
Subject: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 18:14:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when can expect MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?

2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather than 32 bit.

I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32 bit is enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the feasibility of going 64 bit.

Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff. most of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and 64 bit DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit OS faster, but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??

I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware, software companies come to an agreement .

I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital mixers, but that's it..

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 18:22:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running a 64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32 bit OS. The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been 64 bits or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real bump) for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the 64 bit version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's because M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better memory management.

If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through and through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be used on 32 bit versions of XP.

Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't think 64 bit operating systems make much difference.

TCB

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

>
>I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when can
expect
>MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?
>
>2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather than
>32 bit.
>
>I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32 bit
is
>enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the feasibility
>of going 64 bit.
>
>Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff.
most
>of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and 64 bit
>DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit OS faster,
>but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>
>I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware, software
>companies come to an agreement .
>
>I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital mixers,
>but that's it..

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 18:47:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit OS?? I do
have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..

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

>
>Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running
a
>64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages
>are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32 bit OS.
>The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been 64 bits
>or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real bump)
>for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the 64

bit
>version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's because
>M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better memory
>management.
>
>If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through
and
>through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk
>has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be used
on
>32 bit versions of XP.
>
>Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't think
64
>bit operating systems make much difference.
>
>TCB
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when can
>expect
>>MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?
>>
>>2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather than
>>32 bit.
>>
>>I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32 bit
>is
>>enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the feasability
>>of going 64 bit.
>>
>>Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff.
>most
>>of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and 64
bit
>>DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit OS faster,
>>but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>
>>I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware, software
>>companies come to an agreement .
>>
>>I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital mixers,
>>but that's it..
>

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 19:01:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yup, it's really 64 bit. Of course there is code in there to run legacy 32 bit (and 16 bit, sorta) apps, but the kernel and all of the low level stuff is really 64 bit. If your hardware has drivers for XP 64 the odds are good they'll work on Server 2003.

Server 2003 is also just about the best M\$oft OS I've ever dealt with. We had a machine serving up VMs that ran for 600+ days without a reboot and the reboot happened because we were renovating the office and had to take _everything_ down while major electrical work was done.

TCB

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

>

>Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit OS?? I do

>have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..

>

>

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

>>

>>Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running >a

>>64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages

>>are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32 bit OS.

>>The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been 64 bits

>>or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real bump)

>>for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the 64

>bit

>>version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's because

>>M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better memory

>>management.

>>

>>If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through

>and

>>through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk

>>has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be used

>on

>>32 bit versions of XP.

>>

>>Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't think

>64

>>bit operating systems make much difference.

>>

>>TCB
>>
>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when can
>>expect
>>>MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?
>>>
>>>2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather
than
>>>32 bit.
>>>
>>>I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32 bit
>>is
>>>enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the feasability
>>>of going 64 bit.
>>>
>>>Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff.
>>most
>>>of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and 64
>bit
>>>DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>>We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit OS
faster,
>>>but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>
>>>I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware, software
>>>companies come to an agreement .
>>>
>>>I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital
mixers,
>>>but that's it..
>>
>

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 19:56:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks THAD.. I agree with your accessments of Server 2003.. Solid!!

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

>
>Yup, it's really 64 bit. Of course there is code in there to run legacy
32
>bit (and 16 bit, sorta) apps, but the kernel and all of the low level stuff
>is really 64 bit. If your hardware has drivers for XP 64 the odds are good

>they'll work on Server 2003.
>
>Server 2003 is also just about the best M\$oft OS I've ever dealt with. We
>had a machine serving up VMs that ran for 600+ days without a reboot and
>the reboot happened because we were renovating the office and had to take
>_everything_ down while major electrical work was done.
>
>TCB
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit OS??
I
>do
>>have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..
>>
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running
>>a
>>>64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages
>>>are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32 bit
OS.
>>>The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been 64
>bits
>>>or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real
bump)
>>>for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the 64
>>bit
>>>version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's because
>>>M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better
memory
>>>management.
>>>
>>>If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through
>>and
>>>through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk
>>>has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be used
>>on
>>>32 bit versions of XP.
>>>
>>>Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't think
>>64
>>>bit operating systems make much difference.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>

>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when
>>>can
>>>expect
>>>>MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?
>>>>
>>>>2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather
>>>than
>>>>32 bit.
>>>>
>>>>I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32 bit
>>>is
>>>>enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the feasibility
>>>>of going 64 bit.
>>>>
>>>>Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff.
>>>most
>>>>of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and 64
>>bit
>>>>DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>>>We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit OS
>>faster,
>>>>but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>>
>>>>I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware, software
>>>>companies come to an agreement .
>>>>
>>>>I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital
>>mixers,
>>>>but that's it..
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 20:53:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Lamont,

The only thing preventing any 64 bit advancement at this point the 3rd party software and hardware manufacturers to write 64 bit driver and program support. The host applications need to come first. There is nothing close to a fully 64 bit audio app on any platform. All the plug-ins in Sonar are 32 bit and running in a shell to function in a 64 bit. All with anywhere from 5 to 10% resource hit. The plug-ins do get

the benefit of address a full 4 gigs but in most case are performing no better and in some cases far worse with this method.

Hardware developers right now do not have completely 64 bit coded drivers. In most cases they played with them enough so that they would install and function in a 64 bit OS and thats about it.

ASIO is still 32 bit, VST is still 32 bit. There is supposedly 64 bit available in the VST spec but not in ASIO AFAIK though no one is doing anything with it.

All of the main host programs run on 64 bit OS es just fine.

32 bit apps like Cubendo, Reaper, Sonar, Samplitude all run great on Windows 64 bit pro and can address up to 4 gigs of ram. But runs no better CPU performance wise than 32 bit XP. Windows 64 pro is basically just a stripped down Server 2003 64. But its more than likely gonna suffer a quiet death like Windows ME did.

All of these except Nuendo will install correctly in Vista 64. but with the current bottle necks in Vista and the unfinished audio WaveRT driver spec don't expect very good performance out of it anytime soon.

Sonar 32 bit no better than the 64 bit version ina 64 bit OS. The supposed benefit is you can use address beyond 4 gigs. Of course all of the VSTi in Sonar and all the 3rd party ones are 32 bit and they all still bottom out using Sonar's bit bridge at 4 gigs soooo.

The blame for this lies with all the parties. MS for not getting development resources out to companies faster. Companies for using that as an excuse to be lazy in there development.

Supposedly Steinyha are planning on Nuendo being 64 bit and finally making it so it can handle 4 or more core properly. But who knows. Every sense who ever in Germany decided to bail and cash in or whatever and sold to Pinnacle they have been in Chaos. Just before that point they were the most innovative and revolutionary company in the native audio software world and basically made the pro-audio sound card business outside be what it is today. There is not a single audio software that basically owes its very current existence to Steinberg innovations. But now who knows what their future is. Yamaha I think will hold on to them as long as possible and keep em going. Steinberg need to get back in focus soon before they loose too much more ground. I'm not sure who if anybody is actually steering the ship at this if anybody. They need to get back their creative direction and fast. All the copycats are circling around them like vultures at this point.

Chris

LaMont wrote:

> Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit OS?? I do
> have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..

>
>

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

>> Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running
> a

>> 64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages
>> are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32 bit OS.
>> The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been 64 bits
>> or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real bump)
>> for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the 64
> bit

>> version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's because
>> M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better memory
>> management.

>>
>> If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through
> and
>> through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk
>> has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be used
> on
>> 32 bit versions of XP.

>>
>> Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't think
> 64
>> bit operating systems make much difference.

>>
>> TCB

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

>>> I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when can
>> expect

>>> MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?

>>>
>>> 2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather than
>>> 32 bit.

>>>
>>> I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32 bit
>> is

>>> enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the feasibility
>>> of going 64 bit.

>>>
>>> Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff.
>> most

>>> of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and 64
> bit

>>> DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>> We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit OS faster,
>>> but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>
>>> I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware, software
>>> companies come to an agreement .
>>>
>>> I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital mixers,
>>> but that's it..
>

--

Chris Ludwig

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

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 21:43:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chris, great post.. Thanks for the history lessons on the state of Steinberg.

