the
> OS,
>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can gain
>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>
>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being their
>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core audio
>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone else's
>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can

>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.
> For
>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has
> been
>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even Logic
>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party audio
>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>
>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to survive
>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's pitch
>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one of
>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their
>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that had
> no
>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned
>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for one).
>>
>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>
> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When MS goes
> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple does
> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software system.
> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
> VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices on
> a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new plugin
> development companies showed up because the new AU format created new
> opportunities
> for start ups. It's all good.
>
> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>
>
>>
>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>

>>>
>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
> On
>>> Sound -What The Developers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it
> time
>>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>>
>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
> (RME,
>>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>>
>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not
>>> needed.
>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>>> Secondly, They're not impressed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
> built-in
>>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt
>>> the Vista standard..
>>>
>>> OK. Rant:
>>> When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>>> AUDIO-Units.
>>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went
>>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
>>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>>
>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>> Apple's
>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>
>>> Next point:
>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>
>>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
> on
>>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True
>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>>
>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already
>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not
> the
>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
>>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
> in
>>> that 64 bit direction).

>>>
>>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as
>>> well..Chooo
>>> chooooc choo...
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 20:31:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One question, Dedric. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video production?
XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track digital
studio in my living room. What's missing from that?

Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping. I haven't
installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations
into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks . . .

TCB

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>James and Jamie,
>
>Well I'll reply to you and Jamie together to conserve electrons... ;-)
>
>I think you both missed my point, and assumed this was a slight against
>Apple. It wasn't.
>
>The thread was actually about Vista and the article in which few developers
>showed any enthusiasm for it, and in several cases almost outright
>rejection. I don't blame them. OS developers really don't, and sadly,
>can't put the interests of professional audio users at the forefront. Their
>first customers are consumers.
>
>Core audio is cool (great compared to other OS-embedded audio protocols,
>unless we bring BeOS back) and Apple seems to have done a respectable job
by
>including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However,
>the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust
>the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones,
or
>operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have no

>choice.

>

>Truly Apple has made 100x the effort vs. MS in supporting the pro

>audio/video market (well, 100 x 0 would be 0, but you get the point ;-).

>The point was that it wasn't developed for Steinberg's best interests, or

>Digidesign's, or MOTU's (where is MAS?), but Apple's. Logic was the first

>to support OSX because it was an Apple product, Jamie. Does Apple really

>release full SDKs to 3rd parties when they start developing their apps for

>that new design, or do they wait until they release their app, then forward

>the SDKs... ;-)

>

>Just don't assume that because I include Apple in a general discussion that

>I'm bashing Macs. Let's also not poo poo Steinberg just because ASIO and

>VST weren't developed by Apple. They really did make native DAWs a reality

>(more so than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs. MAS

>or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...).

>Steinberg is far from perfect, but that doesn't make Apple the sudden

>defender of the pro audio world by default. ;-)

>

>If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is

>Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)

>

>Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home

>movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation.

But

>that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are

as

>good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger

>fish.

>

>James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey,

>who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for

MS

>and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it looks

>cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping

>Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think

it

>sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices when

I

>could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).

>

>Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug - that

>was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly;

>not so cool of MS to make Vista the next step in the roadmap to 64 bit and

>where we would have no more need for it).

>

>Regards,

>Dedric

>
>On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"
><excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>>
>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides
to
>>> this:
>>>
>>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaiak,
just
>> a
>>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>>>
>>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt
to
>>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from
tests
>>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for the
>> OS,
>>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can
gain
>>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>>
>>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being
their
>>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core
audio
>>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone
else's
>>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can
>>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.
>> For
>>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has
>> been
>>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even
Logic
>>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party
audio
>>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>>
>>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to
survive

>>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
>>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's
pitch
>>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one
of
>>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their
>>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that
had
>> no
>>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned
>>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for
one).
>>>
>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedic
>>
>> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When MS
goes
>> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple
does
>> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software
system.
>> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
>> VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices
on
>> a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new
plugin
>> development companies showed up because the new AU format created new
>> opportunities
>> for start ups. It's all good.
>>
>> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>
>>
>>>
>>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
>> On

>>>> Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is
it
>> time
>>>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>>>
>>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
>> (RME,
>>>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>>>
>>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's
not
>>>> needed.
>>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>>>> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
>> built-in
>>>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not
Adopt
>>>> the Vista standard..
>>>>
>>>> OK. Rant:
>>>> When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>>>> AUDIO-Units.
>>>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple
went
>>>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
>>>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>>>
>>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>>> Apple's
>>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>>
>>>> Next point:
>>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
>>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>>
>>>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
>> on
>>>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A
True
>>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>>>
>>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they
already
>>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not
>> the
>>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies

>>>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
>> in
>>>> that 64 bit direction).
>>>>
>>>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64
bit
>>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-written
>>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train
as
>>>> well..Chooo
>>>> chooooc choo...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 20:36:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey dedric.. That was called (Emagic Driver EASI) :)

well, I for one have taken pre-emptive measures to secure a Mac Pro (8 core)
Running Cubase SX. I purchased from a friend for a really good price. I had him
show me what Sx was like on OS-X/Intel..Bottom line. It handled 80 plus tracks
imported from a Pro Tools session.

I was sold. He een demonstrated SX on his G5-quad. 80 plus tracks, plugins..
No problem..

That's why this I felt that article was so disturbing. I see greater and
greater movement to OS_X and Core audio-audio units. You just get a sense
that Apple has the momentum with the pro audio and video market. And , sadly
my hunches are dead on..

With this Vista fiasco, I think Ms has slammed it's door on our community.
But, MS has a lot money invested in AVID, so Digidesign must know something
we don't..
The next few years should be interesting..

I will be testing Paris on the Mac Pro (running win XP..via boot camp. Won;t
hurt to see what happens..
Stay tuned.

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>James and Jamie,

>
>Well I'll reply to you and Jamie together to conserve electrons... ;-)
>
>I think you both missed my point, and assumed this was a slight against
>Apple. It wasn't.
>
>The thread was actually about Vista and the article in which few developers
>showed any enthusiasm for it, and in several cases almost outright
>rejection. I don't blame them. OS developers really don't, and sadly,
>can't put the interests of professional audio users at the forefront. Their
>first customers are consumers.
>
>Core audio is cool (great compared to other OS-embedded audio protocols,
>unless we bring BeOS back) and Apple seems to have done a respectable job
by
>including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However,
>the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust
>the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones,
or
>operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have no
>choice.
>
>Truly Apple has made 100x the effort vs. MS in supporting the pro
>audio/video market (well, 100 x 0 would be 0, but you get the point ;-).
>The point was that it wasn't developed for Steinberg's best interests, or
>Digidesign's, or MOTU's (where is MAS?), but Apple's. Logic was the first
>to support OSX because it was an Apple product, Jamie. Does Apple really
>release full SDKs to 3rd parties when they start developing their apps for
>that new design, or do they wait until they release their app, then forward
>the SDKs... ;-)
>
>Just don't assume that because I include Apple in a general discussion that
>I'm bashing Macs. Let's also not poo poo Steinberg just because ASIO and
>VST weren't developed by Apple. They really did make native DAWs a reality
>(more so than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs. MAS
>or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...).
>Steinberg is far from perfect, but that doesn't make Apple the sudden
>defender of the pro audio world by default. ;-)
>
>If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is
>Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)
>
>Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home
>movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation.
But
>that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are
as
>good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger

>fish.
>
>James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey,
>who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for
MS
>and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it looks
>cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping
>Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think
it
>sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices when
I
>could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).
>
>Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug - that
>was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly;
>not so cool of MS to make Vista the next stop in the roadmap to 64 bit and
>where we would have no more need for it).
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"
><excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>>
>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides
to
>>> this:
>>>
>>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik,
just
>> a
>>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>>>
>>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt
to
>>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from
tests
>>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for the
>> OS,
>>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can
gain
>>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>>
>>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being
their

>>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core audio
>>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone else's
>>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can
>>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.
>> For
>>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has
>> been
>>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even
Logic
>>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party
audio
>>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>>
>>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to
survive
>>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
>>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's
pitch
>>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one
of
>>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their
>>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that
had
>> no
>>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned
>>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for
one).
>>>
>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedic
>>
>> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When MS
goes
>> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple
does

>> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software system.

>> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices on a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new plugin development companies showed up because the new AU format created new opportunities for start ups. It's all good.

>>

>> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>

>>

>>>

>>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>>

>>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound On Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it time for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.

>>>>

>>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry (RME, M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .

>>>>

>>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not needed.

>>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.

>>>> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new built-in audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated they would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt the Vista standard..

>>>>

>>>> OK. Rant:

>>>> When Apple completely re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard AUDIO-Units.

>>>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.

>>>>

>>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies

>>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>>> Apple's
>>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>>
>>>> Next point:
>>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
>>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>>
>>>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
>> on
>>>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A
True
>>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>>>
>>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they
already
>>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not
>> the
>>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
>>>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
>> in
>>>> that 64 bit direction).
>>>>
>>>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64
bit
>>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-written
>>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train
as
>>>> well..Chooo
>>>> chooooc choo...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 20:42:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dedric Terry wrote:
> James and Jamie,
>
> Well I'll reply to you and Jamie together to conserve electrons... ;-)

Apple sucks! There, now you can tell us apart. :^)

> I think you both missed my point, and assumed this was a slight against
> Apple. It wasn't.

Nope. I got your other insightful point about Vista, accepted it and
deleted it because I wanted to talk about the other stuff. :^)

> The thread was actually about Vista and the article in which few developers
> showed any enthusiasm for it, and in several cases almost outright
> rejection. I don't blame them. OS developers really don't, and sadly,
> can't put the interests of professional audio users at the forefront. Their
> first customers are consumers.
>
> Core audio is cool (great compared to other OS-embedded audio protocols,
> unless we bring BeOS back)

BoOS showed the way...

> and Apple seems to have done a respectable job by
> including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However,
> the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust
> the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones, or
> operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have no
> choice.

Sure we do, just buy a different OSX DAW. There's more than just Logic
on OSX, and Apple is not poisoning the market against other DAWS.

> Truly Apple has made 100x the effort vs. MS in supporting the pro
> audio/video market (well, 100 x 0 would be 0, but you get the point ;-).
> The point was that it wasn't developed for Steinberg's best interests, or
> Digidesign's, or MOTU's (where is MAS?), but Apple's. Logic was the first
> to support OSX because it was an Apple product, Jamie.

I think the support began with Emagic before Apple bought Logic. Pretty
sure.

> Does Apple really
> release full SDKs to 3rd parties when they start developing their apps for
> that new design, or do they wait until they release their app, then forward
> the SDKs... ;-)

Ask MOTU. I think Apple has been very open with the developers, actually.

> Just don't assume that because I include Apple in a general discussion that
> I'm bashing Macs.

I'm not. You just overlooked a few things, IMO. Framed it differently than I would, from my experience.

> Let's also not poo poo Steinberg just because ASIO and
> VST weren't developed by Apple.

Again, I'm not attacking Steinberg in some weird illogical scheme to make Apple look better.

I just mentioned that Steinberg's control of a standard caused its share of problems with other developers. I didn't say it was a bad standard.

But Apple had the opportunity to make a clean start on a platform standard for OSX. To be clear, I thought that was fine but they should have also supported VST. Some apps still support both on OSX.

> They really did make native DAWs a reality
> (more so than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs. MAS
> or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...).

We should all remember a lot of things, like, uh, I forget... :^)

What's cool is that the competition between Steinberg and Emagic produced a lot of progress, with great vision and tenacity in both companies. Add Native Instruments, MOTU, plus a few more = tons of good stuff that we benefit from now. I am very grateful for all of this.

> Steinberg is far from perfect, but that doesn't make Apple the sudden
> defender of the pro audio world by default. ;-)

Not my claim.

> If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is
> Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)

I fear nothing. If Apple can continue to grow using a strategy built on supporting creative tools on the one hand and distribution/user tools on the other, that's a comprehensive vision, a flow from creation to market.

> Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home
> movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation. But
> that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are as
> good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger
> fish.

I don't see how having a computer system that can play a movie makes it
harder for that same system to make one. IOW, there's more synergy than
distraction between those applications.

> James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey,
> who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for MS
> and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it looks
> cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping
> Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think it
> sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices when I
> could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).

Don't give up, Dedic. Don't switch. Apple needs competition and I don't
want to quit using the Mac yet. So go to Linux if Vista gets completely
unlivable, but PLEASE AVOID THE MAC!!!! The day you switch, prices will
go up...

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

> Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug - that
> was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly;
> not so cool of MS to make Vista the next stop in the roadmap to 64 bit and
> where we would have no more need for it).

>
> Regards,
> Dedic

>
> On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"
> <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides to
>>> this:
>>>
>>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik, just
>> a

>>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>>>
>>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt to
>>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from tests
>>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for the
>> OS,
>>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can gain
>>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>>
>>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being their
>>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core audio
>>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone else's
>>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can
>>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.
>> For
>>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has
>> been
>>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even Logic
>>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party audio
>>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>>
>>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to survive
>>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
>>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's pitch
>>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one of
>>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their
>>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that had
>> no
>>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned
>>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for one).
>>>
>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Detric
>> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When MS goes
>> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple does
>> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software system.

>> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
>> VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices on
>> a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new plugin
>> development companies showed up because the new AU format created new
>> opportunities
>> for start ups. It's all good.
>>
>> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>
>>
>>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
>> On
>>>> Sound -What The Developers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it
>> time
>>>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>>>
>>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
>> (RME,
>>>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>>>
>>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not
>>>> needed.
>>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>>>> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
>> built-in
>>>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt
>>>> the Vista standard..
>>>>
>>>> OK. Rant:
>>>> When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>>>> AUDIO-Units.
>>>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went
>>>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
>>>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>>>
>>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>>> Apple's
>>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>>
>>>> Next point:
>>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
>>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>>
>>>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
>> on

>>>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True
>>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>>>
>>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already
>>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not
>> the
>>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
>>>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
>> in
>>>> that 64 bit direction).
>>>>
>>>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
>>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as
>>>> well..Chooo
>>>> chooooc choo...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 20:42:47 GMT

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

Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom" type who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users like myself where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before editing) with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.

All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to HD-TDM. They want it all(Power) natively. They wan t Pro Tools Power in Natively..

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

>
>One question, Detric. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video production?
>XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track digital
>studio in my living room. What's missing from that?

>
>Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping. I haven't
>installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations
>into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks . . .

>
>TCB

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

>>James and Jamie,

>>
>>Well I'll reply to you and Jamie together to conserve electrons... ;-)
>>
>>I think you both missed my point, and assumed this was a slight against
>>Apple. It wasn't.
>>
>>The thread was actually about Vista and the article in which few developers
>>showed any enthusiasm for it, and in several cases almost outright
>>rejection. I don't blame them. OS developers really don't, and sadly,
>>can't put the interests of professional audio users at the forefront.
Their
>>first customers are consumers.
>>
>>Core audio is cool (great compared to other OS-embedded audio protocols,
>>unless we bring BeOS back) and Apple seems to have done a respectable job
>by
>>including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However,
>>the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust
>>the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones,
>or
>>operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have
no
>>choice.
>>
>>Truly Apple has made 100x the effort vs. MS in supporting the pro
>>audio/video market (well, 100 x 0 would be 0, but you get the point ;-).
>>The point was that it wasn't developed for Steinberg's best interests,
or
>>Digidesign's, or MOTU's (where is MAS?), but Apple's. Logic was the first
>>to support OSX because it was an Apple product, Jamie. Does Apple really
>>release full SDKs to 3rd parties when they start developing their apps
for
>>that new design, or do they wait until they release their app, then forward
>>the SDKs... ;-)
>>
>>Just don't assume that because I include Apple in a general discussion
that
>>I'm bashing Macs. Let's also not poo poo Steinberg just because ASIO and
>>VST weren't developed by Apple. They really did make native DAWs a reality
>>(moreso than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs.
MAS
>>or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...).
>>Steinberg is far from perfect, but that doesn't make Apple the sudden
>>defender of the pro audio world by default. ;-)
>>
>>If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is
>>Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)
>>

>>Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home
>>movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation.

