
Subject: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Fri, 18 Mar 2011 23:09:05 GMT

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

I posted a couple polls in the PARIS: Projects section, but so far only four people have responded, and that's not critical mass yet. Please let me know if you're interested in having me work on any of the old projects again...

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Fri, 18 Mar 2011 23:31:37 GMT

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

Voting yes again. Does that count for 2?

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Jim Drago\[2\]](#) on Fri, 18 Mar 2011 23:35:07 GMT

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

Interested in the line-lump option Kerry mentioned, probably won't ever be able to go for the motorized faders because of the \$\$\$\$. I only do this for fun...and as a hobby.

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [mikeaudet](#) on Mon, 21 Mar 2011 20:44:30 GMT

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

Hi Doug,

I'm voting yes! And, I'm offering to help any way I can.

Let's talk.

Mike

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [uptown jimmy](#) on Sun, 15 May 2011 21:58:30 GMT

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

Would the motorized fader box include transport controls and such? How would it behave across multiple submixes?

Jimmy

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Will The Weirdo](#) on Wed, 18 May 2011 22:45:46 GMT

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

Yes to the ADAT first.

Yes to the C-16 second.

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Will The Weirdo](#) on Wed, 18 May 2011 22:48:12 GMT

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

Jim Drago[2 wrote on Fri, 18 March 2011 16:35]Interested in the line-lump option Kerry mentioned,

What is the line lump option?

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Wed, 18 May 2011 23:36:52 GMT

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

The line lump is basically a box that sits between the C-16 and the computer. It converts from the serial protocol that the C-16 speaks to MIDI so that the C-16 can be used with other programs besides PARIS...

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [dnafe](#) on Wed, 18 May 2011 23:43:36 GMT

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

Now that's interesting indeed.

And what would it take to get a couple of those made?

I'm assuming the C16s would interface with the computer via a midi input?

One really dumb question is would any of the other controls, i.e. transport, solo, mute etc be usable?

Could you make one Reaper Specific?

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Wed, 18 May 2011 23:56:31 GMT

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

dnafe wrote on Wed, 18 May 2011 16:43 And what would it take to get a couple of those made? Time...

Quote:I'm assuming the C16s would interface with the computer via a midi input? Yes...

Quote:One really dumb question is would any of the other controls, i.e. transport, solo, mute etc be usable?

Could you make one Reaper Specific?

All the controls would be available. At some level, they are just button presses, so you'd need to map them for specific functions in your application. I don't use Reaper, but I'm sure the buttons could be mapped for that...

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [dnafe](#) on Thu, 19 May 2011 09:04:30 GMT

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

Check your PMs

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [wmarkwilson](#) on Sun, 29 May 2011 09:30:39 GMT

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

Yay from Dubya

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Hotrodstudio151](#) on Mon, 30 May 2011 17:09:20 GMT

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

I vote yes...I really need to come here and keep up with what's going on more often.

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [David L](#) on Mon, 30 May 2011 22:03:30 GMT

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

The line lump project would be very useful to me. Especially interfacing with Reaper.

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Tue, 31 May 2011 22:29:17 GMT

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

YES

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [hungaristan](#) on Tue, 14 Jun 2011 07:02:55 GMT

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

Yes to the line lump and the ADAT IF.

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Colin Simpson](#) on Tue, 14 Jun 2011 15:41:29 GMT

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

Me too for the line lump and the 24-bit ADAT interface.

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Tom Bruhl](#) on Thu, 23 Jun 2011 21:07:36 GMT

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

Hi Doug,

I am totally into having at least three C-16s motorized with the line lump. A fellow Paris user may also be interested in 3-5 C-16s being converted. Will they still work as always using the Cat5 with Paris too ? The 24bit ADAT rack is also a strong possibility for me.

If cash up front is needed please advise. I'd be happy to send you a C-16 and be your guinea pig.

Regards,
Tom

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [kerryg](#) on Thu, 23 Jun 2011 22:49:01 GMT

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

The line lump solution wouldn't motorize a C16 - it'd turn the C16 into a MIDI control surface so you could mix in other DAWs with it.

The way I'd always imagined it at its most basic is a little box with three sockets - Cat5 input and output plus MIDI out - and a couple of switches. You'd plug from the C16 to this little box's "in" and

then from the box's "out" to the EDS. Then you'd take a MIDI cable and connect the box to your DAW's MIDI in.

One switch on the box would toggle between EDS and MIDI operation (it'd need to be buffered in some way so as to prevent the motherboard-frying issues that can arise from "hot swapping" a C16). The other (say dip switches on the underside) would be to set the box to channelize the MIDI info it translates to a discrete MIDI channel so you could theoretically have up to sixteen C16s, each one set to a different channel.

Once again, just speculation about what it could look like, I have no idea if it'll wind up being feasible. But it'd be a pretty popular item if it were - assuming the price was in the "guitar stomp-box" range, I'd pre-purchase two on the spot the moment they were announced and I know I wouldn't be alone.

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Thu, 23 Jun 2011 23:00:58 GMT

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

kerryg wrote on Thu, 23 June 2011 15:49 The way I'd always imagined it at its most basic is a little box with three sockets - Cat5 input and output plus MIDI out - and a couple of switches. Well, *my* idea was to have three connectors, two RJ45s and a USB. The USB would provide power as well as communication to and from the computer. When you do something on the C-16, the signal would be sent out via both the RJ-45 (CAT5) and the USB at the same time, no mode change necessary...

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [kerryg](#) on Thu, 23 Jun 2011 23:19:15 GMT

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

You mean it'd have a *built-in* USB interface? Awesome! That doesn't have to mean it'd require drivers, right?

The reason I thought it would be good to have the C16 switchable between "EDS" and "MIDI" modes is for those people who want to run their DAW in tandem with their PARIS rig. Without that switchability, moving a fader will also change their mix in PARIS.

Awesome that you're looking at doing this! You're welcome to do pre-sales here if you want to, by the way. About how many units do you figure will make it worthwhile?

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Fri, 24 Jun 2011 00:25:47 GMT

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

kerryg wrote on Thu, 23 June 2011 16:19 You mean it'd have a *built-in* USB interface?

Awesome! That doesn't have to mean it'd require drivers, right?

The USB chip I used before uses a driver that creates a virtual serial port, so we'd have to convert from that to MIDI (or OSC even). I'll see what else is available...

Quote:The reason I thought it would be good to have the C16 switchable between "EDS" and "MIDI" modes is for those people who want to run their DAW in tandem with their PARIS rig.

Without that switchability, moving a fader will also change their mix in PARIS.

Yes, good point. Let me think about that...

Quote:Awesome that you're looking at doing this! You're welcome to do pre-sales here if you want to, by the way. About how many units do you figure will make it worthwhile?

Partly depends on how big the pcb ends up being and what kind of box I find to house it.

Subject: Re: Should I resurrect the old skunkworks hardware projects?

Posted by [Kim W.](#) on Mon, 04 Jul 2011 10:09:21 GMT

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

Hi Doug.

Count me in for the controller.

Glad you are still considering development of this "Holy Grail"