On Nuendo.com, Steingerg issues a statement concerning Nunedo 4. Stating that they wer not going to rush the product out and wanted to make sure they had properly tested the revision.

It never ends. Well, I think this opens the door for Apple to rush in with Killer (64bit) DAW along with thier 64 bit OS.

Also, I hear that Digi is already with a 64 bit version of Pro Tools on Both MS and Apple. So is Motu. So... Steiny better get it together.

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>Hi Lamont,

>

>The only thing preventing any 64 bit advancement at this point the 3rd
>party software and hardware manufacturers to write 64 bit driver and
>program support. The host applications need to come first. There is
>nothing close to a fully 64 bit audio app on any platform. All the
>plug-ins in Sonar are 32 bit and running in a shell to function in a 64

>bit. All with anywhere from 5 to 10% resource hit. The plug-ins do get
>the benefit of address a full 4 gigs but in most case are performing no

>better and in some cases far worse with this method.

>Hardware developers right now do not have completely 64 bit coded
 >drivers. In most cases they played with them enough so that they would
 >install and function in a 64 bit OS and thats about it.
 >ASIO is still 32 bit, VST is still 32 bit. There is supposedly 64 bit
 >available in the VST spec but not in ASIO AFAIK though no one is doing
 >anything with it.
 >
 >All of the main host programs run on 64 bit OS es just fine.
 >32 bit apps like Cubendo, Reaper, Sonar, Samplitude all run great on
 >Windows 64 bit pro and can address up to 4 gigs of ram. But runs no
 >better CPU performance wise than 32 bit XP. Windows 64 pro is basically

 >just a stripped down Server 2003 64. But its more than likely gonna
 >suffer a quiet death like Windows ME did.
 >All of these except Nuendo will install correctly in Vista 64. but with

 >the current bottle necks in Vista and the unfinished audio WaveRT driver

 >spec don't expect very good performance out of it anytime soon.
 >
 >Sonar 32 bit no better than the 64 bit version ina 64 bit OS. The
 >supposed benefit is you can use address beyond 4 gigs. Of course all of

 >the VSTi in Sonar and all the 3rd party ones are 32 bit and they all
 >still bottom out using Sonar's bit bridge at 4 gigs soooo.
 >
 >The blame for this lies with all the parties. MS for not getting
 >development resources out to companies faster. Companies for using that

 >as an excuse to be lazy in there development.
 >
 >Supposedly Steinyha are planning on Nuendo being 64 bit and finally
 >making it so it can handle 4 or more core properly. But who knows.
 >Every sense who ever in Germany decided to bail and cash in or whatever

 >and sold to Pinnacle they have been in Chaos. Just before that point
 >they were the most innovative and revolutionary company in the native
 >audio software world and basically made the pro-audio sound card
 >business outside be what it is today. There is not a single audio
 >software that basically owes its very current existence to Steinberg
 >innovations. But now who knows what their future is. Yamaha I think will

 >hold on to them as long as possible and keep em going. Steinberg need to

 >get back in focus soon before they loose too much more ground. I'm not
 >sure who if anybody is actually steering the ship at this if anybody.
 >They need to get back their creative direction and fast. All the
 >copycats are circling around them like vultures at this point.

>
>
>Chris
>
>
>
>LaMont wrote:
>> Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit OS??
I do
>> have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..
>>
>>
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>> Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running
>> a
>>> 64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages
>>> are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32 bit
OS.
>>> The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been 64
bits
>>> or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real
bump)
>>> for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the
64
>> bit
>>> version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's because
>>> M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better
memory
>>> management.
>>>
>>> If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through
>> and
>>> through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk
>>> has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be used
>> on
>>> 32 bit versions of XP.
>>>
>>> Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't think
>> 64
>>> bit operating systems make much difference.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when
can
>>> expect
>>>> MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?

>>>>
>>>> 2) When can we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather
than
>>>> 32 bit.
>>>>
>>>> I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32
bit
>>> is
>>>> enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the feasibility
>>>> of going 64 bit.
>>>>
>>>> Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff.
>>> most
>>>> of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an Win os and
64
>> bit
>>>> DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>>> We keep pouring money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit OS
faster,
>>>> but we are only seeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>>
>>>> I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware, software
>>>> companies come to an agreement .
>>>>
>>>> I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital
mixers,
>>>> but that's it..
>>
>
>--
>Chris Ludwig
>
>ADK Pro Audio
>(859) 635-5762
>www.adkproaudio.com
>chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 22:26:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Lamont,

LaMont wrote:

> Chris, great post.. Thanks for the history lessons on the state of Steinberg.
>

> On Nuendo.com, Steinberg issues a statement concerning Nuendo 4. Stating
> that they were not going to rush the product out and wanted to make sure they
> had properly tested the revision.

This technically is a good thing since Cubase 4 should never have come out. I should have come out when Nuendo 4 does. They were basically I think forced into it unprepared because of market/competition pressure of Sonar making their "claims" of 64 bit. But in the end only they are to blame for doing that. Cakewalk just saw the opportunity of Steinberg's Chaos.

>
> It never ends. Well, I think this opens the door for Apple to rush in with
> Killer (64bit) DAW along with their 64 bit OS.
>
> Also, I hear that Digi is already with a 64 bit version of Pro Tools on Both
> MS and Apple. So is Motu.

Well we'll have to see if it is really a purely 64 bit version or just made to work on the 64 bit platform.

MOTU and RME are the only units with reliable drivers in XP64 pro or Vista 64. RME is about to make a big splash on the Mac with all their HDSP line coming out in PCI-e format.

Now we just gotta wait for all the little podunk plug-in developers re-write their plug-ins to be 64 bit. Remember how long it took some of them to get around to doing a VST version or doing a Audio Unit or even worse a Intel Binary version? Multiply that by 2 lol.

So... Steiny better get it together.

yes I hope they do. Still got the bets over all GUI and concept in the biz. IMHO.

Chris

> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>> Hi Lamont,
>>
>> The only thing preventing any 64 bit advancement at this point the 3rd
>> party software and hardware manufacturers to write 64 bit driver and
>> program support. The host applications need to come first. There is

>> nothing close to a fully 64 bit audio app on any platform. All the
>> plug-ins in Sonar are 32 bit and running in a shell to function in a 64
>
>> bit. All with anywhere from 5 to 10% resource hit. The plug-ins do get
>> the benefit of address a full 4 gigs but in most case are performing no
>
>> better and in some cases far worse with this method.
>> Hardware developers right now do not have completely 64 bit coded
>> drivers. In most cases they played with them enough so that they would
>> install and function in a 64 bit OS and thats about it.
>> ASIO is still 32 bit, VST is still 32 bit. There is supposedly 64 bit
>> available in the VST spec but not in ASIO AFAIK though no one is doing
>> anything with it.
>>
>> All of the main host programs run on 64 bit OS es just fine.
>> 32 bit apps like Cubendo, Reaper, Sonar, Samplitude all run great on
>> Windows 64 bit pro and can address up to 4 gigs of ram. But runs no
>> better CPU performance wise than 32 bit XP. Windows 64 pro is basically
>
>> just a stripped down Server 2003 64. But its more than likely gonna
>> suffer a quiet death like Windows ME did.
>> All of these except Nuendo will install correctly in Vista 64. but with
>
>> the current bottle necks in Vista and the unfinished audio WaveRT driver
>
>> spec don't expect very good performance out of it anytime soon.
>>
>> Sonar 32 bit no better than the 64 bit version ina 64 bit OS. The
>> supposed benefit is you can use address beyond 4 gigs. Of course all of
>
>> the VSTi in Sonar and all the 3rd party ones are 32 bit and they all
>> still bottom out using Sonar's bit bridge at 4 gigs soooo.
>>
>> The blame for this lies with all the parties. MS for not getting
>> development resources out to companies faster. Companies for using that
>
>> as an excuse to be lazy in there development.
>>
>> Supposedly Steinyha are planning on Nuendo being 64 bit and finally
>> making it so it can handle 4 or more core properly. But who knows.
>> Every sense who ever in Germany decided to bail and cash in or whatever
>
>> and sold to Pinnacle they have been in Chaos. Just before that point
>> they were the most innovative and revolutionary company in the native
>> audio software world and basically made the pro-audio sound card
>> business outside be what it is today. There is not a single audio
>> software that basically owes its very current existence to Steinberg
>> innovations. But now who knows what their future is. Yamaha I think will