>But

>>that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are
>as

>>good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger
>>fish.

>>

>>James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey,
>>who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for

>MS

>>and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it looks
>>cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping

>>Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think
>it

>>sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices when
>I

>>could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).

>>

>>Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug - that
>>was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly;

>>not so cool of MS to make Vista the next stop in the roadmap to 64 bit
and

>>where we would have no more need for it).

>>

>>Regards,

>>Dedric

>>

>>On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"

>><excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>>

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

>>>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides

>to

>>>> this:

>>>>

>>>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik,

>just

>>> a

>>>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.

>>>>

>>>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt

>to

>>>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from

>tests

>>>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for

the
>>> OS,
>>>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can
>gain
>>>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>>>
>>>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>>>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being
>their
>>>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core
>audio
>>>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone
>else's
>>>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you
can
>>>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>>>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.
>>> For
>>>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>>>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this
has
>>> been
>>>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even
>Logic
>>>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party
>audio
>>>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>>>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>>>
>>>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to
>survive
>>>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>>>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
>>>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>>>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>>>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>>>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's
>pitch
>>>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one
>of
>>>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting
their
>>>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that
>had
>>> no
>>>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've
learned
>>>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for

>one).
>>>>
>>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When MS
>goes
>>> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple
>does
>>> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software
>system.
>>> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
>>> VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices
>on
>>> a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new
>plugin
>>> development companies showed up because the new AU format created new
>>> opportunities
>>> for start ups. It's all good.
>>>
>>> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>
>>>
>>>>
>>>>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>>>>> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
>>>>>>> On
>>>>>>> Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is
>>>>>>> it
>>>>>>> time
>>>>>>> for (Them DAW manuafuets) to go 64 bit.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
>>>>>>>> (RME,
>>>>>>>>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's
>>>>>>>>>> not
>>>>>>>>>>> needed.
>>>>>>>>>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>>>>>>>>>>>> Secondly, They're not impressed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
>>>> built-in

>>>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated they would stay with ASIO, and Not
>Adopt
>>>> the Vista standard..
>>>>
>>>> OK. Rant:
>>>> When Apple completely re-coded their OS with a NEW Audio engine standard
>>>> AUDIO-Units.
>>>> At that time, ASIO, WDM & MME were the Native standards, but Apple
>went
>>>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding
their
>>>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Audio-Unit drivers.
>>>>
>>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>>> Apple's
>>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>>
>>>> Next point:
>>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to
break
>>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>>
>>>> The problem is that the DAWs are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
>>> on
>>>> a 64 bit OS and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A
>True
>>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>>> we see astounding gains in performance.
>>>>
>>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they
>already
>>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is
not
>>> the
>>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit..
Companies
>>>> like RME & Steinberg will get left behind if they don't start moving
>>> in
>>>> that 64 bit direction).
>>>>
>>>> To many of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64
>bit
>>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-written
>>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train
>as
>>>> well..Choo
>>>> choooc choo...

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

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 20:46:59 GMT

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

TCB wrote:

> One question, Dedic. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video production?
> XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track digital
> studio in my living room. What's missing from that?

Talent?

JUST KIDDING!!!! Didn't mean you, Thad.

But listening to some of the home produced music that's out there, it isn't the gear holding people back any more...

> Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping. I haven't
> installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations
> into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks . . .

Please do, and let us know what you think!

Cheers,

-Jamie

www.JamieKruz.com

> TCB

>

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

>> James and Jamie,

>>

>> Well I'll reply to you and Jamie together to conserve electrons... ;-)

>>

>> I think you both missed my point, and assumed this was a slight against

>> Apple. It wasn't.

>>

>> The thread was actually about Vista and the article in which few developers
>> showed any enthusiasm for it, and in several cases almost outright
>> rejection. I don't blame them. OS developers really don't, and sadly,
>> can't put the interests of professional audio users at the forefront. Their
>> first customers are consumers.
>>
>> Core audio is cool (great compared to other OS-embedded audio protocols,
>> unless we bring BeOS back) and Apple seems to have done a respectable job
> by
>> including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However,
>> the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust
>> the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones,
> or
>> operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have no
>> choice.
>>
>> Truly Apple has made 100x the effort vs. MS in supporting the pro
>> audio/video market (well, 100 x 0 would be 0, but you get the point ;-).
>> The point was that it wasn't developed for Steinberg's best interests, or
>> Digidesign's, or MOTU's (where is MAS?), but Apple's. Logic was the first
>> to support OSX because it was an Apple product, Jamie. Does Apple really
>> release full SDKs to 3rd parties when they start developing their apps for
>> that new design, or do they wait until they release their app, then forward
>> the SDKs... ;-)
>>
>> Just don't assume that because I include Apple in a general discussion that
>> I'm bashing Macs. Let's also not poo poo Steinberg just because ASIO and
>> VST weren't developed by Apple. They really did make native DAWs a reality
>> (moreso than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs. MAS
>> or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...).
>> Steinberg is far from perfect, but that doesn't make Apple the sudden
>> defender of the pro audio world by default. ;-)
>>
>> If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is
>> Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)
>>
>> Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home
>> movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation.
> But
>> that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are
> as
>> good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger
>> fish.
>>
>> James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey,
>> who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for
> MS
>> and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it looks

>> cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping
>> Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think
> it
>> sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices when
> I
>> could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).
>>
>> Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug - that
>> was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly;
>> not so cool of MS to make Vista the next stop in the roadmap to 64 bit and
>> where we would have no more need for it).
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>>
>> On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"
>> <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides
> to
>>>> this:
>>>>
>>>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik,
> just
>>> a
>>>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>>>>
>>>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt
> to
>>>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from
> tests
>>>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for the
>>> OS,
>>>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can
> gain
>>>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>>>
>>>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>>>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being
> their
>>>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core
> audio
>>>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone
> else's
>>>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can
>>>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>>>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.

>>> For
>>>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>>>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has
>>> been
>>>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even
> Logic
>>>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party
> audio
>>>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>>>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>>>
>>>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to
> survive
>>>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>>>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
>>>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>>>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>>>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>>>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's
> pitch
>>>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one
> of
>>>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their
>>>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that
> had
>>> no
>>>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned
>>>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for
> one).
>>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Detric
>>> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When MS
> goes
>>> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple
> does
>>> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software
> system.
>>> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
>>> VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices
> on
>>> a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new
> plugin
>>> development companies showed up because the new AU format created new
>>> opportunities

>>> for start ups. It's all good.
>>>
>>> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>
>>>
>>>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1 @linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
>>> On
>>>>> Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is
> it
>>> time
>>>>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>>>>
>>>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
>>> (RME,
>>>>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>>>>
>>>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's
> not
>>>>> needed.
>>>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>>>>> Secondly, They're not impressed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
>>> built-in
>>>>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated they would stay with ASIO, and Not
> Adopt
>>>>> the Vista standard..
>>>>>
>>>>> OK. Rant:
>>>>> When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>>>>> AUDIO-Units.
>>>>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple
> went
>>>>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
>>>>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>>>>
>>>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>>>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>>>> Apple's
>>>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>>>
>>>>> Next point:
>>>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
>>>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>>>
>>>>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
>>> on
>>>>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A

> True
>>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>>>
>>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they
> already
>>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not
>>> the
>>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
>>>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
>>> in
>>>> that 64 bit direction).
>>>>
>>>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64
> bit
>>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train
> as
>>>> well..Chooo
>>>> chooooc choo...
>>>>
>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.

Posted by [excelav](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 20:47:18 GMT

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

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

>
>Hey dedric.. That was called (Emagic Driver EASI) :)
>
>well, I for onehave taken pre-emptive measures to secire a Mac Pro (8 core)
>Running Cubase SX. I purchased from a friend for a really good price. I
hadhim
>show me what Sx was like on OS-X/Intel..Bottem line. It handled 80 pus tracks
>imported form a Pro Tools session.
>
>I was sold. He een demonstrated SX on his G5-quad. 80 plus tracks, plugins..
>No problem..
>
>That's why this I felt that article was so disturbing. I see greater and
>greater movement to OS_X and Core audio-audio units. You just get a sense
>that Apple has the momentum with the pro audio and video market. And , sadly
>my hunches are dead on..
>
>With theis Vista fiasco, I think Ms has slammed it's door on our community.

>But, MS has a lot money invested in AVID, so Digidesign must know something
>we don't..
>The next few years should be interesting..
>
>I will be testing Paris on the Mac Pro (running win XP..via boot camp. Won;t
>hurt to see what happens..
>Stay tuned.

LaMont, are you going to run a Magma? I don't think the PCI thing will work
with out it. This will be interesting!

>
>Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>James and Jamie,
>>
>>Well I'll reply to you and Jamie together to conserve electrons... ;-)
>>
>>I think you both missed my point, and assumed this was a slight against
>>Apple. It wasn't.
>>
>>The thread was actually about Vista and the article in which few developers
>>showed any enthusiasm for it, and in several cases almost outright
>>rejection. I don't blame them. OS developers really don't, and sadly,
>>can't put the interests of professional audio users at the forefront.
Their
>>first customers are consumers.
>>
>>Core audio is cool (great compared to other OS-embedded audio protocols,
>>unless we bring BeOS back) and Apple seems to have done a respectable job
>by
>>including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However,
>>the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust
>>the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones,
>or
>>operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have
no
>>choice.
>>
>>Truly Apple has made 100x the effort vs. MS in supporting the pro
>>audio/video market (well, 100 x 0 would be 0, but you get the point ;-).
>>The point was that it wasn't developed for Steinberg's best interests,
or
>>Digidesign's, or MOTU's (where is MAS?), but Apple's. Logic was the first
>>to support OSX because it was an Apple product, Jamie. Does Apple really
>>release full SDKs to 3rd parties when they start developing their apps
for
>>that new design, or do they wait until they release their app, then forward

>>the SDKs... ;-)
>>
>>Just don't assume that because I include Apple in a general discussion that
>>I'm bashing Macs. Let's also not poo poo Steinberg just because ASIO and
>>VST weren't developed by Apple. They really did make native DAWs a reality
>>(moreso than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs.
>>MAS
>>or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...).
>>Steinberg is far from perfect, but that doesn't make Apple the sudden
>>defender of the pro audio world by default. ;-)
>>
>>If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is
>>Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)
>>
>>Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home
>>movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation.

>But
>>that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are
>as
>>good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger
>>fish.
>>
>>James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey,
>>who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for
>MS
>>and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it looks
>>cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping
>>Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think
>it
>>sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices when
>I
>>could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).
>>
>>Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug - that
>>was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly;
>>not so cool of MS to make Vista the next stop in the roadmap to 64 bit
>>and
>>where we would have no more need for it).
>>
>>Regards,
>>Dedric
>>
>>On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"
>><excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>>

>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides
>to
>>>> this:
>>>>
>>>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik,
>just
>>> a
>>>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>>>>
>>>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt
>to
>>>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from
>tests
>>>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for
>the
>>> OS,
>>>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can
>gain
>>>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>>>
>>>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>>>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being
>their
>>>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core
>audio
>>>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone
>else's
>>>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you
>can
>>>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>>>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.
>>> For
>>>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>>>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this
>has
>>> been
>>>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even
>Logic
>>>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party
>audio
>>>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>>>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>>>
>>>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to
>survive
>>>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>>>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never

>>>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>>>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>>>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>>>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's
>pitch
>>>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one
>of
>>>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting
their
>>>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that
>had
>>> no
>>>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've
learned
>>>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for
>one).
>>>>
>>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedic
>>>
>>> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When MS
>goes
>>> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple
>does
>>> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software
>system.
>>> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
>>> VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices
>on
>>> a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new
>plugin
>>> development companies showed up because the new AU format created new
>>> opportunities
>>> for start ups. It's all good.
>>>
>>> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>
>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
>>> On

>>>> Sound -What The Developers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is
>it
>>> time
>>>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>>>
>>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
>>> (RME,
>>>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>>>
>>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's
>not
>>>> needed.
>>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>>>> Secondly, They're not impressed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
>>> built-in
>>>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated they would stay with ASIO, and Not
>Adopt
>>>> the Vista standard..
>>>>
>>>> OK. Rant:
>>>> When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>>>> AUDIO-Units.
>>>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple
>went
>>>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding
their
>>>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>>>
>>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>>> Apple's
>>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>>
>>>> Next point:
>>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to
break
>>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>>
>>>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
>>> on
>>>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A
>True
>>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>>>
>>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they
>already
>>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is

not
>>> the
>>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit..
Companies
>>>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
>>> in
>>>> that 64 bit direction).
>>>>
>>>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64
>bit
>>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train
>as
>>>> well..Chooo
>>>> chooooc choo...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 21:04:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Thad - Lamont answered this as well. From general perspectives, no we don't need a specialized DAW, but as Lamont said, it's when you run against the wall of the OS and hardware's capabilities (memory, PCI buss, etc) on a daily basis, then it is an issue. In addition, the main concern is the cost of having to switch between working solutions (not necessarily DAWs, or platforms), but plugins or periphery apps, transer workflow, etc because another piece of software fell prey to a change in an OS, and is either dead or delayed. Weeks and certainly months of delay in the software development world can equate to dollars and clients in the production world.

For sure the level of capability we have with Macs and PCs today is, in a broader perspective, stunning (48 tracks of tape would have broken my budget on some projects years ago), but the requirements of the job don't sit back and let us enjoy it for very long... ;-)

I just loaded up a single voiceover and setup 4 instances of Nebula last week, and a Nebula reverb (that blows away Wizoo W2 and UAD-1 plate) and it sucked down 50% of my cpu - the problem wasn't that I don't have other plugins that would load 100 instances, it's that this plugin sounds 100x better than those and the track is nailed, with nary another track, much less my full orchestral template required to complete the spot (yes, freeze

is my friend. :-).

Last night I tried to connect a simple (older Oxford 911 chipset) firewire drive to my Vista laptop to run a little audio off of, and it locked up Vista after a few minutes (apparently lost connection) - work planned for this weekend will have to wait until I can get back to the studio - hours, and even days lost on my schedule. I can't get a USB thumb drive that works with Vista (tried 3, called Sandisk support - no luck). Fortunately I don't use the Vista laptop for audio work, but it limits the laptop's usefulness in carrying it to another studio for work, previews, transfers, etc.

Obviously, there is no simple alternative to the current crop of mainstream OSs for my audio work, and in reality, OSX and XP probably don't limit us all that much (other than a few areas here and there). Ubuntu looks cool, but there is so much software and hardware involved that moving to a Linux solution would really take a monumental leap to become realistic.

