
Subject: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???

Posted by [SF](#) on Tue, 28 Mar 2006 11:05:35 GMT

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

Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!

I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system but a little outdated.

Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very much functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.

I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my taste. They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound distant, thin and not in front.

I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog board feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like a good option.

My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT lightpipe. Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording, MIDI, VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.

Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT card.

Now, there are some questions left...

1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows XP)? Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not recording.

2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to RME multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee, mytek, Inyx...)

3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)

4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16 channel mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ series) and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that Paris in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks? Paris is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard (near clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with Paris system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...

Regards,
SF

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 28 Mar 2006 12:53:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Paris converters blow the doors off everything in their price range (new and used) as well as 90% of every converter at 10 times their used price.

Your mixes will be hotter, livelier and more analogue than you could believe possible from a DAW and as for your Mackie...throw it away as Paris will eat it for breakfast and throw it up all over your RME converters.

You will have (arguably) the best of both worlds and quickly come to realise how inferior Cubase is and thank your lucky stars you made the decision to add Paris to your rig.

As for running the two DAWs on one machine. I've heard it's been done but inevitable the other platform gets an inferiority complex and insists on moving to its own rig where it can be "Top Dog"

;-)

Don

"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:4429187f\$1@linux...

>

> Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!

>

> I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system but
> a little outdated.

>

> Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very
> much

> functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.

> I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my taste.

> They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound

> distant,

> thin and not in front.

>

> I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog
> board

> feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like a

> good

> option.

>

> My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT

> lightpipe.

> Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording, MIDI,

> VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.
>
> Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT
> card.
>
> Now, there are some questions left...
>
> 1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows
> XP)?
> Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not
> recording.
>
> 2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to RME
> multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee, mytek,
> Inyx...)
>
> 3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)
>
> 4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16 channel
> mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ
> series)
> and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that
> Paris
> in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks?
> Paris
> is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard (near
> clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with
> Paris
> system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...
>
> Regards,
> SF
>

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Tue, 28 Mar 2006 13:35:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It may be worth adding that you can put a DSP system like Paris in a really weak computer if you're merely summing with it.. The first rig I saw was either a Pentium 90 or 150.. can't recall that detail, and it ran 'one' (native, not the DSP) direct x plug before choking.... but Paris did everything it was supposed to w/o any complaining or sluggishness. Do yourself a major favor and find a host PC just for Paris, two DAWs in one PC is going to be nothing but headaches for you.

AA

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:44293379@linux...

> Paris converters blow the doors off everything in their price range (new
> and used) as well as 90% of every converter at 10 times their used price.

>

> Your mixes will be hotter, livelier and more analogue than you could
> believe possible from a DAW and as for you're Mackie...throw it away as
> Paris will eat it for breakfast and throw it up all over your RME
> converters.

>

> You will have (arguably) the best of both worlds and quickly come to
> realise how inferior Cubase is and thank your lucky stars you made the
> decision to add Paris to your rig.

>

> As for running the two DAWs on one machine. I've heard it's been done but
> inevitable the other platform gets an inferiority complex and insists on
> moving to it's own rig where it can be "Top Dog"

>

> ;-)

>

> Don

>

>

>

> "SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:4429187f\$1@linux...

>>

>> Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!

>>

>> I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system
>> but

>> a little outdated.

>>

>> Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very
>> much

>> functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.

>> I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my
>> taste.

>> They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound
>> distant,

>> thin and not in front.

>>

>> I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog
>> board

>> feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like a
>> good

>> option.

>>

>> My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT
>> lightpipe.
>> Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording, MIDI,
>> VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.
>>
>> Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT
>> card.
>>
>> Now, there are some questions left...
>>
>> 1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows
>> XP)?
>> Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not
>> recording.
>>
>> 2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to RME
>> multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee, mytek,
>> Inyx...)
>>
>> 3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)
>>
>> 4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16 channel
>> mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ
>> series)
>> and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that
>> Paris
>> in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks?
>> Paris
>> is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard (near
>> clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with
>> Paris
>> system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...
>>
>> Regards,
>> SF
>>
>
>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?
<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 28 Mar 2006 13:51:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yep and I've got to learn to use spellcheck

doi!