>
 >> hold on to them as long as possible and keep em going. Steinberg need to
 >
 >> get back in focus soon before they loose too much more ground. I'm not
 >> sure who if anybody is actually steering the ship at this if anybody.
 >> They need to get back their creative direction and fast. All the
 >> copycats are circling around them like vultures at this point.
 >>
 >>
 >> Chris
 >>
 >>
 >>
 >> LaMont wrote:
 >>> Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit OS??
 > I do
 >>> have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..
 >>>
 >>>
 >>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
 >>>> Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running
 >>> a
 >>>> 64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages
 >>>> are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32 bit
 > OS.
 >>>> The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been 64
 > bits
 >>>> or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real
 > bump)
 >>>> for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the
 > 64
 >>> bit
 >>>> version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's because
 >>>> M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better
 > memory
 >>>> management.
 >>>>
 >>>> If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through
 >>> and
 >>>> through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk
 >>>> has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be used
 >>> on
 >>>> 32 bit versions of XP.
 >>>>
 >>>> Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't think
 >>> 64
 >>>> bit operating systems make much difference.
 >>>>

>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>> I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when
> can
>>>>> expect
>>>>> MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?
>>>>>
>>>>> 2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather
> than
>>>>> 32 bit.
>>>>>
>>>>> I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32
> bit
>>>>> is
>>>>> enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the feasability
>>>>> of going 64 bit.
>>>>>
>>>>> Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff.
>>>>> most
>>>>> of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and
> 64
>>>>> bit
>>>>> DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>>>> We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit OS
> faster,
>>>>> but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>>>
>>>>> I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware, software
>>>>> companies come to an agreement .
>>>>>
>>>>> I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital
> mixers,
>>>>> but that's it..
>> --
>> Chris Ludwig
>>
>> ADK Pro Audio
>> (859) 635-5762
>> www.adkproaudio.com
>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>
--
Chris Ludwig

ADK Pro Audio
(859) 635-5762

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 13:29:46 GMT

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

Chris,

Unless a _lot_ of things have changed since I last talked to an audio developer, all of the audio DSP is being done in the floating point and (if you're lucky) the vector units on the chips. So is there _any_ advantage to an app coded in 64 bits other than RAM access? Second, considering that only a handful of converters (in either direction) can even pass 20 bits of meaningful data, why on earth would I _want_ DSP to be done on words larger than 32 bit float?

Maybe I'm missing something really really simple here, but I know, uh, a little bit about computers, and I just don't understand the hype.

OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple cores/processors much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have to be ready to take advantage of that.

TCB

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>Hi Lamont,

>

>The only thing preventing any 64 bit advancement at this point is the 3rd
>party software and hardware manufacturers to write 64 bit driver and
>program support. The host applications need to come first. There is
>nothing close to a fully 64 bit audio app on any platform. All the
>plug-ins in Sonar are 32 bit and running in a shell to function in a 64

>bit. All with anywhere from 5 to 10% resource hit. The plug-ins do get
>the benefit of address a full 4 gigs but in most cases are performing no

>better and in some cases far worse with this method.

>Hardware developers right now do not have completely 64 bit coded
>drivers. In most cases they played with them enough so that they would
>install and function in a 64 bit OS and that's about it.

>ASIO is still 32 bit, VST is still 32 bit. There is supposedly 64 bit
>available in the VST spec but not in ASIO AFAIK though no one is doing
>anything with it.

>

>All of the main host programs run on 64 bit OS'es just fine.

>32 bit apps like Cubendo, Reaper, Sonar, Samplitude all run great on

>Windows 64 bit pro and can address up to 4 gigs of ram. But runs no
>better CPU performance wise than 32 bit XP. Windows 64 pro is basically

>just a stripped down Server 2003 64. But its more than likely gonna
>suffer a quiet death like Windows ME did.
>All of these except Nuendo will install correctly in Vista 64. but with

>the current bottle necks in Vista and the unfinished audio WaveRT driver

>spec don't expect very good performance out of it anytime soon.
>
>Sonar 32 bit no better than the 64 bit version in a 64 bit OS. The
>supposed benefit is you can use address beyond 4 gigs. Of course all of

>the VSTi in Sonar and all the 3rd party ones are 32 bit and they all
>still bottom out using Sonar's bit bridge at 4 gigs soooo.
>
>The blame for this lies with all the parties. MS for not getting
>development resources out to companies faster. Companies for using that

>as an excuse to be lazy in their development.
>
>Supposedly Steinberg are planning on Nuendo being 64 bit and finally
>making it so it can handle 4 or more core properly. But who knows.
>Every sense who ever in Germany decided to bail and cash in or whatever

>and sold to Pinnacle they have been in Chaos. Just before that point
>they were the most innovative and revolutionary company in the native
>audio software world and basically made the pro-audio sound card
>business what it is today. There is not a single audio
>software that basically owes its very current existence to Steinberg
>innovations. But now who knows what their future is. Yamaha I think will

>hold on to them as long as possible and keep em going. Steinberg need to

>get back in focus soon before they lose too much more ground. I'm not
>sure who if anybody is actually steering the ship at this if anybody.
>They need to get back their creative direction and fast. All the
>copycats are circling around them like vultures at this point.
>
>
>Chris
>
>
>
>LaMont wrote:
>> Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit OS??
I do

>> have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..

>>

>>

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

>>> Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running

>> a

>>> 64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages

>>> are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32 bit OS.

>>> The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been 64 bits

>>> or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real bump)

>>> for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the 64

>> bit

>>> version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's because

>>> M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better memory

>>> management.

>>>

>>> If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through

>> and

>>> through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk

>>> has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be used

>> on

>>> 32 bit versions of XP.

>>>

>>> Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't think

>> 64

>>> bit operating systems make much difference.

>>>

>>> TCB

>>>

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

>>>> I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when can

>>> expect

>>>> MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?

>>>>

>>>> 2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather than

>>>> 32 bit.

>>>>

>>>> I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32 bit

>>> is

>>>> enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the feasibility

>>>> of going 64 bit.
>>>>
>>>> Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff.
>>> most
>>>> of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and
64
>> bit
>>>> DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>>> We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit OS
faster,
>>>> but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>>
>>>> I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware, software
>>>> companies come to an agreement .
>>>>
>>>> I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital
mixers,
>>>> but that's it..
>>
>
>--
>Chris Ludwig
>
>ADK Pro Audio
>(859) 635-5762
>www.adkproaudio.com
>chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 15:11:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple cores/processors much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have to be ready to take advantage of that.

You are right. They will have to re-code to take advantage all of that raw power.
But, I think one area where 64 bit code can help in, and that is wiith digital Summming. I think for a lot of DAWs, a bigger pipe could help..Right now, 32bits is ok , until you start hitting the sum bus hard.

Maybe, just maybe , they start instituting "modeling" of famous analogy mixers summing..

I disagree with you about 32 bit being enough. As with Asio and vst. You know that when you start bogging down down a project with audio tracks-Over

50, with eq & comps -30..vsti's 4, verbs 3....The asio/vst pipe starts to shrink..And it's very audible..

My hope and others are with 64bit, steinberg/Digi, Cakewalk, Motu and others can over this bottle neck, and let us (Mixers) Mix like we are use to.(Massive Head Room).. You know like Paris..

They are gettign there.. With every update to ProTools (LE, Mpowered and HD) the suming get's better and better.

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

>
>Chris,
>
>Unless a _lot_ of things have changed since I last talked to an audio developer,
>all of the audio DSP is being done in the floating point and (if you're
lucky)
>the vector units on the chips. So is there _any_ advantage to an app coded
>in 64 bits other than RAM access? Second, considering that only a handful
>of converters (in either direction) can even pas 20 bits of meaningful data,
>why on earth would I _want_ DSP to be done on words larger than 32 bit float?
>
>Maybe I'm missing something really really simple here, but I know, uh, a
>little bit about computers, and I just don't understand the hype.
>
>OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple cores/processors
>much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have to
>be ready to take advantage of that.