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/7/07 2:42 PM, in article 46e1b7c7\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>
> Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom' type
> who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users like myself
> where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before editing)
> with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.
>
> All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to HD-TDM.
> They want it all(Power) natively. They wan t Pro Tools Power in Natively..
>
> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>> One question, Dedric. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video
>> production?
>> XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track digital
>> studio in my living room. What's missing from that?
>>
>> Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping. I haven't
>> installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations
>> into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks . . .
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> James and Jamie,
>>>

>>> Well I'll reply to you and Jamie together to conserve electrons... ;-)
>>>
>>> I think you both missed my point, and assumed this was a slight against
>>> Apple. It wasn't.
>>>
>>> The thread was actually about Vista and the article in which few developers
>>> showed any enthusiasm for it, and in several cases almost outright
>>> rejection. I don't blame them. OS developers really don't, and sadly,
>>> can't put the interests of professional audio users at the forefront.
> Their
>>> first customers are consumers.
>>>
>>> Core audio is cool (great compared to other OS-embedded audio protocols,
>>> unless we bring BeOS back) and Apple seems to have done a respectable job
>> by
>>> including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However,
>>> the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust
>>> the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones,
>> or
>>> operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have
> no
>>> choice.
>>>
>>> Truly Apple has made 100x the effort vs. MS in supporting the pro
>>> audio/video market (well, 100 x 0 would be 0, but you get the point ;-).
>>> The point was that it wasn't developed for Steinberg's best interests,
> or
>>> Digidesign's, or MOTU's (where is MAS?), but Apple's. Logic was the first
>>> to support OSX because it was an Apple product, Jamie. Does Apple really
>>> release full SDKs to 3rd parties when they start developing their apps
> for
>>> that new design, or do they wait until they release their app, then forward
>>> the SDKs... ;-)
>>>
>>> Just don't assume that because I include Apple in a general discussion
> that
>>> I'm bashing Macs. Let's also not poo poo Steinberg just because ASIO and
>>> VST weren't developed by Apple. They really did make native DAWs a reality
>>> (moreso than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs.
> MAS
>>> or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...).
>>> Steinberg is far from perfect, but that doesn't make Apple the sudden
>>> defender of the pro audio world by default. ;-)
>>>
>>> If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is
>>> Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)
>>>
>>> Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home

>>> movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation.
>
>> But
>>> that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are
>> as
>>> good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger
>>> fish.
>>>
>>> James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey,
>>> who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for
>> MS
>>> and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it looks
>>> cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping
>>> Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think
>> it
>>> sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices when
>> I
>>> could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).
>>>
>>> Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug - that
>>> was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly;
>>> not so cool of MS to make Vista the next stop in the roadmap to 64 bit
> and
>>> where we would have no more need for it).
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedic
>>>
>>> On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"
>>> <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides
>> to
>>>>> this:
>>>>>
>>>>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik,
>> just
>>>> a
>>>>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>>>>>
>>>>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt
>> to
>>>>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from
>> tests
>>>>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for
> the

>>>> OS,
>>>>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can
>> gain
>>>>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>>>>
>>>>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>>>>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being
>> their
>>>>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core
>> audio
>>>>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone
>> else's
>>>>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you
> can
>>>>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>>>>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.
>>>> For
>>>>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>>>>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this
> has
>>>> been
>>>>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even
>> Logic
>>>>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party
>> audio
>>>>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>>>>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>>>>
>>>>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to
>> survive
>>>>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>>>>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
>>>>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>>>>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>>>>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>>>>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's
>> pitch
>>>>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one
>> of
>>>>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting
> their
>>>>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that
>> had
>>>> no
>>>>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've
> learned
>>>>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for
>> one).

>>>>
>>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedic
>>>>
>>>> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When MS
>> goes
>>>> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple
>> does
>>>> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software
>> system.
>>>> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
>>>> VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices
>> on
>>>> a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new
>> plugin
>>>> development companies showed up because the new AU format created new
>>>> opportunities
>>>> for start ups. It's all good.
>>>>
>>>> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>>> <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>>>>> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
>>>>> On
>>>>>> Sound -What The Developers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is
>> it
>>>> time
>>>>>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
>>>> (RME,
>>>>>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>>>>>
>>>>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's
>> not
>>>>>> needed.
>>>>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>>>>>> Secondly, They're not impressed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
>>>> built-in

>>>>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated they would stay with ASIO, and Not
>> Adopt
>>>>> the Vista standard..
>>>>>
>>>>> OK. Rant:
>>>>> When Apple completely re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>>>>> AUDIO-Units.
>>>>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple
>> went
>>>>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding
> their
>>>>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>>>>
>>>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same
>>>>> companies
>>>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>>>> Apple's
>>>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>>>
>>>>> Next point:
>>>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to
> break
>>>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>>>
>>>>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
>>>> on
>>>>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A
>> True
>>>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>>>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>>>>
>>>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they
>> already
>>>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is
> not
>>>> the
>>>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit..
> Companies
>>>>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
>>>> in
>>>>> that 64 bit direction).
>>>>>
>>>>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64
>> bit
>>>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>>>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train
>> as
>>>>> well..Chooo

>>>>> chooooc choo...

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>

>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 21:25:17 GMT

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

On 9/7/07 2:42 PM, in article 46e1b9a1@linux, "Jamie K"
<Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>> and Apple seems to have done a respectable job by
>> including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However,
>> the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust
>> the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones, or
>> operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have no
>> choice.

>

> Sure we do, just buy a different OSX DAW. There's more than just Logic
> on OSX, and Apple is not poisoning the market against other DAWS.

Actually I was referring to choice in terms of consumer/general OS vs.
audio-dedicated OS, without resorting to RADAR (which uses BeOS I believe),
Fairlight, etc.

>

> Ask MOTU. I think Apple has been very open with the developers, actually.

>

Check the Nuendo forum thread on direct monitoring support.

>> They really did make native DAWs a reality
>> (moreso than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs. MAS
>> or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...).

>

> We should all remember a lot of things, like, uh, I forget... :^)

I'll try to remember that... ;-)

>

> What's cool is that the competition between Steinberg and Emagic
> produced a lot of progress, with great vision and tenacity in both
> companies. Add Native Instruments, MOTU, plus a few more = tons of good
> stuff that we benefit from now. I am very grateful for all of this.

>
For sure. I wasn't diminishing Emagic or MOTU's contribution - they just made some proprietary decisions that helped ASIO and VST take the lead. All three, and Cakewalk are innovators in the native DAW, audio and sequencer market. My fear of the OS vs. audio developer is in watching all 4 companies have to jump roll and spin to keep up with OS development - we are riding the tailwind of the OS, not dictating it for the most part. So far Apple's development of core audio has been a step in the right direction, but as Chris pointed out, it still lags ASIO in some ways and took a while to get there.

>
>> If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is >> Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)

>
> I fear nothing. If Apple can continue to grow using a strategy built on > supporting creative tools on the one hand and distribution/user tools on > the other, that's a comprehensive vision, a flow from creation to market.

Really? You don't wonder, like a lot of other Logic users, if Logic 8 will really become "Garageband Goes to the Studio"? ;-)) lol

I see your point, and it fits Apple's marketing, but remember, ultimately Apple answers to the bottom line. While the creation to market idea is a good one, it can also mean one or the other becomes, at some point, limited by the fact that one company is defining what that means. There are a lot of experienced disciplines involved with content creation using a wide range of tools, and few of them work for Apple, and not all of them are using Apple products (unless Apple is developing a new 4k HD cam, Dolby conversion hardware, etc). ;-)

>
>
>> Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home >> movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation. But >> that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are as >> good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger >> fish.

>
> I don't see how having a computer system that can play a movie makes it > harder for that same system to make one. IOW, there's more synergy than > distraction between those applications.

Playing movies alone doesn't, but when it is a product whose market is as diverse as this country, you should be able to see the distraction from the level of performance pro audio demands. So far Apple is keeping pace quite well - it's probably safe to say FCP has been revolutionary for the video market - the first NLE to truly quiet Avid rooms.

>

>
>> James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey,
>> who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for MS
>> and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it looks
>> cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping
>> Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think it
>> sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices when I
>> could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).
>
> Don't give up, Dedic. Don't switch. Apple needs competition and I don't
> want to quit using the Mac yet. So go to Linux if Vista gets completely
> unlivable, but PLEASE AVOID THE MAC!!!! The day you switch, prices will
> go up...

Oh don't worry. I'll only switch if it actually makes sense, and money for
my business. A benefit of looking at all sides equally is having the
ability see through cute marketing ads and fancy cases. ;-)

Regards,
Dedic

>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKruz.com

>
>
>
>> Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug - that
>> was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly;
>> not so cool of MS to make Vista the next stop in the roadmap to 64 bit and
>> where we would have no more need for it).

>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>>
>> On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"
>> <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>
>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides to
>>>> this:
>>>>
>>>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik, just
>>>> a
>>>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>>>>
>>>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt to

>>>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from tests
>>>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for the
>>> OS,
>>>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can gain
>>>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>>>
>>>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>>>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being their
>>>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core
>>>> audio
>>>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone else's
>>>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can
>>>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>>>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.
>>> For
>>>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>>>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has
>>> been
>>>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even Logic
>>>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party audio
>>>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>>>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>>>
>>>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to
>>>> survive
>>>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>>>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
>>>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>>>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>>>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>>>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's
>>>> pitch
>>>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one of
>>>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their
>>>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that had
>>> no
>>>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned
>>>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for
>>>> one).
>>>>
>>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Detric
>>> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When MS goes
>>> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple does

>>> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software
>>> system.
>>> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
>>> VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices on
>>> a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new plugin
>>> development companies showed up because the new AU format created new
>>> opportunities
>>> for start ups. It's all good.
>>>
>>> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>
>>>
>>>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
>>> On
>>>>> Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it
>>> time
>>>>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>>>>
>>>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
>>> (RME,
>>>>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>>>>
>>>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not
>>>>> needed.
>>>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>>>>> Secondly, They're not impreessed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
>>> built-in
>>>>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated they would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt
>>>>> the Vista standard..
>>>>>
>>>>> OK. Rant:
>>>>> When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>>>>> AUDIO-Units.
>>>>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went
>>>>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
>>>>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>>>>
>>>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>>>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>>>> Apple's
>>>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>>>
>>>>> Next point:
>>>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
>>>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>>>

>>>> The problem is that the DAWs are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
>>> on
>>>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True
>>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>>>
>>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they
>>>> already
>>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not
>>> the
>>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit..
>>>> Companies
>>>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
>>> in
>>>> that 64 bit direction).
>>>>
>>>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
>>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as
>>>> well..Chooo
>>>> chooooc choo...
>>>>
>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 21:34:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK, forgive me for being dense here, guys. Let's put aside the question of whether audio and video need the same things, which is a damn good sized set aside but let's do it. How would a 'dedicated audio and video production OS' solve any of this? What you're saying is that you need more CPU bandwidth, faster memory, etc. and so forth. You're not going to get a whole lot more out of the underlying computer hardware than you get out of XP. Really, the OS overhead under XP is surprisingly small. Maybe not as small as the most efficient OS, but damn close.

Again, the question is not whether high end users need more computing power but whether they need a 'dedicated audio and video production OS.'

TCB

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Hey Thad - Lamont answered this as well. From general perspectives, no
we
>don't need a specialized DAW, but as Lamont said, it's when you run against

>the wall of the OS and hardware's capabilities (memory, PCI buss, etc) on
a
>daily basis, then it is an issue. In addition, the main concern is the
cost
>of having to switch between working solutions (not necessarily DAWs, or
>platforms), but plugins or periphery apps, transer workflow, etc because
>another piece of software fell prey to a change in an OS, and is either
dead
>or delayed. Weeks and certainly months of delay in the software development
>world can equate to dollars and clients in the production world.
>
>For sure the level of capability we have with Macs and PCs today is, in
a
>broader perspective, stunning (48 tracks of tape would have broken my budget
>on some projects years ago), but the requirements of the job don't sit back
>and let us enjoy it for very long... ;-)
>
>I just loaded up a single voiceover and setup 4 instances of Nebula last
>week, and a Nebula reverb (that blows away Wizoo W2 and UAD-1 plate) and
it
>sucked down 50% of my cpu - the problem wasn't that I don't have other
>plugins that would load 100 instances, it's that this plugin sounds 100x
>better than those and the track is nailed, with nary another track, much
>less my full orchestral template required to complete the spot (yes, freeze
>is my friend. :-).
>
>Last night I tried to connect a simple (older Oxford 911 chipset) firewire
>drive to my Vista laptop to run a little audio off of, and it locked up
>Vista after a few minutes (apparently lost connection) - work planned for
>this weekend will have to wait until I can get back to the studio - hours,
>and even days lost on my schedule. I can't get a USB thumb drive that works
>with Vista (tried 3, called Sandisk support - no luck). Fortunately I don't
>use the Vista laptop for audio work, but it limits the laptop's usefulness
>in carrying it to another studio for work, previews, transfers, etc.
>
>Obviously, there is no simple alternative to the current crop of mainstream
>OSs for my audio work, and in reality, OSX and XP probably don't limit us
>all that much (other than a few areas here and there). Ubuntu looks cool,
>but there is so much software and hardware involved that moving to a Linux
>solution would really take a monumental leap to become realistic.
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>On 9/7/07 2:42 PM, in article 46e1b7c7\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>wrote:
>
>>

>> Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom' type
>> who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users like myself
>> where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before editing)
>> with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.
>>
>> All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to HD-TDM.
>> They want it all(Power) natively. They wan t Pro Tools Power in Natively..
>>
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> One question, Dedic. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video
>>> production?
>>> XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track digital
>>> studio in my living room. What's missing from that?
>>>
>>> Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping. I haven't
>>> installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations
>>> into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks . .

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 21:42:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Nebula reverb (that blows away Wizoo W2 and UAD-1 plate)" ...

WOW!! W2 and IK Classics verbs are my go to verbs, even over Alti verb..Nubula you say..??

I played with free demo last winter and it was buggy, slow on my Dual-core Opteron PC. I'll have to them another shot.. Thanks

Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Hey Thad - Lamont answered this as well. From general perspectives, no we
>don't need a specialized DAW, but as Lamont said, it's when you run against
>the wall of the OS and hardware's capabilities (memory, PCI buss, etc) on a
>daily basis, then it is an issue. In addition, the main concern is the cost
>of having to switch between working solutions (not necessarily DAWs, or
>platforms), but plugins or periphery apps, transer workflow, etc because
>another piece of software fell prey to a change in an OS, and is either
dead

>or delayed. Weeks and certainly months of delay in the software development
>world can equate to dollars and clients in the production world.
>
>For sure the level of capability we have with Macs and PCs today is, in
a
>broader perspective, stunning (48 tracks of tape would have broken my budget
>on some projects years ago), but the requirements of the job don't sit back
>and let us enjoy it for very long... ;-)
>
>I just loaded up a single voiceover and setup 4 instances of Nebula last
>week, and a Nebula reverb (that blows away Wizoo W2 and UAD-1 plate) and
it
>sucked down 50% of my cpu - the problem wasn't that I don't have other
>plugins that would load 100 instances, it's that this plugin sounds 100x
>better than those and the track is nailed, with nary another track, much
>less my full orchestral template required to complete the spot (yes, freeze
>is my friend. :-).
>
>Last night I tried to connect a simple (older Oxford 911 chipset) firewire
>drive to my Vista laptop to run a little audio off of, and it locked up
>Vista after a few minutes (apparently lost connection) - work planned for
>this weekend will have to wait until I can get back to the studio - hours,
>and even days lost on my schedule. I can't get a USB thumb drive that works
>with Vista (tried 3, called Sandisk support - no luck). Fortunately I don't
>use the Vista laptop for audio work, but it limits the laptop's usefulness
>in carrying it to another studio for work, previews, transfers, etc.
>
>Obviously, there is no simple alternative to the current crop of mainstream
>OSs for my audio work, and in reality, OSX and XP probably don't limit us
>all that much (other than a few areas here and there). Ubuntu looks cool,
>but there is so much software and hardware involved that moving to a Linux
>solution would really take a monumental leap to become realistic.
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>On 9/7/07 2:42 PM, in article 46e1b7c7\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>wrote:
>
>>
>> Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom'
type
>> who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users like
myself
>> where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before editing)
>> with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.
>>
>> All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to HD-TDM.