Don

"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
news:44293d29\$1@linux...

> It may be worth adding that you can put a DSP system like Paris in a
> really weak computer if you're merely summing with it.. The first rig I
> saw was either a Pentium 90 or 150.. can't recall that detail, and it ran
> 'one' (native, not the DSP) direct x plug before choking.... but Paris did
> everything it was supposed to w/o any complaining or sluggishness.
> Do yourself a major favor and find a host PC just for Paris, two DAWS in
> one PC is going to be nothing but headaches for you.

>

> AA

>

>

> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:44293379@linux...

>> Paris converters blow the doors off everything in their price range (new
>> and used) as well as 90% of every converter at 10 times their used price.

>>

>> Your mixes will be hotter, livelier and more analogue than you could
>> believe possible from a DAW and as for you're Mackie...throw it away as
>> Paris will eat it for breakfast and throw it up all over your RME
>> converters.

>>

>> You will have (arguably) the best of both worlds and quickly come to
>> realise how inferior Cubase is and thank your lucky stars you made the
>> decision to add Paris to your rig.

>>

>> As for running the two DAWs on one machine. I've heard it's been done but
>> inevitable the other platform gets an inferiority complex and insists on
>> moving to it's own rig where it can be "Top Dog"

>>

>> ;-)

>>

>> Don

>>

>>

>>

>> "SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:4429187f\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!

>>>

>>> I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system

>>> but
>>> a little outdated.
>>>
>>> Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very
>>> much
>>> functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.
>>> I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my
>>> taste.
>>> They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound
>>> distant,
>>> thin and not in front.
>>>
>>> I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog
>>> board
>>> feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like a
>>> good
>>> option.
>>>
>>> My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT
>>> lightpipe.
>>> Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording,
>>> MIDI,
>>> VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.
>>>
>>> Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT
>>> card.
>>>
>>> Now, there are some questions left...
>>>
>>> 1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows
>>> XP)?
>>> Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not
>>> recording.
>>>
>>> 2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to RME
>>> multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee, mytek,
>>> Inyx...)
>>>
>>> 3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)
>>>
>>> 4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16 channel
>>> mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ
>>> series)
>>> and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that
>>> Paris
>>> in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks?
>>> Paris
>>> is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard

>>> (near
>>> clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with
>>> Paris
>>> system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> SF
>>>
>>
>>
>
>
> I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?
> <http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>
>

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???
Posted by [Sound Dog](#) on Tue, 28 Mar 2006 15:21:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi SF,

I used to run PARIS and Logic together (a few years ago now), but have found that having 2 PCs (one for PARIS and one for Logic / Cubase / whatever) is definitely the way to go. As Aaron says, the computer for Paris doesn't need to be all that flash. My setup goes like this:-

PARIS System

Asus A7N8X-E

1GB TwinX (2 x 512) RAM

200GB system drive, 3 partitions (W98SE, WXPpro, storage area)

2 x 120GB audio drives (I keep a backup of everything on the second audio drive)

3 EDS cards

MEC 1 - 2 x 8 in analog card and 1 x ADat

MEC 2 - 1 x ADat card

Logic System

Mac G5

RME HDSP 9652

I use lightpipes and coax S/PDIF to get VST instruments and some audio tracks into PARIS from Logic, and audio from PARIS to Logic. Basically I use PARIS as a summing box. PARIS is the MTC master.

This sounds something like what you're planning to do.

There's a few "gotchas" with setting up a PARIS system on Windows XP, for example you have to install certain software components in a particular order, and for some reason you can't have two ADat cards on one MEC, but with a few workarounds you'll end up with good-quality AD/DA conversion, and a really nice mixing environment. The only thing that's missing really is flying faders.

There's lots of information around on the net, but if you get stumped I can send you the documentation you'll need to get started.

Good luck and welcome 8)

Cheers,

Stewart.
dogster@tpg.com.au

SF wrote in message <4429187f\$1@linux>...

>

>Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!

>

>I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system but
>a little outdated.