>
>TCB

>
>Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>>Hi Lamont,

>>

>>The only thing preventing any 64 bit advancement at this point the 3rd

>>party software and hardware manufacturers to write 64 bit driver and
>>program support. The host applications need to come first. There is
>>nothing close to a fully 64 bit audio app on any platform. All the
>>plug-ins in Sonar are 32 bit and running in a shell to function in a 64

>

>>bit. All with anywhere from 5 to 10% resource hit. The plug-ins do get

>>the benefit of address a full 4 gigs but in most case are performing no

>

>>better and in some cases far worse with this method.

>>Hardware developers right now do not have completely 64 bit coded
>>drivers. In most cases they played with them enough so that they would

>>install and function in a 64 bit OS and thats about it.
>>ASIO is still 32 bit, VST is still 32 bit. There is supposedly 64 bit
>>available in the VST spec but not in ASIO AFAIK though no one is doing

>>anything with it.
>>
>>All of the main host programs run on 64 bit OS es just fine.
>>32 bit apps like Cubendo, Reaper, Sonar, Samplitude all run great on
>>Windows 64 bit pro and can address up to 4 gigs of ram. But runs no
>>better CPU performance wise than 32 bit XP. Windows 64 pro is basically
>
>>just a stripped down Server 2003 64. But its more than likely gonna
>>suffer a quiet death like Windows ME did.
>>All of these except Nuendo will install correctly in Vista 64. but with
>
>>the current bottle necks in Vista and the unfinished audio WaveRT driver
>
>>spec don't expect very good performance out of it anytime soon.
>>
>>Sonar 32 bit no better than the 64 bit version ina 64 bit OS. The
>>supposed benefit is you can use address beyond 4 gigs. Of course all of
>
>>the VSTi in Sonar and all the 3rd party ones are 32 bit and they all
>>still bottom out using Sonar's bit bridge at 4 gigs soooo.
>>
>>The blame for this lies with all the parties. MS for not getting
>>development resources out to companies faster. Companies for using that
>
>>as an excuse to be lazy in there development.
>>
>>Supposedly Steinyha are planning on Nuendo being 64 bit and finally
>>making it so it can handle 4 or more core properly. But who knows.
>>Every sense who ever in Germany decided to bail and cash in or whatever
>
>>and sold to Pinnacle they have been in Chaos. Just before that point
>>they were the most innovative and revolutionary company in the native
>>audio software world and basically made the pro-audio sound card
>>business outside be what it is today. There is not a single audio
>>software that basically owes its very current existence to Steinberg
>>innovations. But now who knows what their future is. Yamaha I think will
>
>>hold on to them as long as possible and keep em going. Steinberg need to
>
>>get back in focus soon before they loose too much more ground. I'm not

>>sure who if anybody is actually steering the ship at this if anybody.
>>They need to get back their creative direction and fast. All the
>>copycats are circling around them like vultures at this point.
>>
>>
>>Chris
>>
>>
>>
>>LaMont wrote:
>>> Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit OS??
>I do
>>> have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..
>>>
>>>
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>> Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running
>>> a
>>>> 64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages
>>>> are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32 bit
>OS.
>>>> The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been
64
>bits
>>>> or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real
>bump)
>>>> for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the
>64
>>> bit
>>>> version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's because
>>>> M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better
>memory
>>>> management.
>>>>
>>>> If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through
>>> and
>>>> through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk
>>>> has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be used
>>> on
>>>> 32 bit versions of XP.
>>>>
>>>> Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't think
>>> 64
>>>> bit operating systems make much difference.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>>> I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when
>can
>>>> expect
>>>>> MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?
>>>>>
>>>>> 2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather
>than
>>>>> 32 bit.
>>>>>
>>>>> I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32
>bit
>>>> is
>>>>> enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the feasability
>>>>> of going 64 bit.
>>>>>
>>>>> Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff.
>>>> most
>>>>> of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and
>64
>>> bit
>>>>> DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>>>> We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit
OS
>faster,
>>>>> but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>>>
>>>>> I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware, software
>>>>> companies come to an agreement .
>>>>>
>>>>> I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital
>mixers,
>>>>> but that's it..
>>>
>>
>>--
>>Chris Ludwig
>>
>>ADK Pro Audio
>>(859) 635-5762
>>www.adkproaudio.com
>>chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 15:30:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But LaMont, all of the audio DSP/summing/mixing floating point processing, which could be 100% 64 bit on a 32 bit operating system. Hell, it could be 128 bit if people wanted it to be with most processors. And keep in mind, let's say this is your 32 bit word

```
1011101010100001010101010000011
```

Now let's say you have a 64 bit word that is identical for the first 32 bits, and then is different. It might look like this.

```
101110101010000101010101000001100111110101100010101010100000 10
```

Now if you do the same math on both of those words you _might_ have a different result in the 32nd place holder i.e. here

```
1011101010100001010101010000011
      ^
```

Every other bit will be exactly the same. Even thinking of these as decimal numbers (where adding a place holder multiplies the number represented by a factor of ten) for our stupid little decimal brains I can't see that mattering. In the case of binary numbers (where a place holder squares the available numbers) it's just comical to pretend we need a 64 bit words. Particularly when we'll have to halve our available DSP.

Personally I think a lot of the discussing of 'summing busses' is snake oil. But even if you do believe in that, as I know you do, it's a matter of preference not precision. I.e. you don't need more bits you need the programmers to program them more the way you want things to sound.

Do, don't, do, don't, don't believe the hype. Believe the math.

TCB

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

>

>OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple cores/processors
>much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have to
>be ready to take advantage of that.

>

>You are right. They will have to re-code to take advantage all of that raw
>power.

>But, I think one area where 64 bit code can help in, and that is wiith digital
>Summming. I think for a lot of DAWs, a bigger pipe could help..Right now,
>32bits is ok , until you start hitting the sum bus hard.

>

>Maybe, just maybe , they start instituting "modeling" of famous analogy
mixers

>summing..

>

>I disagree with you about 32 bit being enough. As with Asio and vst. You

>know that when you start bogging down down a project with audio tracks-Over

>50, with eq & comps -30..vsti's 4, verbs 3....The asio/vst pipe starts to

>shrink..And it's very audible..

>

>My hope and others are with 64bit, steinberg/Digi, Cakewalk, Motu and others

>can over this bottle neck, and let us (Mixers) Mix like we are use to.(Massive

>Head Room).. You know like Paris..

>They are gettign there.. With every update to ProTools (LE, Mpowered and

>HD) the suming get's better and better.

>

>

>

>

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

>>

>>Chris,

>>

>>Unless a _lot_ of things have changed since I last talked to an audio developer,

>>all of the audio DSP is being done in the floating point and (if you're

>lucky)

>>the vector units on the chips. So is there _any_ advantage to an app coded

>>in 64 bits other than RAM access? Second, considering that only a handful

>>of converters (in either direction) can even pas 20 bits of meaningful

data,

>>why on earth would I _want_ DSP to be done on words larger than 32 bit

float?

>>

>>Maybe I'm missing something really really simple here, but I know, uh,

a

>>little bit about computers, and I just don't understand the hype.

>>

>>OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple cores/processors

>>much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have

to

>>be ready to take advantage of that.