>> They want it all(Power) natively. They want Pro Tools Power in Natively..
>>
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> One question, Dedic. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video
>>> production?
>>> XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track digital
>>> studio in my living room. What's missing from that?
>>>
>>> Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping. I
haven't
>>> installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations
>>> into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks . .

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discussion) irritating.
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 21:45:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, LaMont, I'll go back to my tried and true response. Native users really want the power of [Pro Tools HD/SSL 9k/fill in blank] natively. Well, I really want to bang Scarlett Johansson but all the wanting it in the world won't make it so.

Don't take this too personally but I get a little sick of the 'power users' simultaneously turning their noses up at the 'bedroom studio' market segment while at the same time wanting everything in native land to be cheap, super powerful, and easy to use. If the crap that us 'bedroom' guys use can't get it done, well since you're so power user go off and spend a few million on a Neve desk and a boatload of fancy hardware. Good on ya. It also hacks me off that the 'bedroom studio' computer geeks like me spent nearly a decade getting our noses bloody and doing the ditch digging to help get nativelyland working only to be told that we don't know what the hell we're talking about.

Just sayin'

TCB

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

>
>Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom' type
>who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users like myself
>where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before editing)
>with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.
>
>All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to HD-TDM.
>They want it all(Power) natively. They want Pro Tools Power in Natively..

>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>One question, Dedic. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video production?
>>XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track digital
>>studio in my living room. What's missing from that?
>>
>>Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping. I haven't
>>installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations
>>into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks . . .
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>James and Jamie,
>>>
>>>Well I'll reply to you and Jamie together to conserve electrons... ;-)
>>>
>>>I think you both missed my point, and assumed this was a slight against
>>>Apple. It wasn't.
>>>
>>>The thread was actually about Vista and the article in which few developers
>>>showed any enthusiasm for it, and in several cases almost outright
>>>rejection. I don't blame them. OS developers really don't, and sadly,
>>>can't put the interests of professional audio users at the forefront.

>Their
>>>first customers are consumers.
>>>
>>>Core audio is cool (great compared to other OS-embedded audio protocols,
>>>unless we bring BeOS back) and Apple seems to have done a respectable
job
>>by
>>>including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However,
>>>the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust
>>>the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones,
>>or
>>>operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have
>no
>>>choice.
>>>
>>>Truly Apple has made 100x the effort vs. MS in supporting the pro
>>>audio/video market (well, 100 x 0 would be 0, but you get the point ;-).
>>>The point was that it wasn't developed for Steinberg's best interests,
>or
>>>Digidesign's, or MOTU's (where is MAS?), but Apple's. Logic was the first
>>>to support OSX because it was an Apple product, Jamie. Does Apple really
>>>release full SDKs to 3rd parties when they start developing their apps

>for
>>>that new design, or do they wait until they release their app, then forward
>>>the SDKs... ;-)
>>>
>>>Just don't assume that because I include Apple in a general discussion
>that
>>>I'm bashing Macs. Let's also not poo poo Steinberg just because ASIO
and
>>>VST weren't developed by Apple. They really did make native DAWs a reality
>>>(moreso than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs.
>MAS
>>>or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...)
>>>Steinberg is far from perfect, but that doesn't make Apple the sudden
>>>defender of the pro audio world by default. ;-)
>>>
>>>If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is
>>>Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)
>>>
>>>Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home
>>>movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation.
>
>>But
>>>that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are
>>as
>>>good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger
>>>fish.
>>>
>>>James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey,
>>>who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for
>>MS
>>>and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it
looks
>>>cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping
>>>Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think
>>it
>>>sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices
when
>>I
>>>could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).
>>>
>>>Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug -
that
>>>was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly;
>>>not so cool of MS to make Vista the next step in the roadmap to 64 bit
>and
>>>where we would have no more need for it).
>>>
>>>Regards,

>>>Dedric
>>>
>>>On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"
>>><excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides
>>to
>>>>> this:
>>>>>
>>>>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik,
>>just
>>>> a
>>>>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>>>>>
>>>>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt
>>to
>>>>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from
>>tests
>>>>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for
>the
>>>> OS,
>>>>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can
>>gain
>>>>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>>>>
>>>>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>>>>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being
>>their
>>>>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core
>>audio
>>>>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone
>>else's
>>>>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you
>can
>>>>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>>>>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.
>>>> For
>>>>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>>>>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this
>has
>>>> been
>>>>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even
>>Logic
>>>>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party
>>audio
>>>>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct

>>>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>>>
>>>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to
>>survive
>>>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>>>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support,
never
>>>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>>>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if
it
>>>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>>>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's
>>pitch
>>>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least
one
>>of
>>>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting
>their
>>>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that
>>had
>>>> no
>>>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've
>learned
>>>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX
for
>>one).
>>>>
>>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Detric
>>>>
>>>> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When
MS
>>goes
>>>> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple
>>does
>>>> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software
>>system.
>>>> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
>>>> VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices
>>on
>>>> a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new
>>plugin
>>>> development companies showed up because the new AU format created new
>>>> opportunities

>>>> for start ups. It's all good.
>>>>
>>>> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>>>>> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS
(Sound
>>>> On
>>>>>> Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is
>>it
>>>> time
>>>>>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
>>>> (RME,
>>>>>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>>>>>
>>>>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's
>>not
>>>>>> needed.
>>>>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>>>>>> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's
new
>>>> built-in
>>>>>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not
>>Adopt
>>>>>> the Vista standard..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> OK. Rant:
>>>>>> When Apple completly re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>>>>>> AUDIO-Units.
>>>>>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple
>>went
>>>>>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding
>their
>>>>>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>>>>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>>>>> Apple's
>>>>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Next point:
>>>>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to

>break
>>>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>>>
>>>>> The problem is that the DAWs are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit
apps
>>>> on
>>>>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But,
A
>>True
>>>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>>>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>>>>
>>>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they
>>already
>>>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is
>not
>>>> the
>>>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit..
>Companies
>>>>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
>>>> in
>>>>> that 64 bit direction).
>>>>>
>>>>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of
64
>>bit
>>>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>>>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train
>>as
>>>>> well..Chooo
>>>>> chooooc choo...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 21:52:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, via Magma..

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

>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Hey dedric.. That was called (Emagic Driver EASI) :)
>>
>>well, I for one have taken pre-emptive measures to secure a Mac Pro (8 core)
>>Running Cubase SX. I purchased from a friend for a really good price. I
>had him
>>show me what Sx was like on OS-X/Intel..Bottom line. It handled 80 plus
tracks
>>imported from a Pro Tools session.
>>
>>I was sold. He even demonstrated SX on his G5-quad. 80 plus tracks, plugins..
>>No problem..
>>
>>That's why this I felt that article was so disturbing. I see greater and
>>greater movement to OS_X and Core audio-audio units. You just get a sense
>>that Apple has the momentum with the pro audio and video market. And ,
sadly
>>my hunches are dead on..
>>
>>With this Vista fiasco, I think MS has slammed its door on our community.
>>But, MS has a lot of money invested in AVID, so Digidesign must know something
>>we don't..
>>The next few years should be interesting..
>>
>>I will be testing Paris on the Mac Pro (running win XP..via boot camp.
Won;t
>>hurt to see what happens..
>>Stay tuned.
>
>LaMont, are you going to run a Magma? I don't think the PCI thing will
work
>with out it. This will be interesting!
>
>
>>
>>Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>James and Jamie,
>>>
>>>Well I'll reply to you and Jamie together to conserve electrons... ;-)
>>>
>>>I think you both missed my point, and assumed this was a slight against
>>>Apple. It wasn't.
>>>
>>>The thread was actually about Vista and the article in which few developers
>>>showed any enthusiasm for it, and in several cases almost outright
>>>rejection. I don't blame them. OS developers really don't, and sadly,

>>>can't put the interests of professional audio users at the forefront.

>Their

>>>first customers are consumers.

>>>

>>>Core audio is cool (great compared to other OS-embedded audio protocols,
>>>unless we bring BeOS back) and Apple seems to have done a respectable
job

>>by

>>>including such core media hooks in the OS (core animation too). However,
>>>the point is how much a full time professional can or should really trust
>>>the performance of their DAW to a company that makes 10x selling phones,
>>or

>>>operating systems (Apple or MS). Of course that's a paradox - we have

>no

>>>choice.

>>>

>>>Truly Apple has made 100x the effort vs. MS in supporting the pro
>>>audio/video market (well, 100 x 0 would be 0, but you get the point ;-).

>>>The point was that it wasn't developed for Steinberg's best interests,

>or

>>>Digidesign's, or MOTU's (where is MAS?), but Apple's. Logic was the first
>>>to support OSX because it was an Apple product, Jamie. Does Apple really
>>>release full SDKs to 3rd parties when they start developing their apps

>for

>>>that new design, or do they wait until they release their app, then forward
>>>the SDKs... ;-)

>>>

>>>Just don't assume that because I include Apple in a general discussion

>that

>>>I'm bashing Macs. Let's also not poo poo Steinberg just because ASIO
and

>>>VST weren't developed by Apple. They really did make native DAWs a reality

>>>(moreso than Emagic or MOTU if we look at the life of ASIO and VST vs.

>MAS

>>>or whatever Emagic's shortlived driver was called - I should remember...).

>>>Steinberg is far from perfect, but that doesn't make Apple the sudden

>>>defender of the pro audio world by default. ;-)

>>>

>>>If you are a Mac audio user (or PC user facing the sad reality that is

>>>Vista), fear the iPhone.... fear Garageband.... ;-)

>>>

>>>Ideally we really need an OS developed "for" audio/video alone, not home

>>>movies, not downloading mp3s, not posting pics of the family vacation.

>

>>But

>>>that opens up a whole other can of worms. I guess the worms we have are

>>as

>>>good as it gets, at least until they are all used up trying to catch bigger
>>>fish.
>>>
>>>James - I think your link supports my comment that Vista sucks (if Aleksey,
>>>who was never going to port to OSX, now is, things are looking grim for
>>MS
>>>and PC DAW users...). ;-)) (yes, I said it, and yes I believe it - it
looks
>>>cool, but ... well I'll save the list for another day). I'm just hoping
>>>Nuendo 4 rocks on the Mac, so at least I have a backup. (I still think
>>it
>>>sucks that with Macs I have to buy average hardware at premium prices
when
>>I
>>>could build a much more robust, higher end DAW for 20-30% less).
>>>
>>>Oh, btw - in that link Aleksey talks about fixing a /3GB switch bug -
that
>>>was yours truly that found that bug (cool of Aleksey to fix it so quickly;
>>>not so cool of MS to make Vista the next stop in the roadmap to 64 bit
>and
>>>where we would have no more need for it).
>>>
>>>Regards,
>>>Dedric
>>>
>>>On 9/7/07 10:40 AM, in article 46e17f14\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"
>>><excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides
>>to
>>>>> this:
>>>>>
>>>>> 1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afaik,
>>just
>>>>> a
>>>>> marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.
>>>>>
>>>>> 2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt
>>to
>>>>> separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from
>>tests
>>>>> I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for
>the
>>>>> OS,
>>>>> memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can

>>gain
>>>> some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).
>>>>
>>>> 3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>>>> developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being
>>their
>>>> main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core
>>audio
>>>> is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone
>>else's
>>>> protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you
>can
>>>> market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>>>> fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.
>>>> For
>>>> example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>>>> software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this
>has
>>>> been
>>>> slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even
>>Logic
>>>> doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party
>>audio
>>>> applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>>>> vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.
>>>>
>>>> Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to
>>survive
>>>> - most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>>>> didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support,
>>>> never
>>>> moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>>>> since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if
>>>> it
>>>> doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>>>> VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's
>>pitch
>>>> to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least
>>>> one
>>>> of
>>>> the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting
>>>> their
>>>> product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that
>>>> had
>>>> no
>>>> direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've
>>>> learned
>>>> from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX

for
>>one).
>>>>>
>>>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>>>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>>>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Detric
>>>>>
>>>>> Sometimes You guys kill me with your anti Mac/Apple opinions. When
MS
>>goes
>>>> proprietary you guys call it a standard, and you accept it. If Apple
>>does
>>>> it, it's a problem. AU is a ground up rewrite of their audio software
>>system.
>>>> They did it to improve audio on Mac OS. I don't like that they dropped
>>>> VST support in some of their software, but you still have other choices
>>on
>>>> a Mac to use VSTs, including your favorites from Steinberg. Many new
>>plugin
>>>> development companies showed up because the new AU format created new
>>>> opportunities
>>>> for start ups. It's all good.
>>>>>
>>>>> By the way, read this: <http://www.voxengo.com/press/114/>
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>>>>>> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS
(Sound
>>>>> On
>>>>>>> Sound -What The Devlopers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is
>>it
>>>>> time
>>>>>>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
>>>>> (RME,
>>>>>>>>>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's
>>not
>>>>>>>>>>> needed.

>>>>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>>>>> Secondly, They're not impressed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's
new
>>>> built-in
>>>>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated they would stay with ASIO, and Not
>>Adopt
>>>>> the Vista standard..
>>>>>
>>>>> OK. Rant:
>>>>> When Apple completly re-coded their OS with NEW Audio engine standard
>>>>> AUDIO-Units.
>>>>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple
>>went
>>>>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding
>their
>>>>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>>>>
>>>>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>>>>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>>>>> Apple's
>>>>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>>>>
>>>>> Next point:
>>>>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to
>break
>>>>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>>>>
>>>>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit
apps
>>>> on
>>>>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But,
A
>>True
>>>>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>>>>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>>>>
>>>>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they
>>already
>>>>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is
>not
>>>> the
>>>>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit..
>Companies
>>>>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
>>>> in
>>>>> that 64 bit direction).
>>>>>
>>>>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of

64

>>bit

>>>>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten

>>>>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train

>>as

>>>>> well..Chooo

>>>>> chooooc choo...

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>

>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.

Posted by [IOUOI](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 21:52:36 GMT

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

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

>

>"Nebula reverb (that blows away Wizoo W2 and UAD-1 plate)" ...

>

>WOW!! W2 and IK Classics verbs are my go to verbs, even over Alti verb..Nubula

>you say..??

>

>I played with free demo last winter and it was buggy, slow on my Dual-core

>Opteron PC. I'll have to them another shot.. Thanks

I couldn't even get it to work. It just sat there staring at me & taking up about 20% of my CPU cycles. It was like a cycle-sucking parasite, feeding off my PC and doing it no good in the process lol

It didn't make anything lock up, or anything like that, it just didn't do anything.

Neil

Subject: Re: OT: Nebula

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 22:06:37 GMT

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

The free version kind of worked here, but it was a bit like - "well here's the idea, and once it works, you'll have a better idea of what the idea is".