>>

>>TCB

>>

>>Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>>>Hi Lamont,

>>>

>>>The only thing preventing any 64 bit advancement at this point the 3rd

>

>>>party software and hardware manufacturers to write 64 bit driver and

>>>program support. The host applications need to come first. There is

>>>nothing close to a fully 64 bit audio app on any platform. All the
>>>plug-ins in Sonar are 32 bit and running in a shell to function in a 64
>>
>>>bit. All with anywhere from 5 to 10% resource hit. The plug-ins do get
>
>>>the benefit of address a full 4 gigs but in most case are performing no
>>
>>>better and in some cases far worse with this method.
>>>Hardware developers right now do not have completely 64 bit coded
>>>drivers. In most cases they played with them enough so that they would
>
>>>install and function in a 64 bit OS and thats about it.
>>>ASIO is still 32 bit, VST is still 32 bit. There is supposedly 64 bit

>>>available in the VST spec but not in ASIO AFAIK though no one is doing
>
>>>anything with it.
>>>
>>>All of the main host programs run on 64 bit OS es just fine.
>>>32 bit apps like Cubendo, Reaper, Sonar, Samplitude all run great on
>>>Windows 64 bit pro and can address up to 4 gigs of ram. But runs no
>>>better CPU performance wise than 32 bit XP. Windows 64 pro is basically
>>
>>>just a stripped down Server 2003 64. But its more than likely gonna
>>>suffer a quiet death like Windows ME did.
>>>All of these except Nuendo will install correctly in Vista 64. but with
>>
>>>the current bottle necks in Vista and the unfinished audio WaveRT driver
>>
>>>spec don't expect very good performance out of it anytime soon.
>>>
>>>Sonar 32 bit no better than the 64 bit version ina 64 bit OS. The
>>>supposed benefit is you can use address beyond 4 gigs. Of course all of
>>
>>>the VSTi in Sonar and all the 3rd party ones are 32 bit and they all
>>>still bottom out using Sonar's bit bridge at 4 gigs soooo.
>>>
>>>The blame for this lies with all the parties. MS for not getting
>>>development resources out to companies faster. Companies for using that
>>
>>>as an excuse to be lazy in there development.
>>>
>>>Supposedly Steinyha are planning on Nuendo being 64 bit and finally
>>>making it so it can handle 4 or more core properly. But who knows.
>>>Every sense who ever in Germany decided to bail and cash in or whatever
>>
>>>and sold to Pinnacle they have been in Chaos. Just before that point
>>>they were the most innovative and revolutionary company in the native

>>>audio software world and basically made the pro-audio sound card
>>>business outside be what it is today. There is not a single audio
>>>software that basically owes its very current existence to Steinberg
>>>innovations. But now who knows what their future is. Yamaha I think will
>>
>>>hold on to them as long as possible and keep em going. Steinberg need
to
>>
>>>get back in focus soon before they loose too much more ground. I'm not
>
>>>sure who if anybody is actually steering the ship at this if anybody.

>>>They need to get back their creative direction and fast. All the
>>>copycats are circling around them like vultures at this point.
>>>
>>>
>>>Chris
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>> Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit OS??
>>I do
>>>> have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>> Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running
>>>>> a
>>>>>> 64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages
>>>>>> are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32 bit
>>OS.
>>>>>> The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been
>>64
>>bits
>>>>>> or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real
>>bump)
>>>>>> for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the
>>64
>>>>> bit
>>>>>> version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's because
>>>>>> M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better
>>memory
>>>>>> management.
>>>>>
>>>>>> If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through
>>>> and

>>>>> through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk
>>>>> has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be
used
>>>> on
>>>>> 32 bit versions of XP.
>>>>>
>>>>> Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't think
>>>> 64
>>>>> bit operating systems make much difference.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>> I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when
>>can
>>>>> expect
>>>>>> MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> 2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather
>>than
>>>>>> 32 bit.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks 32
>>bit
>>>>> is
>>>>>> enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the
feasability
>>>>>> of going 64 bit.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster stuff.
>>>>> most
>>>>>> of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and
>>64
>>>> bit
>>>>>> DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>>>>> We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit
>OS
>>faster,
>>>>>> but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware,
software
>>>>>> companies come to an agreement .
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital
>>mixers,
>>>>>> but that's it..
>>>>>

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

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 20:35:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thad , you and all of those who use the pure logic of digital audio apparently don't use your ears.. I'm sorry man.. If you think all DAWs , converters sound the same using the same DAW, then you need better ears..

That's why we and many others have these discussions on sound.. Matter not what the math and the theory of Digital audio is.. DAWs and Converters sound different.

Some companies like Apogee, EMU/Ensoniq set out to make their converter color and distort in pleasing ways...

To simply say 01 010's 01 is not the whole story. DAW's sound different when using the same wave files.. The way parameters are coded are different per manufacturer.

This is an old argument that many Engineers will tell why they like a certain DAW and converters better than others..

The bottom line is this: We like pleasing gentle Harmonic Distortion. Ensoniq figure out how to do it. So did Apogee and others (Sony).. We like some Color in our converters..

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

>
>But LaMont, all of the audio DSP/summing/mixing floating point processing,
>which could be 100% 64 bit on a 32 bit operating system. Hell, it could be
>128 bit if people wanted it to be with most processors. And keep in mind,
>let's say this is your 32 bit word
>
>1011101010100001010101010000011
>

>Now let's say you have a 64 bit word that is identical for the first 32 bits,
>and then is different. It might look like this.
>
> 101110101010000101010101000001100111110101100010101010100000 10
>
>Now if you do the same math on both of those words you _might_ have a different
>result in the 32nd place holder i.e. here
>
>1011101010100001010101010000011
 ^
>
>
>Every other bit will be exactly the same. Even thinking of these as decimal
>numbers (where adding a place holder multiplies the number represented by
>a factor of ten) for our stupid little decimal brains I can't see that mattering.
>In the case of binary numbers (where a place holder squares the available
>numbers) it's just comical to pretend we need a 64 bit words. Particularly
>when we'll have to halve our available DSP.
>
>Personally I think a lot of the discussing of 'summing busses' is snake oil.
>But even if you do believe in that, as I know you do, it's a matter of preference
>not precision. I.e. you don't need more bits you need the programmers to
>program them more the way you want things to sound.
>
>Do, don't, do, don't, don't believe the hype. Believe the math.
>
>TCB
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple cores/processors
>>much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have to
>>be ready to take advantage of that.
>>
>>You are right. They will have to re-code to take advantage all of that raw
>>power.
>>But, I think one area where 64 bit code can help in, and that is wiith digital
>>Summming. I think for a lot of DAWs, a bigger pipe could help..Right now,
>>32bits is ok , until you start hitting the sum bus hard.
>>
>>Maybe, just maybe , they start instituting "modeling" of famous analogy
>mixers
>>summing..
>>

>>I disagree with you about 32 bit being enough. As with Asio and vst. You
>>know that when you start bogging down down a project with audio tracks-Over
>>50, with eq & comps -30..vsti's 4, verbs 3....The asio/vst pipe starts
to
>>shrink..And it's very audible..
>>
>>My hope and others are with 64bit, steinberg/Digi, Cakewalk, Motu and others
>>can over this bottle neck, and let us (Mixers) Mix like we are use to.(Massive
>>Head Room).. You know like Paris..
>>They are gettign there.. With every update to ProTools (LE, Mpowered and
>>HD) the suming get's better and better.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Chris,
>>>
>>>Unless a _lot_ of things have changed since I last talked to an audio
developer,
>>>all of the audio DSP is being done in the floating point and (if you're
>>lucky)
>>>the vector units on the chips. So is there _any_ advantage to an app coded
>>>in 64 bits other than RAM access? Second, considering that only a handful
>>>of converters (in either direction) can even pas 20 bits of meaningful
>data,
>>>why on earth would I _want_ DSP to be done on words larger than 32 bit
>float?
>>>
>>>Maybe I'm missing something really really simple here, but I know, uh,
>a
>>>little bit about computers, and I just don't understand the hype.
>>>
>>>OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple cores/processors
>>>much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have
>to
>>>be ready to take advantage of that.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>>Hi Lamont,
>>>>
>>>>The only thing preventing any 64 bit advancement at this point the 3rd
>>
>>>>party software and hardware manufacturers to write 64 bit driver and

>>>>program support. The host applications need to come first. There is
>>>>nothing close to a fully 64 bit audio app on any platform. All the
>>>>plug-ins in Sonar are 32 bit and running in a shell to function in a
64
>>>
>>>>bit. All with anywhere from 5 to 10% resource hit. The plug-ins do get
>>
>>>>the benefit of address a full 4 gigs but in most case are performing
no
>>>
>>>>better and in some cases far worse with this method.
>>>>Hardware developers right now do not have completely 64 bit coded
>>>>drivers. In most cases they played with them enough so that they would
>>
>>>>install and function in a 64 bit OS and thats about it.
>>>>ASIO is still 32 bit, VST is still 32 bit. There is supposedly 64 bit
>
>>>>available in the VST spec but not in ASIO AFAIK though no one is doing
>>
>>>>anything with it.
>>>>
>>>>All of the main host programs run on 64 bit OS es just fine.
>>>>32 bit apps like Cubendo, Reaper, Sonar, Samplitude all run great on