;-)

The commercial version does work. It is a cpu killer, and doesn't feel fluid (editing parameters is sluggish and inaccurate), but some of the presets really do sound excellent - some sound like the hardware they emulate (there are Mackie EQs and pres... not sure why).

It also depends on what you need - I do love Wizoo verbs for spaces, but some of Nebula's are deeper and in reality, Lexicon emulations, so apples and oranges. Nebula has a U-140 plate that does sound deeper and smoother than my UAD-1 Plate 140, but it also runs stereo even from mono inserts or sends, which helps.

Dedric

On 9/7/07 3:52 PM, in article 46e1c824\$1@linux, "Neil" <IOUOI@OIU.com> wrote:

>
> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>> "Nebula reverb (that blows away Wizoo W2 and UAD-1 plate)" ...
>>
>> WOW!! W2 and IK Classics verbs are my go to verbs, even over Alti
>> verb..Nubula
>> you say..??
>>
>> I played with free demo last winter and it was buggy, slow on my Dual-core
>> Opteron PC. I'll have to them another shot.. Thanks
>
> I couldn't even get it to work. It just sat there staring at me
> & taking up about 20% of my CPU cycles. It was like a cycle-
> sucking parasite, feeding off my PC and doing it no good in the
> process lol
>
> It didn't make anything lock up, or anything like that, it just
> didn't do anything.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 22:59:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good points Thad,

I guess the point of view(s) from the so called "High-End" is that we've been

sold some hardware updates with the promise of vastly superior performance results.

We've been told we just wait until we get an 64 bit OS to go along with yur new 64 bit cpu and those new video cards. Then , you guys will have vastly superior performance greater than TDM.

Well, again, we've been dupped,hood winked.. Bamboozeled :)

Truth is : The average Native Power DAW user has spent the equivlent to an Pro Tools HD setup. AND, the funny thing is, this kind of user will keep on chasing that elusive "Native" faster Than Pro Tools Rig" not realizing that he or she has spent "WAY" more say over 15k in a native solution.

That's the frustration: And as James M has stated onm any occasions, they(DAW manufacturing companies) only really care about is the Bed Room user. with products 8 & 2 channels channels at a time with chessy at best on board pre-amps.

Suprisingly: The Computer makers (DELL, Apple, HP, Gateway, etc) have been great to our community. Today we can purchase a very fast dual-core intel/AMD for \$500.00 bucks...then add a nother drive \$100.00 bucks or less..instant DAW..

Another source of frustration fro th eso called high-end, is again the hype aroundn so called hardware devices that's supposed to free up cpu resources.ie. UAD.. To this day I have purchased a single UAD Card due te fact that it does not free up any resources , but rather adds overhead. Read: Big Dongle. As well as the Tc-powercore..

God Bless Steigberg Cakewalk ,& Samplitude for re-writting their code from scratch to take advantage of the Win 2000/XP platform. With their wrok, native DAW work would still be in the slow, third world midi-based land of Emagic and MOtu..

So, whatdo we do..Do we continue to invest in Native rigs like BrianT(4-dual core) Opterons(Do the Math).. Scary.. Now, do you realize that a Pro Tools HD 1accel cost under 5k..Another 16 hundred for i/o..Boom your into no excuse land. HD2 accel..street with 192 I/O around \$9600.00.. 128 tracks..with rediculous amount of plugin power..End of story..

Oh yeah. You can run the above protool rigs on an G4-500-700,800.?????

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

>

>Well, LaMont, I'll go back to my tried and true response. Native users really >want the power of [Pro Tools HD/SSL 9k/fill in blank] natively. Well, I

really

>want to bang Scarlett Johansson but all the wanting it in the world won't

>make it so.

>

>Don't take this too personally but I get a little sick of the 'power users'

>simultaneously turning their noses up at the 'bedroom studio' market segment

>while at the same time wanting everything in native land to be cheap, super

>powerful, and easy to use. If the crap that us 'bedroom' guys use can't

get

>it done, well since you're so power user go off and spend a few million

on

>a Neve desk and a boatload of fancy hardware. Good on ya. It also hacks

me

>off that the 'bedroom studio' computer geeks like me spent nearly a decade

>getting our noses bloody and doing the ditch digging to help get natively

>working only to be told that we don't know what the hell we're talking about.

>

>

>Just sayin'

>

>TCB

>

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

>>

>>Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom'
type

>>who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users like
myself

>>where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before editing)

>>with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.

>>

>>All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to HD-TDM.

>>They want it all(Power) natively. They wan t Pro Tools Power in Natively..

>>

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

>>>

>>>One question, Detric. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video production?

>>>XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track digital

>>>studio in my living room. What's missing from that?

>>>

>>>Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping. I
haven't

>>>installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations

>>>into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks . .

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 07 Sep 2007 23:58:44 GMT

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

In real world use, XP and OSX are fine, and maybe there wouldn't be much to gain from a dedicated system beyond enhanced stability or just consistency perhaps (thought that isn't really an issue on my XP systems), but my thinking is drivers could be tighter and general media streaming wouldn't be subject to normal OS interaction, but I could be wrong.

I guess your last question really depends on the reality of what would or wouldn't be gained by a dedicated OS. Hard to say, but as long as we work with commercial OSs that are geared towards a wide range of uses, it is clear that we will always wonder what we might be missing. Along these lines though, I think it's only fair that we question the efficiency of hardware that is based on a 30 year old legacy model (IRQs, etc).

Dedric

On 9/7/07 3:34 PM, in article 46e1c3d7\$1@linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

> OK, forgive me for being dense here, guys. Let's put aside the question of
> whether audio and video need the same things, which is a damn good sized
> set aside but let's do it. How would a 'dedicated audio and video production
> OS' solve any of this? What you're saying is that you need more CPU bandwidth,
> faster memory, etc. and so forth. You're not going to get a whole lot more
> out of the underlying computer hardware than you get out of XP. Really, the
> OS overhead under XP is surprisingly small. Maybe not as small as the most
> efficient OS, but damn close.

>

> Again, the question is not whether high end users need more computing power
> but whether they need a 'dedicated audio and video production OS.'

>

> TCB

>

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

>> Hey Thad - Lamont answered this as well. From general perspectives, no

> we

>> don't need a specialized DAW, but as Lamont said, it's when you run against
>> the wall of the OS and hardware's capabilities (memory, PCI buss, etc) on

> a

>> daily basis, then it is an issue. In addition, the main concern is the

> cost

>> of having to switch between working solutions (not necessarily DAWs, or

>> platforms), but plugins or periphery apps, transer workflow, etc because

>> another piece of software fell prey to a change in an OS, and is either

> dead

>> or delayed. Weeks and certainly months of delay in the software development

>> world can equate to dollars and clients in the production world.
>>
>> For sure the level of capability we have with Macs and PCs today is, in
> a
>> broader perspective, stunning (48 tracks of tape would have broken my budget
>> on some projects years ago), but the requirements of the job don't sit back
>> and let us enjoy it for very long... ;-)
>>
>> I just loaded up a single voiceover and setup 4 instances of Nebula last
>> week, and a Nebula reverb (that blows away Wizoo W2 and UAD-1 plate) and
> it
>> sucked down 50% of my cpu - the problem wasn't that I don't have other
>> plugins that would load 100 instances, it's that this plugin sounds 100x
>> better than those and the track is nailed, with nary another track, much
>> less my full orchestral template required to complete the spot (yes, freeze
>> is my friend. :-).
>>
>> Last night I tried to connect a simple (older Oxford 911 chipset) firewire
>> drive to my Vista laptop to run a little audio off of, and it locked up
>> Vista after a few minutes (apparently lost connection) - work planned for
>> this weekend will have to wait until I can get back to the studio - hours,
>> and even days lost on my schedule. I can't get a USB thumb drive that works
>> with Vista (tried 3, called Sandisk support - no luck). Fortunately I don't
>> use the Vista laptop for audio work, but it limits the laptop's usefulness
>> in carrying it to another studio for work, previews, transfers, etc.
>>
>> Obviously, there is no simple alternative to the current crop of mainstream
>> OSs for my audio work, and in reality, OSX and XP probably don't limit us
>> all that much (other than a few areas here and there). Ubuntu looks cool,
>> but there is so much software and hardware involved that moving to a Linux
>> solution would really take a monumental leap to become realistic.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>>
>> On 9/7/07 2:42 PM, in article 46e1b7c7\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom'
> type
>>> who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users like
> myself
>>> where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before
>>> editing)
>>> with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.
>>>
>>> All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to HD-TDM.

>>> They want it all(Power) natively. They want Pro Tools Power in Natively..
>>>
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> One question, Dedric. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video
>>>> production?
>>>> XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track digital
>>>> studio in my living room. What's missing from that?
>>>>
>>>> Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping. I
> haven't
>>>> installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations
>>>> into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks . .

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 00:10:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lamont - you might want to add up the equivalent plugin counts on a HD accel card and compare it to, for example, a UAD-1. The cost is more than double per plugin compared to a UAD-1, with PCs and all hardware factored in/balanced off. So, who's hoodwinking who? ;-)

Digi has no interest in preventing you from spending too much money. Just compare the cost of a TDM plugin to a native version - same plugin - Waves, UAD, etc. Then add not only the cost of an Accel card, I/O, but also the computer, peripherals, conversion add ons that aren't included in PT, etc.

When doing price comparisons I've never spec'd a PT rig under about \$12k that equaled what I do with my \$1700 Core 2, RME interfaces and Nuendo.

If you are tracking 40+ live tracks, then yes, native's latency may become a disadvantage depending on what you need to monitor. A PT rig will give you near zero latency monitoring, but much the same can be done with RME totalmix, Cuemix etc, though not as elegantly for sure.

However, for production, scoring, editing, sound design, and many mixing scenarios, etc - it's hard to justify the extra cost for PT HD per plugin, or per track. It is significantly higher than native, easily.

Btw - you should check out the track count mix Brian posted on the Nuendo forum recently
(<http://forum.nuendo.com/phpbb2/viewtopic.php?t=13740&pos tdays=0&postorder=asc&start=300>).

I really doubt you could come close to matching it with PTHD for the cost.

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/7/07 4:59 PM, in article 46e1d7ca\$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
> Good points Thad,
>
> I guess the point of view(s) from the so called "High-End" is that we've been
> sold some hardware updates with the promise of vastly superior performance
> results.
>
> We've been told we just wait until we get an 64 bit OS to go along with yur
> new 64 bit cpu and those new video cards. Then , you guys will have vastly
> superior performance greater than TDM.
>
> Well, again, we've been dupped, hood winked.. Bamboozeled :)
>
> Truth is : The average Native Power DAW user has spent the equivalent to an
> Pro Tools HD setup. AND, the funny thing is, this kind of user will keep
> on chasing that elusive "Native" faster Than Pro Tools Rig" not realizing
> that he or she has spent "WAY" more say over 15k in a native solution.
>
> That's the frustration: And as James M has stated on many occasions, they (DAW
> manufacturing companies) only really care about is the Bed Room user. with
> products 8 & 2 channels channels at a time with chessey at best on board
> pre-amps.
>
> Surprisingly: The Computer makers (DELL, Apple, HP, Gateway, etc) have been
> great to our community. Today we can purchase a very fast dual-core intel/AMD
> for \$500.00 bucks...then add a nother drive \$100.00 bucks or less..instant
> DAW..
>
> Another source of frustration from the so called high-end, is again the hype
> around so called hardware devices that's supposed to free up cpu resources. ie.
> UAD.. To this day I have purchased a single UAD Card due to the fact that it
> does not free up any resources , but rather adds overhead. Read: Big Dongle.
> As well as the Tc-powercore..
>
> God Bless Steigberg Cakewalk , & Samplitude for re-writing their code from
> scratch to take advantage of the Win 2000/XP platform. With their work,
> native DAW work would still be in the slow, third world midi-based land of
> Emagic and MOTU..
>
> So, what do we do.. Do we continue to invest in Native rigs like Brian T (4-dual
> core) Opterons (Do the Math).. Scary.. Now, do you realize that a Pro Tools
> HD 1 accel cost under 5k.. Another 16 hundred for i/o.. Boom your into no excuse

> land. HD2 accel..street with 192 I/O around \$9600.00.. 128 tracks..with
> ridiculous amount of plugin power..End of story..
>
> Oh yeah. You can run the above protocol rigs on an G4-500-700,800.?????
>
>
> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>> Well, LaMont, I'll go back to my tried and true response. Native users really
>> want the power of [Pro Tools HD/SSL 9k/fill in blank] natively. Well, I
> really
>> want to bang Scarlett Johansson but all the wanting it in the world won't
>> make it so.
>>
>> Don't take this too personally but I get a little sick of the 'power users'
>> simultaneously turning their noses up at the 'bedroom studio' market segment
>> while at the same time wanting everything in native land to be cheap, super
>> powerful, and easy to use. If the crap that us 'bedroom' guys use can't
> get
>> it done, well since you're so power user go off and spend a few million
> on
>> a Neve desk and a boatload of fancy hardware. Good on ya. It also hacks
> me
>> off that the 'bedroom studio' computer geeks like me spent nearly a decade
>> getting our noses bloody and doing the ditch digging to help get nativelyland
>> working only to be told that we don't know what the hell we're talking about.
>>
>>
>> Just sayin'
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom'
> type
>>> who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users like
> myself
>>> where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before
>>> editing)
>>> with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.
>>>
>>> All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to HD-TDM.
>>> They want it all(Power) natively. They wan t Pro Tools Power in Natively..
>>>
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> One question, Detric. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video

>>>> production?
>>>> XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track digital
>>>> studio in my living room. What's missing from that?
>>>>
>>>> Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping. I
> haven't
>>>> installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations
>>>> into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks . .

Subject: Re: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 01:19:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well put, LaMont
This, and topics like this, are what our NG (should) be about.
More than half of us are using other DAWs but these topics apply to us
all.--

Martin Harrington
Lend An Ear Sound
Sydney, Australia
0414 913 247

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 01:23:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

James, you are SO predictable, chill out and be constructive...--

Martin Harrington
Lend An Ear Sound
Sydney, Australia
0414 913 247

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [excelav](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 02:01:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Mac bashing is SO predictable.

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
>James, you are SO predictable, chill out and be constructive...--
>
>Martin Harrington

>Lend An Ear Sound
>Sydney, Australia
>0414 913 247
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discussion) irritating.
Posted by [excelav](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 02:06:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>I read the article a while back, and I think there are multiple sides to
>this:

>

>1 - Vista isn't great for low latency audio. WaveRT is still, afai, just
a

>marketing feature, not proven in reality for pro audio.

>

>2 - Cakewalk has staked their marketing on 64-bit in order to attempt to
>separate themselves from the market. Reality is (or so it seems from tests
>I've seen), there is little advantage for the audio engine, and for the
OS,

>memory access is the main advantage. 64-bit apps in a 64-bit OS can gain
>some performance gains, but so far that appears to be minimal).

>

>3 - Apple hasn't really worked for, or to the advantage of DAW/audio
>developers, except their own (Final Cut Pro and iTunes/QT/iLife being their
>main interests here, with Logic running a distant 5th, or 10th). Core audio
>is likely a 30% technical decision (easier to implement than someone else's
>protocol), and 70% product control - what you develop yourself, you can
>market, control and use to differentiate your product. ASIO is perfectly
>fast, and stable on WinXP, but it's Steinberg's protocol, not Apple's.