>>>>Windows 64 bit pro and can address up to 4 gigs of ram. But runs no
>>>>better CPU performance wise than 32 bit XP. Windows 64 pro is basically
>>>
>>>>just a stripped down Server 2003 64. But its more than likely gonna
>>>>suffer a quiet death like Windows ME did.
>>>>All of these except Nuendo will install correctly in Vista 64. but with
>>>
>>>>the current bottle necks in Vista and the unfinished audio WaveRT driver
>>>
>>>>spec don't expect very good performance out of it anytime soon.
>>>>
>>>>Sonar 32 bit no better than the 64 bit version ina 64 bit OS. The
>>>>supposed benefit is you can use address beyond 4 gigs. Of course all
of
>>>
>>>>the VSTi in Sonar and all the 3rd party ones are 32 bit and they all

>>>>still bottom out using Sonar's bit bridge at 4 gigs soooo.
>>>>
>>>>The blame for this lies with all the parties. MS for not getting
>>>>development resources out to companies faster. Companies for using that
>>>
>>>>as an excuse to be lazy in there development.
>>>>

>>>>Supposedly Steinyha are planning on Nuendo being 64 bit and finally
 >>>>making it so it can handle 4 or more core properly. But who knows.
 >>>>Every sense who ever in Germany decided to bail and cash in or whatever
 >>>
 >>>>and sold to Pinnacle they have been in Chaos. Just before that point

 >>>>they were the most innovative and revolutionary company in the native
 >
 >>>>audio software world and basically made the pro-audio sound card
 >>>>business outside be what it is today. There is not a single audio
 >>>>software that basically owes its very current existence to Steinberg

 >>>>innovations. But now who knows what their future is. Yamaha I think will
 >>>>
 >>>>hold on to them as long as possible and keep em going. Steinberg need
 >to
 >>>>
 >>>>get back in focus soon before they loose too much more ground. I'm not
 >>>>
 >>>>sure who if anybody is actually steering the ship at this if anybody.
 >
 >>>>They need to get back their creative direction and fast. All the
 >>>>copycats are circling around them like vultures at this point.
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>>Chris
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>>LaMont wrote:
 >>>>> Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit OS??
 >>>>I do
 >>>>> have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..
 >>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
 >>>>>> Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running
 >>>>>> a
 >>>>>>> 64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real advantages
 >>>>>>> are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32
 bit
 >>>>>>>OS.
 >>>>>>> The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been
 >>>>>>>64
 >>>>>>>bits
 >>>>>>> or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the real
 >>>>>>>bump)
 >>>>>>> for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using the

>>>64
>>>> bit
>>>>> version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's
because
>>>>> M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better
>>>memory
>>>>> management.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through
>>>> and
>>>>> through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level. Cakewalk
>>>>> has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be
>used
>>>>> on
>>>>> 32 bit versions of XP.
>>>>>
>>>>> Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't
think
>>>>> 64
>>>>> bit operating systems make much difference.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>> I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07, when
>>>can
>>>>>> expect
>>>>>> MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> 2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather
>>>than
>>>>>> 32 bit.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks
32
>>>bit
>>>>>> is
>>>>>>> enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the
>feasability
>>>>>>> of going 64 bit.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster
stuff.
>>>>>>> most
>>>>>>> of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os and
>>>64
>>>>> bit
>>>>>>> DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..

>>>>>> We kkeep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit
>>OS
>>>faster,
>>>>>> but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware,
>software
>>>>>> companies come to an agreement .
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital
>>>mixers,
>>>>>> but that's it..
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>--
>>>>Chris Ludwig
>>>>
>>>>ADK Pro Audio
>>>>(859) 635-5762
>>>>www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 20:47:40 GMT

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

Read the end of my post, LaMont. I said that to get what you want you don't need more precision, you need programmers to write mixers that sound (and I think, more importantly, act) the way you want them to. That probably will involve some kind of modeling/convolution and other magic tricks incorporated into the mixer, but for heaven's sake don't halve your DSP juice for a marginally more accurate LSB in a 32 bit word. It's not going to do squat to get you where you want to be.

TCB

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

>

>Thad , you and all of those who use the pure logic of digital audio aparently
>don;t use your ears.. I'm sorry man.. If you think all DAWs , converters
>sound the same using thesam DAW, then you need better ears..
>

>That's why we and many other, have these discussion on sound.. Matter not
>what the math and the theory of Digital audio is..DAWs and Convertors sound

>

>and distort in pleasing way...

 \geq

>

>

>

 \succ

>>

>>128 bit if people wanted it to be with most processors. And keep in mind,

>>

>>

>>and then is different. It might look like this.

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>a factor of ten) for our stupid little decimal brains I can't see that mattering.

Page 38 of 52 ---- Generated from The PARIS Forums

>>
>>Personally I think a lot of the discussing of 'summing busses' is snake
>oil.
>>But even if you do believe in that, as I know you do, it's a matter of
preference
>>not precision. I.e. you don't need more bits you need the programmers to
>>program them more the way you want things to sound.
>>
>>Do, don't, do, don't, don't believe the hype. Believe the math.
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple cores/processors
>>>much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have
>to
>>>be ready to take advantage of that.
>>>
>>>You are right. They will have to re-code to take advantage all of that
>raw
>>>power.
>>>But, I think one area where 64 bit code can help in, and that is wiith
>digital
>>>Summming. I think for a lot of DAWs, a bigger pipe could help..Right now,
>>>32bits is ok , until you start hitting the sum bus hard.
>>>
>>>Maybe, just maybe , they start instituting "modeling" of famous analogy
>>mixers
>>>summing..
>>>
>>>I disagree with you about 32 bit being enough. As with Asio and vst. You
>>>know that when you start bogging down down a project with audio tracks-Over
>>>50, with eq & comps -30..vsti's 4, verbs 3....The asio/vst pipe starts
>to
>>>shrink..And it's very audible..
>>>
>>>My hope and others are with 64bit, steinberg/Digi, Cakewalk, Motu and
others
>>>can over this bottle neck, and let us (Mixers) Mix like we are use to.(Massive
>>>Head Room).. You know like Paris..
>>>They are gettign there.. With every update to ProTools (LE, Mpowered and
>>>HD) the suming get's better and better.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>>>
 >>>>Chris,
 >>>>
 >>>>Unless a _lot_ of things have changed since I last talked to an audio
 >developer,
 >>>>all of the audio DSP is being done in the floating point and (if you're
 >>lucky)
 >>>>the vector units on the chips. So is there _any_ advantage to an app
 coded
 >>>>in 64 bits other than RAM access? Second, considering that only a handful
 >>>>of converters (in either direction) can even pas 20 bits of meaningful
 >>data,
 >>>>why on earth would I _want_ DSP to be done on words larger than 32 bit
 >>float?
 >>>>
 >>>>Maybe I'm missing something really really simple here, but I know, uh,
 >>a
 >>>>little bit about computers, and I just don't understand the hype.
 >>>>
 >>>>OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple cores/processors
 >>>>much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have
 >>to
 >>>>be ready to take advantage of that.
 >>>>
 >>>>TCB
 >>>>
 >>>>Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
 >>>>>Hi Lamont,
 >>>>>
 >>>>>The only thing preventing any 64 bit advancement at this point the 3rd
 >>>
 >>>>>party software and hardware manufacturers to write 64 bit driver and
 >
 >>>>>program support. The host applications need to come first. There is

 >>>>>nothing close to a fully 64 bit audio app on any platform. All the
 >>>>>plug-ins in Sonar are 32 bit and running in a shell to function in a
 >64
 >>>>>
 >>>>>bit. All with anywhere from 5 to 10% resource hit. The plug-ins do get
 >>>
 >>>>>the benefit of address a full 4 gigs but in most case are performing
 >no
 >>>>>
 >>>>>better and in some cases far worse with this method.
 >>>>>Hardware developers right now do not have completely 64 bit coded
 >>>>>drivers. In most cases they played with them enough so that they would
 >>>

>>>>>install and function in a 64 bit OS and thats about it.
>>>>>ASIO is still 32 bit, VST is still 32 bit. There is supposedly 64 bit
>>
>>>>>available in the VST spec but not in ASIO AFAIK though no one is doing
>>>
>>>>>anything with it.
>>>>>
>>>>>All of the main host programs run on 64 bit OS es just fine.
>>>>>32 bit apps like Cubendo, Reaper, Sonar, Samplitude all run great on
>
>>>>>Windows 64 bit pro and can address up to 4 gigs of ram. But runs no

>>>>>better CPU performance wise than 32 bit XP. Windows 64 pro is basically
>>>>>
>>>>>just a stripped down Server 2003 64. But its more than likely gonna

>>>>>suffer a quiet death like Windows ME did.
>>>>>All of these except Nuendo will install correctly in Vista 64. but with
>>>>>
>>>>>the current bottle necks in Vista and the unfinished audio WaveRT driver
>>>>>
>>>>>spec don't expect very good performance out of it anytime soon.
>>>>>
>>>>>Sonar 32 bit no better than the 64 bit version ina 64 bit OS. The
>>>>>supposed benefit is you can use address beyond 4 gigs. Of course all
>of
>>>>>
>>>>>the VSTi in Sonar and all the 3rd party ones are 32 bit and they all
>
>>>>>still bottom out using Sonar's bit bridge at 4 gigs soooo.
>>>>>
>>>>>The blame for this lies with all the parties. MS for not getting
>>>>>development resources out to companies faster. Companies for using that
>>>>>
>>>>>as an excuse to be lazy in there development.
>>>>>
>>>>>Supposedly Steinyha are planning on Nuendo being 64 bit and finally

>>>>>making it so it can handle 4 or more core properly. But who knows.
>>>>>Every sense who ever in Germany decided to bail and cash in or whatever
>>>>>
>>>>>and sold to Pinnacle they have been in Chaos. Just before that point
>
>>>>>they were the most innovative and revolutionary company in the native
>>
>>>>>audio software world and basically made the pro-audio sound card
>>>>>business outside be what it is today. There is not a single audio
>>>>>software that basically owes its very current existence to Steinberg

>
>>>>innovations. But now who knows what their future is. Yamaha I think
will
>>>>
>>>>hold on to them as long as possible and keep em going. Steinberg need
>>to
>>>>
>>>>get back in focus soon before they loose too much more ground. I'm not
>>>
>>>>sure who if anybody is actually steering the ship at this if anybody.
>>
>>>>They need to get back their creative direction and fast. All the
>>>>copycats are circling around them like vultures at this point.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Chris
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>> Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit
OS??
>>>>I do
>>>>> have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to running
>>>>>> a
>>>>>>> 64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real
advantages
>>>>>>> are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32
>bit
>>>>OS.
>>>>>>> The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been
>>>>64
>>>>bits
>>>>>>> or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the
real
>>>>bump)
>>>>>>> for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using
the
>>>>64
>>>>>> bit
>>>>>>> version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's
>because
>>>>>>> M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better
>>>>memory

>>>>>> management.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit through
>>>>>> and
>>>>>> through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level.
Cakewalk
>>>>>> has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can be
>>used
>>>>>> on
>>>>>> 32 bit versions of XP.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't
>think
>>>>>> 64
>>>>>> bit operating systems make much difference.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07,
when
>>>>can
>>>>>>> expect
>>>>>>> MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit , rather
>>>>than
>>>>>>> 32 bit.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks
>32
>>>>bit
>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>> enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the
>>feasability
>>>>>>> of going 64 bit.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster
>stuff.
>>>>>>> most
>>>>>>> of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os
and
>>>>64
>>>>>>> bit
>>>>>>> DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>>>>>> We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32 bit
>>>OS
>>>>faster,

```
>>>>>>> but we are only seeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware,
>>software
>>>>>>> companies come to an agreement .
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital
>>>>mixers,
>>>>>>> but that's it..
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>--
>>>>>Chris Ludwig
>>>>>
>>>>>ADK Pro Audio
>>>>>(859) 635-5762
>>>>>www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>>chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>
```

Subject: Re: Ok.. When 64 bit mainstream win OS..
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sat, 23 Jun 2007 13:05:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sorry Thad.. You did in fact state that. My bad. :)

I would add this to the argument: I think today, we have 3 camps of audio mixing needs..

-In one corner you the OLd guard of audio engineers who demands color in their gear . Converters,pre amps, eqs..etc.

-The other corner we have the post crowd. Who does not care about coloring of converters, just results.

-Then there is the DJ crowd. Again, they don;t really care about vintage audio gear and the sound of it in there work..

So you really have 3 different needs and opinions going today. I think before we start to our opinions on the subject of converters, mixing, pres we need to first state what genre we work in and our needs are..Before we tell someone else what's good or not good..

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

>

>Read the end of my post, LaMont. I said that to get what you want you don't
>need more precision, you need programmers to write mixers that sound (and
>I think, more importantly, act) the way you want them to. That probably
will
>involve some kind of modeling/convolution and other magic tricks incorporated
>into the mixer, but for heaven's sake don't halve your DSP juice for a marginally
>more accurate LSB in a 32 bit word. It's not going to do squat to get you
>where you want to be.

>

>TCB

>

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

>>

>>Thad , you and all of those who use the pure logic of digital audio aparently
>>don;t use your ears.. I'm sorry man.. If you think all DAWs , converters
>>sound the same using thesam DAW, then you need better ears..

>>

>>That's why we and many other, have these discussion on sound.. Matter not
>>what the math and the theory of Digital audio is..DAWs and Convertors sound
>>different.

>>

>>Some companies like Apogee, EMU/Ensoniq set out to make thier converter
>color
>>and distort in pleasing way...

>>

>>To simple say 01 010's 01 is not the whole story. Daw's sound differnt
when

>>using the same wave files.. The way pan laws coded are different per manufactuer.

>>

>>

>>This is an old argument that many Engineers will tell why they like a certian
>>DAW and converters better than others..

>>

>>The bottom line is this: We like pleasing gentle Harmonic Distorion. Ensoniq
>>figure out how to do it. So did apogee and others (Sony)..We like some
>Color

>>in our converters..

>>

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

>>>

>>>But LaMont, all of the audio DSP/summing/mixing floating point processing,
>>>which could be 100% 64 bit on a 32 bit operating system. Hell, it could
>>be

>>>128 bit if people wanted it to be with most processors. And keep in mind,

>>>let's say this is your 32 bit word

```

>>>
>>>1011101010100001010101010000011
>>>
>>>Now let's say you have a 64 bit word that is identical for the first 32
>>bits,
>>>and then is different. It might look like this.
>>>
>>> 101110101010000101010101000001100111110101100010101010100000 10
>>>
>>>Now if you do the same math on both of those words you _might_ have a
different
>>>result in the 32nd place holder i.e. here
>>>
>>>1011101010100001010101010000011
>>>          ^
>>>
>>>Every other bit will be exactly the same. Even thinking of these as decimal
>>>numbers (where adding a place holder multiplies the number represented
>>by
>>>a factor of ten) for our stupid little decimal brains I can't see that
>matterng.
>>>In the case of binary numbers (where a place holder squares the available
>>>numbers) it's just comical to pretend we need a 64 bit words. Particularly
>>>when we'll have to halve our available DSP.
>>>
>>>Personally I think a lot of the discussing of 'summing busses' is snake
>>oil.
>>>But even if you do believe in that, as I know you do, it's a matter of
>preference
>>>not precision. I.e. you don't need more bits you need the programmers
to
>>>program them more the way you want things to sound.
>>>
>>>Do, don't, do, don't, don't believe the hype. Believe the math.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple cores/processors
>>>>much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have
>>to
>>>>be ready to take advantage of that.
>>>>
>>>>You are right. They will have to re-code to take advantage all of that
>>raw
>>>>power.
>>>>But, I think one area where 64 bit code can help in, and that is wiith