For

>example, direct monitoring still isn't supported by most hardware or
>software for OSX, and was questionable for core audio (whether this has
been

>slow to develop, or slow to release the SDK for, I don't know) - even Logic
>doesn't have it. Apple just isn't interested in supporting 3rd party audio
>applications or protocols for the Mac purely because they have a direct
>vested interest in their own, and in selling more Macs.

>

>Developers adopted AU and Core Audio because they had to in order to survive
>- most of them already had Mac products they would simply lose if they
>didn't. Notice that some developers that didn't have Mac support, never
>moved to AU (Voxengo for one; Algorithmix, etc). It was a forced decision
>since VST, ASIO, etc had been dropped, just as Logic 5/PC was - if it
>doesn't make money for Apple, it is unceremoniously canned. With Vista,
>VST, ASIO, WDM all still work, so developers aren't buying Microsoft's pitch

>to move to their own internal driver/protocol. I believe at least one of
>the developers in that article expressed reservations over trusting their
>product to a protocol (WaveRT) that was held by an OS developer that had
no
>direct interest in professional audio (sound familiar now? They've learned
>from the Apple experience, and past Microsoft experience - DirectX for one).
>
>I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>
>Regards,
>Dedric

Back around 1990 I took a computer class, the instructor told the class that Apple computers were toys with their stupid cartoon icons. He told the class that the mouse was dumb, that you could get around a computer faster with a keyboard. He said that real men used real computers, and real computers used command lines, not cartoon pictures. The guy was an arrogant pompous ass, and he was wrong. That was over seventeen years ago, that thinking was bullheaded and ignorant back then and it still is today! I've heard this slam on apple for years along with all the other stupid stuff like their going out of business.

Dedric, your comment insinuates that Apple is a toy company that does not make serious computers, that is a slam. Apple products are not toys. Right now Mac OSX is a more serious OS for audio and video than Vista is. When Apple releases the next major release of Logic, it will be a serious contender, it won't be a toy. You could even get some serious work done with GarageBand, even though it's a consumer product. Is there multi track music production software in Vista?

As far as a OS that is geared for audio or video, I would say most Mac users are satisfied and feel there is no reason to have a proprietary completely dedicated computer. Because of physics, there will always be some kind of latency, but it's already livable.

Yes, Apple hardware is too expensive, but you get what you pay for. I don't know how many times I've heard on this board and others that somebody is on there second or third MOBO or power supply in a year because they burn up. I know the story about the FW port on your 5-7 year old G4. The other day Dave was talking about how great Glyph is. The service he got was great, and product was in warranty. I was a dealer for them at one time, and I think they are a good company, but I think their products are over priced. Nobody thinks anything of it, but when it comes to Apple you guys bitch about how over priced they are. You guys wouldn't think twice about dropping 3K on a single mic pre, but the thought of dropping 3K on a computer, the

core center of your studio is unthinkable. Even if Apple computers were the same price as PCs somebody would bitch that they couldn't get a replacement MOBO for \$20.00 at 7-11. This will never end. I still say Apple makes high quality stuff, you have to look at what you are really getting for the money. You get what you pay for.

>
>On 9/7/07 9:16 AM, in article 46e16b5e\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com>
>wrote:
>
>>
>> Okay fam, I just read a very interesting article in July's 07 SOS (Sound
On
>> Sound -What The Developers Think) about the state of MS Vista AND is it
time
>> for (Them DAW manufactuers) to go 64 bit.
>>
>> Well, the article featured most of the heavey hitters in the industry
(RME,
>> M-Audio, Native Instruments, Steingberg, Cakewalk, Lynx .
>>
>> As far as 64 bit in the DAW most , except Cakewalk, feels that it's not
>> needed.
>> But, you get the feeling that they say this because of the work involved.
>> Secondly, They're not impreesed(except Cakewalk) with Microsoft's new
built-in
>> audio hooks (WaveRT).. RME stated thay would stay with ASIO, and Not Adopt
>> the Vista standard..
>>
>> OK. Rant:
>> When Apple completely re-coded their OS witha NEW Audio engine standard
>> AUDIO-Units.
>> At that time, ASIO, WMD & MAS where the NAtive standards, but Apple went
>> their own way. So what did the Developers do...They started coding their
>> apps, plugins, audio interfaces with Auduo-Unit drivers.
>>
>> Now, that Microsoft is proposing the same thing, these very same companies
>> are balking. Why? Even with Lower latency and less pull on the CPU,like
>> Apple's
>> Audio Unit design, their balking.
>>
>> Next point:
>> To all of those who state the only useful purpose for 64 bit is to break
>> the 4 gig memory limitation (for Samplers) in Bull!
>>
>> The problem is that the DAWS are all using 32 bit coding. #2 bit apps
on

>> a 64 bit os and processor will only get you marginal gains...But, A True
>> 64 DAW/App using a 64 bit CPU,64 bit plugins
>> we we see astouding gains in performance.
>>
>> I'll stop now. But, we need to let the manufacturers know (what they already
>> know) and that is the Windows train is moving and even if Vista is not
the
>> OS, the Next version will be the right one and it will be 64 bit.. Companies
>> like RME & Steinbergs will get left behind if they don't start moving
in
>> that 64 bit direction).
>>
>> To may of us have Pre-Invested in 64 bit CPUs with the promise of 64 bit
>> processing. Apple will be there soon with OS-x 64 with a newly re-wriiten
>> version of Logic (64 bit). Digi and Motu will be on the 64 bit train as
>> well..Chooo
>> chooooc choo...
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 02:07:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

However, what kinda price do you put on "piece of mind". Work arounds, Total mix?? Yikes!!

How much does, "it just works" cost?? :)

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Lamont - you might want to add up the equivalent plugin counts on a HD accel
>card and compare it to, for example, a UAD-1. The cost is more than double
>per plugin compared to a UAD-1, with PCs and all hardware factored
>in/balanced off. So, who's hoodwinking who? ;-)

>

>Digi has no interest in preventing you from spending too much money. Just
>compare the cost of a TDM plugin to a native version - same plugin - Waves,
>UAD, etc. Then add not only the cost of an Accel card, I/O, but also the
>computer, peripherals, conversion add ons that aren't included in PT, etc.

>

>When doing price comparisons I've never spec'd a PT rig under about \$12k
>that equaled what I do with my \$1700 Core 2, RME interfaces and Nuendo.

>

>If you are tracking 40+ live tracks, then yes, native's latency may become
a
>disadvantage depending on what you need to monitor. A PT rig will give

you
>near zero latency monitoring, but much the same can be done with RME
>totalmix, Cuemix etc, though not as elegantly for sure.
>
>However, for production, scoring, editing, sound design, and many mixing
>scenarios, etc - it's hard to justify the extra cost for PT HD per plugin,
>or per track. It is significantly higher than native, easily.
>
>Btw - you should check out the track count mix Brian posted on the Nuendo
>forum recently
>(<http://forum.nuendo.com/phpbb2/viewtopic.php?t=13740&postdays=0&postorder=asc&start=300>).
>
>I really doubt you could come close to matching it with PTHD for the cost.
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>On 9/7/07 4:59 PM, in article 46e1d7ca\$1 @linux, "LaMont"
><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> Good points Thad,
>>
>> I guess the point of view(s)from the so called "High-End" is that we've
been
>> sold some hardware updates with the promise of vastly superior performance
>> results.
>>
>> We've been told we just wait until we get an 64 bit OS to go along with
yur
>> new 64 bit cpu and those new video cards. Then , you guys will have vastly
>> superior performance greater than TDM.
>>
>> Well, again, we've been dupped,hood winked.. Bamboozeled :)
>>
>> Truth is : The average Native Power DAW user has spent the equivlent to
an
>> Pro Tools HD setup. AND, the funny thing is, this kind of user will keep
>> on chasing that elusive "Native" faster Than Pro Tools Rig" not realizing
>> that he or she has spent "WAY" more say over 15k in a native solution.
>>
>> That's the frustration: And as James M has stated onm any occasions, they(DAW
>> manufacturing companies) only really care about is the Bed Room user.
with
>> products 8 & 2 channels channels at a time with chessy at best on board
>> pre-amps.
>>

>> Suprisingly: The Computer makers (DELL, Apple, HP, Gateway, etc) have been
>> great to our community. Today we can purchase a very fast dual-core intel/AMD
>> for \$500.00 bucks...then add a nother drive \$100.00 bucks or less..instant
>> DAW..
>>
>> Another source of frustration fro th eso called high-end, is again the
hype
>> aroudn so called hardware devices that's supposed to free up cpu resources.ie.
>> UAD.. To this day I have purchased a single UAD Card due te fact that
it
>> does not free up any resources , but rather adds overhead. Read: Big
Dongle.
>> As well as the Tc-powercore..
>>
>> God Bless Steigberg Cakewalk ,& Samplitude for re-writting their code
from
>> scratch to take advantage of the Win 2000/XP platform. With their wrok,
>> native DAW work would still be in the slow, third world midi-based land
of
>> Emagic and MOtu..
>>
>> So, whatdo we do..Do we continue to invest in Native rigs like BrianT(4-dual
>> core) Opterons(Do the Math).. Scary.. Now, do you realize that a Pro
Tools
>> HD 1accel cost under 5k..Another 16 hundred for i/o..Boom your into no
excuse
>> land. HD2 accel..street with 192 I/O around \$9600.00.. 128 tracks..with
>> rediculous amount of plugin power..End of story..
>>
>> Oh yeah. You can run the above protool rigs on an G4-500-700,800.?????
>>
>>
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> Well, LaMont, I'll go back to my tried and true response. Native users
really
>>> want the power of [Pro Tools HD/SSL 9k/fill in blank] natively. Well,
I
>> really
>>> want to bang Scarlett Johansson but all the wanting it in the world won't
>>> make it so.
>>>
>>> Don't take this too personally but I get a little sick of the 'power
users'
>>> simultaneously turning their noses up at the 'bedroom studio' market
segment
>>> while at the same time wanting everything in native land to be cheap,

super
>>> powerful, and easy to use. If the crap that us 'bedroom' guys use can't
>> get
>>> it done, well since you're so power user go off and spend a few million
>> on
>>> a Neve desk and a boatload of fancy hardware. Good on ya. It also hacks
>> me
>>> off that the 'bedroom studio' computer geeks like me spent nearly a decade
>>> getting our noses bloody and doing the ditch digging to help get natively
>>> working only to be told that we don't know what the hell we're talking
about.
>>>
>>>
>>> Just sayin'
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom'
>> type
>>>> who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users like
>> myself
>>>> where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before
>>>> editing)
>>>> with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.
>>>>
>>>> All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to
HD-TDM.
>>>> They want it all(Power) natively. They wan t Pro Tools Power in Natively..
>>>>
>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> One question, Dedic. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video
>>>>> production?
>>>>> XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track
digital
>>>>> studio in my living room. What's missing from that?
>>>>>
>>>>> Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping.
I
>> haven't
>>>>> installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell workstations
>>>>> into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks .

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 02:17:55 GMT

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

Wherever did you get the idea I use workarounds or that native is a workaround? I simply said Totalmix was a less elegant solution to accomplish monitoring, but clearly stated that ProTools holds the advantage in large tracking sessions.

How many people here read a few lines, guess the rest, and hit reply? ;-))

Btw, I'm doing post for a film, several corporate docs (international clients, not local stuff), all in Nuendo - works perfectly. I wouldn't say a native DAW is optimal for a live 30-40 input tracking session, with monitor feeds to musicians, but I know guys doing it daily.

ProTools doesn't have a reputation for absolute stability, so let's not talk about "peace of mind". My rig never fails me and keeps me busy 6-7 days a week, so I guess that would be called a pretty solid "peace of mind".

Dedric

On 9/7/07 8:07 PM, in article 46e203c7\$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
> However, what kinda price do you put on "piece of mind". Work arounds, Total
> mix?? Yikes!!
>
> How much does, "it just works" cost?? :)
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> Lamont - you might want to add up the equivalent plugin counts on a HD accel
>> card and compare it to, for example, a UAD-1. The cost is more than double
>> per plugin compared to a UAD-1, with PCs and all hardware factored
>> in/balanced off. So, who's hoodwinking who? ;-)
>>
>> Digi has no interest in preventing you from spending too much money. Just
>> compare the cost of a TDM plugin to a native version - same plugin - Waves,
>> UAD, etc. Then add not only the cost of an Accel card, I/O, but also the
>> computer, peripherals, conversion add ons that aren't included in PT, etc.
>>
>> When doing price comparisons I've never spec'd a PT rig under about \$12k
>> that equaled what I do with my \$1700 Core 2, RME interfaces and Nuendo.
>>
>> If you are tracking 40+ live tracks, then yes, native's latency may become
> a
>> disadvantage depending on what you need to monitor. A PT rig will give
> you
>> near zero latency monitoring, but much the same can be done with RME

>> totalmix, Cuemix etc, though not as elegantly for sure.
>>
>> However, for production, scoring, editing, sound design, and many mixing
>> scenarios, etc - it's hard to justify the extra cost for PT HD per plugin,
>> or per track. It is significantly higher than native, easily.
>>
>> Btw - you should check out the track count mix Brian posted on the Nuendo
>> forum recently
>> (<http://forum.nuendo.com/phpbb2/viewtopic.php?t=13740&postdays=0&postorder=asc&start=300>).
>>
>> I really doubt you could come close to matching it with PTHD for the cost.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>>
>> On 9/7/07 4:59 PM, in article 46e1d7ca\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> Good points Thad,
>>>
>>> I guess the point of view(s)from the so called "High-End" is that we've
> been
>>> sold some hardware updates with the promise of vastly superior performance
>>> results.
>>>
>>> We've been told we just wait until we get an 64 bit OS to go along with
> yur
>>> new 64 bit cpu and those new video cards. Then , you guys will have vastly
>>> superior performance greater than TDM.
>>>
>>> Well, again, we've been dupped,hood winked.. Bamboozeled :)
>>>
>>> Truth is : The average Native Power DAW user has spent the equivalent to
> an
>>> Pro Tools HD setup. AND, the funny thing is, this kind of user will keep
>>> on chasing that elusive "Native" faster Than Pro Tools Rig" not realizing
>>> that he or she has spent "WAY" more say over 15k in a native solution.
>>>
>>> That's the frustration: And as James M has stated onm any occasions,
>>> they(DAW
>>> manufacturing companies) only really care about is the Bed Room user.
> with
>>> products 8 & 2 channels channels at a time with chessy at best on board
>>> pre-amps.
>>>
>>> Suprisingly: The Computer makers (DELL, Apple, HP, Gateway, etc) have

> been
>>> great to our community. Today we can purchase a very fast dual-core
>>> intel/AMD
>>> for \$500.00 bucks...then add a nother drive \$100.00 bucks or less..instant
>>> DAW..
>>>
>>> Another source of frustration fro th eso called high-end, is again the
> hype
>>> aroudn so called hardware devices that's supposed to free up cpu
>>> resources.ie.
>>> UAD.. To this day I have purchased a single UAD Card due te fact that
> it
>>> does not free up any resources , but rather adds overhead. Read: Big
> Dongle.
>>> As well as the Tc-powercore..
>>>
>>> God Bless Steigberg Cakewalk ,& Samplitude for re-writting their code
> from
>>> scratch to take advantage of the Win 2000/XP platform. With their wrok,
>>> native DAW work would still be in the slow, third world midi-based land
> of
>>> Emagic and MOtu..
>>>
>>> So, whatdo we do..Do we continue to invest in Native rigs like BrianT(4-dual
>>> core) Opterons(Do the Math).. Scary.. Now, do you realize that a Pro
> Tools
>>> HD 1 accel cost under 5k..Another 16 hundred for i/o..Boom your into no
> excuse
>>> land. HD2 accel..street with 192 I/O around \$9600.00.. 128 tracks..with
>>> rediculous amount of plugin power..End of story..
>>>
>>> Oh yeah. You can run the above protool rigs on an G4-500-700,800.?????
>>>
>>>
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> Well, LaMont, I'll go back to my tried and true response. Native users
> really
>>>> want the power of [Pro Tools HD/SSL 9k/fill in blank] natively. Well,
> I
>>>> really
>>>> want to bang Scarlett Johansson but all the wanting it in the world won't
>>>> make it so.
>>>>
>>>> Don't take this too personally but I get a little sick of the 'power
> users'
>>>> simultaneously turning their noses up at the 'bedroom studio' market
> segment

>>>> while at the same time wanting everything in native land to be cheap,
> super
>>>> powerful, and easy to use. If the crap that us 'bedroom' guys use can't
>>> get
>>>> it done, well since you're so power user go off and spend a few million
>>> on
>>>> a Neve desk and a boatload of fancy hardware. Good on ya. It also hacks
>>> me
>>>> off that the 'bedroom studio' computer geeks like me spent nearly a decade
>>>> getting our noses bloody and doing the ditch digging to help get nativelyland
>>>> working only to be told that we don't know what the hell we're talking
> about.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Just sayin'
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom'
>>>> type
>>>>> who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users like
>>>> myself
>>>>> where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before
>>>>> editing)
>>>>> with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.
>>>>>
>>>>> All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to
> HD-TDM.
>>>>> They want it all(Power) natively. They wan t Pro Tools Power in Natively..
>>>>>
>>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> One question, Detric. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video
>>>>>> production?
>>>>>> XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track
> digital
>>>>>> studio in my living room. What's missing from that?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping.
> I
>>> haven't
>>>>>> installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell
>>>>>> workstations
>>>>>> into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks .

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 03:14:24 GMT

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

Pro Tools HD is extremely stable. My Nuendo rig is stable as well. But, Pro Tools is a complete "on stop" shop solution.

And, if you were to purchase a system these days, Digi throws in around 10-15k of the good plugins for Free.

It all comes down to this: The native way will always have you on the promise of more power the better treadmill. Read: System updates..\$\$\$\$\$\$

Pro Tools , yes out the gate is expensive, but you can run it on a very modest Mac or PC. You're not on the Native upgrad bandwagon. Yes, you are stuck with with Digi...But, you can have your choice in I/O..(Lynx, Apogee, Prism)..

I guarantee you the Native is way more expensive in the long run, than a Pro Tools HD 3Acell rig..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Wherever did you get the idea I use workarounds or that native is a
>workaround? I simply said Totalmix was a less elegant solution to
>accomplish monitoring, but clearly stated that ProTools holds the advantage
>in large tracking sessions.

>

>How many people here read a few lines, guess the rest, and hit reply? ;-))

>

>Btw, I'm doing post for a film, several corporate docs (international
>clients, not local stuff), all in Nuendo - works perfectly. I wouldn't
say

>a native DAW is optimal for a live 30-40 input tracking session, with
>monitor feeds to musicians, but I know guys doing it daily.

>

>ProTools doesn't have a reputation for absolute stability, so let's not
talk

>about "peace of mind". My rig never fails me and keeps me busy 6-7 days
a

>week, so I guess that would be called a pretty solid "peace of mind".

>

>Dedric

>

>On 9/7/07 8:07 PM, in article 46e203c7\$1@linux, "LaMontt"

><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>>

>> However, what kinda price do you put on "piece of mind". Work arounds,
Total

>> mix?? Yikes!!

>>
>> How much does, "it just works" cost?? :)
>>
>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> Lamont - you might want to add up the equivalent plugin counts on a HD
accel
>>> card and compare it to, for example, a UAD-1. The cost is more than
double
>>> per plugin compared to a UAD-1, with PCs and all hardware factored
>>> in/balanced off. So, who's hoodwinking who? ;-)
>>>
>>> Digi has no interest in preventing you from spending too much money.
Just
>>> compare the cost of a TDM plugin to a native version - same plugin -
Waves,
>>> UAD, etc. Then add not only the cost of an Accel card, I/O, but also
the
>>> computer, peripherals, conversion add ons that aren't included in PT,
etc.
>>>
>>> When doing price comparisons I've never spec'd a PT rig under about \$12k
>>> that equaled what I do with my \$1700 Core 2, RME interfaces and Nuendo.
>>>
>>> If you are tracking 40+ live tracks, then yes, native's latency may become
>> a
>>> disadvantage depending on what you need to monitor. A PT rig will give
>> you
>>> near zero latency monitoring, but much the same can be done with RME
>>> totalmix, Cuemix etc, though not as elegantly for sure.
>>>
>>> However, for production, scoring, editing, sound design, and many mixing
>>> scenarios, etc - it's hard to justify the extra cost for PT HD per plugin,
>>> or per track. It is significantly higher than native, easily.
>>>
>>> Btw - you should check out the track count mix Brian posted on the Nuendo
>>> forum recently
>>> ([http://forum.nuendo.com/phpbb2/viewtopic.php?t=13740&pos_tdays=0&postorder=a](http://forum.nuendo.com/phpbb2/viewtopic.php?t=13740&pos_tdays=0&postorder=a&sc&start=300)
>>> [sc&start=300](http://forum.nuendo.com/phpbb2/viewtopic.php?t=13740&pos_tdays=0&postorder=a&sc&start=300)).
>>>
>>> I really doubt you could come close to matching it with PTHD for the
cost.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedic
>>>
>>> On 9/7/07 4:59 PM, in article 46e1d7ca\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>

>>>>
>>>> Good points Thad,
>>>>
>>>> I guess the point of view(s)from the so called "High-End" is that we've
>> been
>>>> sold some hardware updates with the promise of vastly superior performance
>>>> results.
>>>>
>>>> We've been told we just wait until we get an 64 bit OS to go along with
>> yur
>>>> new 64 bit cpu and those new video cards. Then , you guys will have
vastly
>>>> superior performance greater than TDM.
>>>>
>>>> Well, again, we've been dupped,hood winked.. Bamboozeled :)
>>>>
>>>> Truth is : The average Native Power DAW user has spent the equivlent
to
>> an
>>>> Pro Tools HD setup. AND, the funny thing is, this kind of user will
keep
>>>> on chasing that elussive "Native" faster Than Pro Tools Rig" not realizing
>>>> that he or she has spent "WAY" more say over 15k in a native solution.
>>>>
>>>> That's the frustration: And as James M has stated onm any occasions,
>>>> they(DAW
>>>> manufacturing companies) only really care about is the Bed Room user.
>> with
>>>> products 8 & 2 channels channels at a time with chessy at best on board
>>>> pre-amps.
>>>>
>>>> Suprisingly: The Computer makers (DELL, Apple, HP, Gateway, etc) have
>> been
>>>> great to our community. Today we can purchase a very fast dual-core
>>>> intel/AMD
>>>> for \$500.00 bucks...then add a nother drive \$100.00 bucks or less..instant
>>>> DAW..
>>>>
>>>> Another source of frustration fro th eso called high-end, is again the
>> hype
>>>> aroudn so called hardware devices that's supposed to free up cpu
>>>> resources.ie.
>>>> UAD.. To this day I have purchased a single UAD Card due te fact that
>> it
>>>> does not free up any resources , but rather adds overhead. Read: Big
>> Dongle.
>>>> As well as the Tc-powercore..
>>>>

>>>> God Bless Steigberg Cakewalk ,& Samplitude for re-writing their code
>> from
>>>> scratch to take advantage of the Win 2000/XP platform. With their wrok,
>>>> native DAW work would still be in the slow, third world midi-based land
>> of
>>>> Emagic and MOtu..
>>>>
>>>> So, whatdo we do..Do we continue to invest in Native rigs like BrianT(4-dual
>>>> core) Opterons(Do the Math).. Scary.. Now, do you realize that a Pro
>> Tools
>>>> HD 1accel cost under 5k..Another 16 hundred for i/o..Boom your into
no
>> excuse
>>>> land. HD2 accel..street with 192 I/O around \$9600.00.. 128 tracks..with
>>>> rediculous amount of plugin power..End of story..
>>>>
>>>> Oh yeah. You can run the above protool rigs on an G4-500-700,800.?????
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> Well, LaMont, I'll go back to my tried and true response. Native users
>> really
>>>>> want the power of [Pro Tools HD/SSL 9k/fill in blank] natively. Well,
>> I
>>>>> really
>>>>> want to bang Scarlett Johansson but all the wanting it in the world
won't
>>>>> make it so.
>>>>>
>>>>> Don't take this too personally but I get a little sick of the 'power
>> users'
>>>>> simultaneously turning their noses up at the 'bedroom studio' market
>> segment
>>>>> while at the same time wanting everything in native land to be cheap,
>> super
>>>>> powerful, and easy to use. If the crap that us 'bedroom' guys use can't
>>>> get
>>>>> it done, well since you're so power user go off and spend a few million
>>>> on
>>>>> a Neve desk and a boatload of fancy hardware. Good on ya. It also hacks
>>>> me
>>>>> off that the 'bedroom studio' computer geeks like me spent nearly a
decade
>>>>> getting our noses bloody and doing the ditch digging to help get nativeland
>>>>> working only to be told that we don't know what the hell we're talking
>> about.
>>>>>

>>>>
>>>> Just sayin'
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> Thad, you are talkign about 2 different market segments. The 'Bedroom'
>>>> type
>>>>> who 48 tracks is more than enough..Then there are the power users
like
>>>> myself
>>>>> where are song tracking session can reach upwards to 90 plus (before
>>>>> editing)
>>>>> with power hungry plugins, and low latency for those running ITB.
>>>>>
>>>>> All in all, the power "Native" daw user does not want to go over to
>> HD-TDM.
>>>>> They want it all(Power) natively. They wan t Pro Tools Power in Natively..
>>>>>
>>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> One question, Detric. Why do we need an OS dedicated to audio/video
>>>>>> production?
>>>>>> XP or OS X + software + quality audio interface gives me a 48 track
>> digital
>>>>>> studio in my living room. What's missing from that?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Also, if you want to try it out Ubuntu Studio is actually shipping.
>> I
>>>> haven't
>>>>>> installed it but we just got 20 dual processor dual core Dell
>>>>>> workstations
>>>>>> into my office and I just might try one of them with it for kicks

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [DJ](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 03:24:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Detric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C30741D4.C813%dterry@keyofd.net...
> In real world use, XP and OSX are fine, and maybe there wouldn't be much
> to
> gain from a dedicated system beyond enhanced stability or just consistency
> perhaps (thought that isn't really an issue on my XP systems), but my
> thinking is drivers could be tighter and general media streaming wouldn't
> be

> subject to normal OS interaction, but I could be wrong.
>
> I guess your last question really depends on the reality of what would or
> wouldn't be gained by a dedicated OS. Hard to say, but as long as we work
> with commercial OSs that are geared towards a wide range of uses, it is
> clear that we will always wonder what we might be missing. Along these
> lines though, I think it's only fair that we question the efficiency of
> hardware that is based on a 30 year old legacy model (IRQs, etc).
>
> Dedic
>

All I would like to do is to be able to run Cubase 4 on a dual socket Quad Core mobo with something like 4GB RAM and be able to use my UAD-1 cards as well. I know Cubase isn't able to utilize the Dual quads yet but I would be quite happy to run win XP from now on if it could utilize these. Unfortunately, I don't think that will be the case, which is the reason that when I decide to make some kind of quantum leap, it may be to a Mac.

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.
Posted by [Dedic Terry](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 03:55:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 9/7/07 8:06 PM, in article 46e20390\$1@linux, "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by
>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling
>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic

> Dedic, your comment insinuates that Apple is a toy company that does not
> make serious computers, that is a slam. Apple products are not toys. Right

You are right, it might insinuate that, but it wasn't intended to be a jab at Macs, but just a reference to the consumer/entertainment level apps that are at the forefront of Apple's marketing - they aren't sub-par apps for what they do - but they are home/entertainment apps when compared to workplace apps like Photoshop, Nuendo/ProTools, Final Cut Pro, etc, so let's not kid ourselves that Apple is intent on marketing a Mac to the average CompUsa or BestBuy shopper based on Final Cut Pro's gaussian blur rendering

speed, or the number of instances of Kontakt Logic can run. Neither is Microsoft.

No, Macs are not toys, and Apple does a good job of putting together a complete package with useful and nicely designed apps for the home/entertainment user, and can be useful in the workplace as well.

But, James, you are overly sensitive to any mention of Macs and always assume it's negative. Try to lighten up a bit and read more objectively. It would make conversing about platform pros and cons (yes, they have both), much easier and informative, which is what this forum is usually about.

To that end, let's just settle the hardware cost/quality debate once and for all:

Open up a new dual core 2 Mac pro, spec the cpus (dual 6600 etc), motherboard (which will be name/brandless I am guessing, so just supply the specs (I/O, drive ports, max ram, fsb, etc) and a photo), hard drive bays, drive models, capacity and number, ram brand and specs, power supply brand/model/power rating, DVD drive brand/model, etc. Seriously - it would better serve users who are highly tech savvy to know what they are getting should they/we decide to buy a Mac at some point, rather than always getting the same generic defensive posture from Mac users - let's put it all to the test. I couldn't care less which is cheaper, or a better bang for the buck - I just want to see that for once we could have an objective discussion about them on this forum, and put real numbers to the defensive speculating on the Mac end.

As far as service, I'm sure Apple's service is good (I have film/video producer friends I work with that have used it, several times...), but the service I got from Staples/HP the one time I had to use it, was, however surprisingly, much better and way faster - can't beat 20 minutes from dead PC to new one that is twice as fast, not a refurb, no bench test, no shipping costs - that rivals golden support packages from high tech companies, esp. considering that Staples is only 300 yds from my office ;-).

Dedric

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 04:00:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dedric Terry wrote:

> Btw, I'm doing post for a film, several corporate docs (international
> clients, not local stuff), all in Nuendo - works perfectly. I wouldn't say
> a native DAW is optimal for a live 30-40 input tracking session, with
> monitor feeds to musicians, but I know guys doing it daily.

Sounds like you're keeping busy with some cool projects. Congrats!

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discussion) irritating.
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 04:03:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don't quite know why you can't get a thumb drive to work with Vista.
All mine do, and they're all generic, largest is 4gb, but the usb 40 gb
notebook drive works perfectly as well.--

Martin Harrington
Lend An Ear Sound
Sydney, Australia
0414 913 247

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.
Posted by [Neil](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 05:13:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>I guarantee you the Native is way more expensive in the long run, than a
>Pro Tools HD 3Acell rig..

Well, that's just bullshit Lamont, because I can guarantee you
- whether you choose to believe it or not - that I've not spent
\$20k-\$25k on Native-related upgrades, hardware reconfigs, etc
since HD3 came out. And my shit is competitive, if not better
than what can be cranked out on an HD system - you've heard it
yourself and said as much.

Frankly, I don't even see how you could get CLOSE to the cost of
an HD system in the Native Realm unless you went with MADI for
hardware & Nuendo or Samplitude (the most expensive Native apps
to my knowledge) on the soft side.