```

>>digital
>>>>Summing. I think for a lot of DAWs, a bigger pipe could help..Right
now,
>>>>32bits is ok , until you start hitting the sum bus hard.
>>>>
>>>>Maybe, just maybe , they start instituting "modeling" of famous analogy
>>>mixers
>>>>summing..
>>>>
>>>>I disagree with you about 32 bit being enough. As with Asio and vst.
You
>>>>know that when you start bogging down down a project with audio tracks-Over
>>>>50, with eq & comps -30..vsti's 4, verbs 3....The asio/vst pipe starts
>>to
>>>>shrink..And it's very audible..
>>>>
>>>>My hope and others are with 64bit, steinberg/Digi, Cakewalk, Motu and
>others
>>>>can over this bottle neck, and let us (Mixers) Mix like we are use to.(Massive
>>>>Head Room).. You know like Paris..
>>>>They are gettign there.. With every update to ProTools (LE, Mpowered
and
>>>>HD) the suming get's better and better.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Chris,
>>>>>
>>>>>Unless a _lot_ of things have changed since I last talked to an audio
>>developer,
>>>>>all of the audio DSP is being done in the floating point and (if you're
>>>>lucky)
>>>>>the vector units on the chips. So is there _any_ advantage to an app
>coded
>>>>>in 64 bits other than RAM access? Second, considering that only a handful
>>>>>of converters (in either direction) can even pas 20 bits of meaningful
>>>data,
>>>>>why on earth would I _want_ DSP to be done on words larger than 32 bit
>>>float?
>>>>>
>>>>>Maybe I'm missing something really really simple here, but I know, uh,
>>>a
>>>>>little bit about computers, and I just don't understand the hype.
>>>>>
>>>>>OK, one thing. The 64 bit kernel in Server 2003 deals with multiple

cores/processors
>>>>>much more gracefully, but even then the developer of the DAW will have
>>>to
>>>>>be ready to take advantage of that.
>>>>>
>>>>>TCB
>>>>>
>>>>>Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>>>>Hi Lamont,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>The only thing preventing any 64 bit advancement at this point the
3rd
>>>>>
>>>>>>party software and hardware manufacturers to write 64 bit driver and
>>
>>>>>>program support. The host applications need to come first. There is
>
>>>>>>nothing close to a fully 64 bit audio app on any platform. All the

>>>>>>plug-ins in Sonar are 32 bit and running in a shell to function in
a
>>64
>>>>>
>>>>>>bit. All with anywhere from 5 to 10% resource hit. The plug-ins do
get
>>>>>
>>>>>>the benefit of address a full 4 gigs but in most case are performing
>>no
>>>>>
>>>>>>better and in some cases far worse with this method.
>>>>>>Hardware developers right now do not have completely 64 bit coded
>>>>>>drivers. In most cases they played with them enough so that they would
>>>>>
>>>>>>install and function in a 64 bit OS and thats about it.
>>>>>>ASIO is still 32 bit, VST is still 32 bit. There is supposedly 64 bit
>>>
>>>>>>available in the VST spec but not in ASIO AFAIK though no one is doing
>>>>>
>>>>>>anything with it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>All of the main host programs run on 64 bit OS es just fine.
>>>>>>32 bit apps like Cubendo, Reaper, Sonar, Samplitude all run great on
>>
>>>>>>Windows 64 bit pro and can address up to 4 gigs of ram. But runs no
>
>>>>>>better CPU performance wise than 32 bit XP. Windows 64 pro is basically
>>>>>
>>>>>>just a stripped down Server 2003 64. But its more than likely gonna

>
>>>>>suffer a quiet death like Windows ME did.
>>>>>All of these except Nuendo will install correctly in Vista 64. but
with
>>>>>
>>>>>the current bottle necks in Vista and the unfinished audio WaveRT driver
>>>>>
>>>>>spec don't expect very good performance out of it anytime soon.
>>>>>
>>>>>Sonar 32 bit no better than the 64 bit version in a 64 bit OS. The
>>>>>supposed benefit is you can use address beyond 4 gigs. Of course all
>>of
>>>>>
>>>>>the VSTi in Sonar and all the 3rd party ones are 32 bit and they all
>>
>>>>>still bottom out using Sonar's bit bridge at 4 gigs soooo.
>>>>>
>>>>>The blame for this lies with all the parties. MS for not getting
>>>>>development resources out to companies faster. Companies for using
that
>>>>>
>>>>>as an excuse to be lazy in their development.
>>>>>
>>>>>Supposedly Steinberg are planning on Nuendo being 64 bit and finally
>
>>>>>making it so it can handle 4 or more core properly. But who knows.
>>>>>Every sense who ever in Germany decided to bail and cash in or whatever
>>>>>
>>>>>and sold to Pinnacle they have been in Chaos. Just before that point
>>
>>>>>they were the most innovative and revolutionary company in the native
>>>
>>>>>audio software world and basically made the pro-audio sound card
>>>>>business out of what it is today. There is not a single audio
>>>>>software that basically owes its very current existence to Steinberg
>>
>>>>>innovations. But now who knows what their future is. Yamaha I think
>will
>>>>>
>>>>>hold on to them as long as possible and keep em going. Steinberg need
>>>to
>>>>>
>>>>>get back in focus soon before they lose too much more ground. I'm
not
>>>>>
>>>>>sure who if anybody is actually steering the ship at this if anybody.
>>>
>>>>>They need to get back their creative direction and fast. All the

>>>>>copycats are circling around them like vultures at this point.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Chris
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>> Thanks Thad.. So, if I have Server 2003 (64) that's a true 64 bit
>OS??
>>>>>I do
>>>>>> have a legit copy of Server 2003 (64 bit)..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Haven't we gone over this already? There's minimal advantage to
running
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> 64 bit OS for audio. The '64 bits' are integer bits, so the real
>advantages
>>>>>>>> are in the ability to address file space and RAM larger than a 32
>>bit
>>>>>OS.
>>>>>>> The floating point processing (all that matters for audio) has been
>>>>64
>>>>>bits
>>>>>>> or more (or less in parallel, which is usually where you get the
>real
>>>>>bump)
>>>>>>> for years now. Some people report incremental improvements using
>the
>>>>>64
>>>>>>> bit
>>>>>>> version of XP but I'll bet you hash brownies to has browns that's
>>because
>>>>>>> M\$oft is trickling their Server 2003 tech into XP 64 so it has better
>>>>>memory
>>>>>>> management.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you're interested, XP 64 and Vista 64 are pretty much 64 bit
through
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> through. I don't know about driver support, but at the OS level.
>Cakewalk
>>>>>>>> has a '64 bit audio engine' which since it's floating point can
be
>>>>used
>>>>>>> on

>>>>>>> 32 bit versions of XP.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Bottom line, unless you want to run more than 3 GB of RAM I don't
>>think
>>>>>>> 64
>>>>>>> bit operating systems make much difference.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> I know apple has stated that they will be 64 OXS in October 07,
>when
>>>>>can
>>>>>>> expect
>>>>>>>> MS to give us a true 64 bit OS ..?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> 2) When acan we expect the current DAW's to recode in 64 bit ,
rather
>>>>>than
>>>>>>>> 32 bit.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I read somewhere on Nuendo.com that that they (Steinberg) thinks
>>32
>>>>>bit
>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>> enough and that 64 bit is not needed. But, they are exploring the
>>>feasability
>>>>>>>> of going 64 bit.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Meanwhile, the hardware market keeps advancing with newer faster
>>stuff.
>>>>>>>> most
>>>>>>>> of us are already 64 bit compatible. Only waiting for an WIn os
>and
>>>>>64
>>>>>>> bit
>>>>>>>> DAW to take full advantage of our current workstations..
>>>>>>>> We kkep porrign money into a 32 bit system trying to make a 32
bit
>>>>>OS
>>>>>faster,
>>>>>>>> but we are only seeeing marginal returns. What gives??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I think it's time to put on the brakes and just let the Hardware,
>>>software
>>>>>>>> companies come to an agreement .
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I'm sitting on the fence from here on. I'm still looking into Digital

>>>>>mixers,
>>>>>>> but that's it..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>--
>>>>>>Chris Ludwig
>>>>>>
>>>>>>ADK Pro Audio
>>>>>>(859) 635-5762
>>>>>>www.adkproaudio.com
>>>>>>chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>