Neil

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discussion) irritating.
Posted by [Neil](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 05:41:44 GMT

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

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

>Don't take this too personally but I get a little sick of the 'power users'
>simultaneously turning their noses up at the 'bedroom studio' market segment
>while at the same time wanting everything in native land to be cheap, super
>powerful, and easy to use. If the crap that us 'bedroom' guys use can't
get
>it done, well since you're so power user go off and spend a few million
on
>a Neve desk and a boatload of fancy hardware. Good on ya. It also hacks
me
>off that the 'bedroom studio' computer geeks like me spent nearly a decade
>getting our noses bloody and doing the ditch digging to help get nativelyland
>working only to be told that we don't know what the hell we're talking about.

Good points, all, Thadster.

Native Neil

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.

Posted by [Neil](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 05:46:10 GMT

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

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

>
>However, what kinda price do you put on "piece of mind". Work arounds, Total
>mix?? Yikes!!

What's wrong with Totalmix? It's essentially a zero-latency monitoring application... if you look at it primarily from that perspective, then chances are, yer cool.

Neil

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.

Posted by [LaMon](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 17:42:22 GMT

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

Total mix is cool, but do I want to look a another mixer app while I'm working?
For me no.. Why can't total mix just Morph in with the DAW mixer? Just one
mixer with same funtionality. Neil, the same you feel about using 2 computers
, the one being for sum mixing..

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

>

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

>>

>>However, what kinda price do you put on "piece of mind". Work arounds,
Total

>>mix?? Yikes!!

>

>What's wrong with Totalmix? It's essentially a zero-latency

>monitoring application... if you look at it primarily from that

>perspective, then chances are, yer cool.

>

>Neil

>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.

Posted by [LaMon](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 18:03:08 GMT

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

Hey Man,

look, ask those guys on Nuendo.com how they spent on their Native PC rigs, you'd be shocked.. Plus, and I'm speaking of myself as well..As soon as AMD or Intel introduces another new whiz bang chip, say 8 core or 16 core processors, we jump and rebuild our etire systems.. Yes, at first it SEEMS not that expensive...But, If really honest and do the math from the time you Native...You'd be shocked at you , Me and others have spent with trying to reach that Native Nirvana..

In the time I started using Nuendo (2002), I have upgraded 4 times.

The PC DAW builders including myself, was happy as well the music store outlets, and Like James M states the Manufacturers who know they have the elusive bait with the Native user market..

Let's not even talk about lost productivity with reiventing your Pc every 2 years..Chasing and waiting on DAW maufactuers to Catch up with the new hardware offerings.. This is the very scenario that prompted me to start this thread..

we just spec'ed out a new PT HD 3 for another room at the studio..Sweetwater rep go t back with us with a price of 25K with a slew of top of the line plugs. But, just for discussion sake, I personally don;t need a PT 3HD, a HD2accel wol dmore than do..128 tracks, really flexible mixer and routing..nero zero latency for say with I/O 14-15k...And this can run on a 500 pc an or old mac ..

I'm not saying that PT is the bell end all, but rather just making point as to how much is the real TCO -Total Cost Of Ownership of staying with high-end Native.

It's big bucks for them..So, like the commercial states: You can pay me now,
Or you can Pay me later..

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

>

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

>>I guarantee you the Native is way more expensive in the long run, than

a

>>Pro Tools HD 3Acell rig..

>

>Well, that's just bullshit Lamont, because I can guarantee you

>- whether you choose to believe it or not - that I've not spent

>\$20k-\$25k on Native-related upgrades, hardware reconfigs, etc

>since HD3 came out. And my shit is competitive, if not better

>than what can be cranked out on an HD system - you've heard it

>yourself and said as much.

>Frankly, I don't even see how you could get CLOSE to the cost of

>an HD system in the Native Realm unless you went with MADI for

>hardware & Nuendo or Samplitude (the most expensive Native apps

>to my knowledge) on the soft side.

>

>Neil

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.

Posted by [DJ](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 19:58:47 GMT

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

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:46e1c65d\$1@linux...

>

> Well, LaMont, I'll go back to my tried and true response. Native users

> really

> want the power of [Pro Tools HD/SSL 9k/fill in blank] natively. Well, I

> really

> want to bang Scarlett Johansson but all the wanting it in the world won't

> make it so.

.....and whoda' thunk that gawky little thing would end up being such
a hottie when she debuted in the Horse Whisperer?

>

> Don't take this too personally but I get a little sick of the 'power

> users'

> simultaneously turning their noses up at the 'bedroom studio' market

> segment
> while at the same time wanting everything in native land to be cheap,
> super
> powerful, and easy to use. If the crap that us 'bedroom' guys use can't
> get
> it done, well since you're so power user go off and spend a few million on
> a Neve desk and a boatload of fancy hardware. Good on ya. It also hacks me
> off that the 'bedroom studio' computer geeks like me spent nearly a decade
> getting our noses bloody and doing the ditch digging to help get
> nativeland
> working only to be told that we don't know what the hell we're talking
> about.

Ya know, I just dug up a big pile of those old Home Recording magazines when cleaning out an old closet. I've been segregating them from the rest of my audio porn (which, with the exception of a few issues) will soon be relegated to the shredder to make excelsiorlike material for igniting kindling in our big fireplace since it's getting cold here now at night (mid 40's is the norm-trees are turning already)

Those HR mags are still a good read because they talk about how do do something instead of how warm tubes sound..Guess I'll never be a power suer since every time I open HR, I actually learn something I didn't know, even after almost 10 years at this.

Hmmmm.....well.....so much for my OT rant

;o)

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista discusion) irritating.

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Sat, 08 Sep 2007 23:27:16 GMT

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

Dedric Terry wrote:

> On 9/7/07 8:06 PM, in article 46e20390\$1@linux, "James McCloskey"

> <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

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

>>> I think the moral of the story is that pro audio is best handled by

>>> developers in that market, not companies more interested in selling

>>> operating systems, home computers, and/or iToys.

>>>

>>> Regards,

>>> Dedric

>

>

>> Dedric, your comment insinuates that Apple is a toy company that does not

>> make serious computers, that is a slam. Apple products are not toys. Right
>
> You are right, it might insinuate that, but it wasn't intended to be a jab
> at Macs, but just a reference to the consumer/entertainment level apps that
> are at the forefront of Apple's marketing - they aren't sub-par apps for
> what they do - but they are home/entertainment apps when compared to
> workplace apps like Photoshop, Nuendo/ProTools, Final Cut Pro, etc, so let's
> not kid ourselves that Apple is intent on marketing a Mac to the average
> CompUSA or BestBuy shopper based on Final Cut Pro's gaussian blur rendering
> speed, or the number of instances of Kontakt Logic can run. Neither is
> Microsoft.

Marketing to one market doesn't exclude the other, so it can't be a legitimately serious put down of the Mac, as you say. Clearly Apple is also marketing decent products to professional media folks at the same time, and have been for years.

> No, Macs are not toys, and Apple does a good job of putting together a
> complete package with useful and nicely designed apps for the
> home/entertainment user, and can be useful in the workplace as well.
>
> But, James, you are overly sensitive to any mention of Macs and always
> assume it's negative. Try to lighten up a bit and read more objectively.
> It would make conversing about platform pros and cons (yes, they have both),
> much easier and informative, which is what this forum is usually about.
>
> To that end, let's just settle the hardware cost/quality debate once and for
> all:
>
> Open up a new dual core 2 Mac pro, spec the cpus (dual 6600 etc),
> motherboard (which will be name/brandless I am guessing, so just supply the
> specs (I/O, drive ports, max ram, fsb, etc) and a photo), hard drive bays,
> drive models, capacity and number, ram brand and specs, power supply
> brand/model/power rating, DVD drive brand/model, etc. Seriously - it would
> better serve users who are highly tech savvy to know what they are getting
> should they/we decide to buy a Mac at some point, rather than always getting
> the same generic defensive posture from Mac users - let's put it all to the
> test. I couldn't care less which is cheaper, or a better bang for the buck
> - I just want to see that for once we could have an objective discussion
> about them on this forum, and put real numbers to the defensive speculating
> on the Mac end.

There are a couple of web sites that regularly review the hardware specs and performance.

Beyond just the pile of components and the case they come in, the elegance of the OS matters to some folks. So whether the whole package

is worth it or not is a judgment call.

Things I think about include the total system abilities and speed, the elegance of integration between apps, the amount of time it does (or doesn't) take to keep the system running, the useful life of the system, and the overall reliability over that life. Time is money, so initial cost is just one consideration (not an unimportant consideration, but not the only consideration).

Based on their own considerations, different people with different experiences and expectations choose different systems, which helps keep the market at least somewhat vibrant given the few choices remaining.

> As far as service, I'm sure Apple's service is good (I have film/video
> producer friends I work with that have used it, several times...), but the
> service I got from Staples/HP the one time I had to use it, was, however
> surprisingly, much better and way faster - can't beat 20 minutes from dead
> PC to new one that is twice as fast, not a refurb, no bench test, no
> shipping costs - that rivals golden support packages from high tech
> companies, esp. considering that Staples is only 300 yds from my office ;-).

That sounds pretty handy. They just put a Staples up near my old house in Conifer. It would have been nice to have that when I lived there...

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

> Detric
>

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 01:31:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Lamont,
The vast majority of people that make a living using Nuendo, Cubase or another app for that matter do not upgrade their systems that often. The vast majority of people who waste bandwidth on Steinies, Cakewalk's and even DUC are at best enthusiasts on par with DIY gamer kids. But thats mainly the companies fault for not managing their forums better.
Chris

LaMont wrote:

> Hey Man,
> look, ask those guys on Nuendo.com how they spent on their Native PC rigs,
> you'd be shocked.. Plus, and I'm speaking of myself as well..As soon as AMD
> or Intel introduces another new whiz bang chip, say 8 core or 16 core processors,
> we jump and rebuild our entire systems.. Yes, at first it SEEMS not that expensive...But,
> If really honest and do the math from the time you Native...You'd be shocked
> at you , Me and others have spent with trying to reach that Native Nirvana..
>
> In the time I started using Nuendo (2002), I have upgraded 4 times.
> The PC DAW builders including myself, was happy as well the music store outlets,
> and Like James M states the Manufacturers who know they have the elusive
> bait with the Native user market..
>
> Let's not even talk about lost productivity with reventing your Pc every
> 2 years..Chasing and waiting on DAW maufactuers to Catch up with the new
> hardware offerings.. This is the very scenario that prompted me to start
> this thread..
>
> we just spec'ed out a new PT HD 3 for another room at the studio..Sweetwater
> rep go t back with us with a price of 25K with a slew of top of the line
> plugs. But, just for discussion sake, I personally don;t need a PT 3HD, a
> HD2accel wol dmore than do..128 tracks, really flexible mixer and routing..nero
> zero latency for say with I/O 14-15k...And this can run on a 500 pc an or
> old mac ..
>
> I'm not saying that PT is the bell end all, but rather just making point
> as to how much is the real TCO -Total Cost Of Ownership of staying with
> high-end Native.
>
>
> It's big bucks for them..So, like the commercial states: You can pay me now,
> Or you can Pay me later..
>
>
>
> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>> I guarantee you the Native is way more expensive in the long run, than
>>>
> a
>
>>> Pro Tools HD 3Acell rig..
>>>
>> Well, that's just bullshit Lamont, because I can guarantee you
>> - whether you choose to believe it or not - that I've not spent
>> \$20k-\$25k on Native-related upgrades, hardware reconfigs, etc

>> since HD3 came out. And my shit is competitive, if not better
>> than what can be cranked out on an HD system - you've heard it
>> yourself and said as much.
>> Frankly, I don't even see how you could get CLOSE to the cost of
>> an HD system in the Native Realm unless you went with MADI for
>> hardware & Nuendo or Samplitude (the most expensive Native apps
>> to my knowledge) on the soft side.

>>
>> Neil
>>
>
>

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

Subject: Re: OT: 64 bit -Microsoft Vista (discussion) irritating.
Posted by [LaMon](#) on Sun, 09 Sep 2007 02:03:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chris, man have you been ont the Neundo's harware userlist site of late? Man, they are always specing new PC rig setups. In my circle, whenever INTEL or AMD makes a statement about a new CPU, they are already planning their new rig. And, they jump all the time..8 core, 4 cores ...Dual core..Dual Dual cores

The only people I don't see on the upgrade war path :) are the Pr Tools HD folks.

The PC market as you state has a very enthusiest mentality. And I agrre with you, with the online forums, the Upgrade discussion are never ending. Now, when you read your 'real-world" or beter State of what's really going on with DAW manufacuers, you can see how the users on the PC and Mac side are getting taking for and Expensive rider..

That's why I will always be a DSP DW guy first, a Native-via Mixer guy second..No ITB box for me..Too expensive in the long run..

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>Hi Lamont,
>The vast majority of people that make a living using Nuendo, Cubase or
>another app for that matter do not upgrade their systems that often.
>The vast majority of people who waste bandwidth on Steinies, Cakewalk's

>and even DUC are at best enthusiasts on par with DIY gamer kids.
>But thats mainly the companies fault for not managing their forums better.
>Chris
>
>LaMont wrote:
>> Hey Man,
>> look, ask those guys on Nuendo.com how they spent on their Native PC rigs,
>> you'd be shocked.. Plus, and I'm speaking of myself as well..As soon as
AMD
>> or Intel introduces another new whiz bang chip, say 8 core or 16 core processors,
>> we jump and rebuild our etire systems.. Yes, at first it SEEMS not that
expensive...But,
>> If really honest and do the math from the time you Native...You'd be shocked
>> at you , Me and others have spent with trying to reach that Native Nirvana..
>>
>> In the time I started using Nuendo (2002), I have upgraded 4 times.
>> The PC DAW builders including myself, was happy as well the music store
outlets,
>> and Like James M states the Manufacturers who know they have the elusive
>> bait with the Native user market..
>>
>> Let's not even talk about lost productivity with reiventing your Pc every
>> 2 years..Chasing and waiting on DAW maufactuers to Catch up with the new
>> hardware offerings.. This is the very scenario that prompted me to start
>> this thread..
>>
>> we just spec'ed out a new PT HD 3 for another room at the studio..Sweetwater
>> rep go t back with us with a price of 25K with a slew of top of the line
>> plugs. But, just for discussion sake, I personally don;t need a PT 3HD,
a
>> HD2accel wol dmore than do..128 tracks, really flexible mixer and routing..nero
>> zero latency for say with I/O 14-15k...And this can run on a 500 pc an
or
>> old mac ..
>>
>> I'm not saying that PT is the bell end all, but rather just making point
>> as to how much is the real TCO -Total Cost Of Ownership of staying with
>> high-end Native.
>>
>>
>> It's big bucks for them..So, like the commercial states: You can pay me
now,
>> Or you can Pay me later..
>>
>>
>>
>> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> I guarantee you the Native is way more expensive in the long run, than
>>>>
>> a
>>
>>>> Pro Tools HD 3Acell rig..
>>>>
>>> Well, that's just bullshit Lamont, because I can guarantee you
>>> - whether you choose to believe it or not - that I've not spent
>>> \$20k-\$25k on Native-related upgrades, hardware reconfigs, etc
>>> since HD3 came out. And my shit is competitive, if not better
>>> than what can be cranked out on an HD system - you've heard it
>>> yourself and said as much.
>>> Frankly, I don't even see how you could get CLOSE to the cost of
>>> an HD system in the Native Realm unless you went with MADI for
>>> hardware & Nuendo or Samplitude (the most expensive Native apps
>>> to my knowledge) on the soft side.
>>>
>>> Neil
>>>
>>
>>
>
>--
>Chris Ludwig
>ADK
>chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
>www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
>(859) 635-5762