>

>Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very much
>functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.

>I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my taste.

>They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound
distant,

>thin and not in front.

>

>I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog
board

>feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like a
good

>option.

>

>My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT
lightpipe.

>Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording, MIDI,

>VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.

>

>Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT
card.

>

>Now, there are some questions left...

>
>1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows XP)?
>Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not recording.
>
>2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to RME
>multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee, mytek,
>Inyx...)
>
>3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)
>
>4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16 channel
>mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ
series)
>and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that
Paris
>in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks?
Paris
>is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard (near
>clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with
Paris
>system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...
>
>Regards,
>SF
>

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???
Posted by [Mark McDermott](#) on Tue, 28 Mar 2006 16:57:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey SF,

Sounds like you've come to the right place!

Let me know if you decide to go with PARIS. I've got an EDS, C16, MEC and
a 3.0 license for sale.

Cheers!

Mark

"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!
>
>I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system but
>a little outdated.

>
>Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very much
>functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.
>I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my taste.
>They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound distant,
>thin and not in front.
>
>I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog board
>feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like a good
>option.
>
>My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT lightpipe.
>Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording, MIDI,
>VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.
>
>Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT card.
>
>Now, there are some questions left...
>
>1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows XP)?
>Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not recording.
>
>2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to RME
>multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee, mytek,
>Inyx...)
>
>3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)
>
>4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16 channel
>mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ series)
>and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that Paris
>in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks?
Paris
>is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard (near
>clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with
Paris
>system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...
>
>Regards,
>SF
>

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 28 Mar 2006 17:34:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have a Multiface here. I have a Cubase SX template set up a 1.5ms latency that I use to patch the Multiface converters into my Paris rig via Paris lightpipe for tracking. I like them both. The Paris and Multiface converters sound different from each other. I sometimes prefer the Multiface converters to the Paris on some sources depending on the source, the mic and the preamp.

I always track to Paris using the Paris converters, RME converters and Mytek converters, batch convert them to .wavs, import them to a second DAW running Cubase, then lightpipe them back to Paris during mixdown. This allows me to take advantage of the PDC and editor in SX and the automation in both systems.

There's a lot more to getting this to happen than I have described. If you decide you want to go there, I have attached a word.doc that explains how it is done.

I prefer the Paris mix bus to the one in SX and unless you just like the sound of the Mackie mixer for some reason, you'll likely be happy with Paris if you use its strengths and accept its limitations.

Deej

"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:4429187f\$1@linux...

>

> Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!

>

> I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system but
> a little outdated.

>

> Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very
much

> functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.

> I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my taste.

> They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound
distant,

> thin and not in front.

>

> I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog
board

> feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like a
good

> option.

>

> My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT

lightpipe.

> Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording, MIDI,

> VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.

>

> Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT card.

>

> Now, there are some questions left...

>

> 1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows XP)?

> Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not recording.

>

> 2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to RME
> multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee, mytek,
> Inyx...)

>

> 3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)

>

> 4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16 channel
> mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ
series)

> and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that
Paris

> in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks?

Paris

> is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard (near
> clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with

Paris

> system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...

>

> Regards,

> SF

>

File Attachments

1) [ANIMIX Productions-session methodology.doc](#), downloaded 61 times

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???

Posted by [SF](#) on Wed, 29 Mar 2006 12:18:54 GMT

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

Don,

about paris converters sounding that good...do you find DA converters also so good? I posted similar question at gearslutz.com and most people trashed paris converters...

Aaron&Stewart,

its seems that separate machine is the way to go. Which operating system is the best for running Paris 2.2 and which drivers are the best? Is there any reason to move to Paris 3.0 if I just use paris for mixing and converters?

Mark,

I already found this paris rig for sale. I will try to arrange to have a listen before I buy. What is the resonable price for mec/c16/eds1000/8in/adat rig and is it hard to resell if I do not like it? Are Paris components easy to resell in Europe?

Deej,

You have very nice DAW setup!

Where exactly Paris magic happens? Is it AD converters, summing or something else? Is there any "sonical" reason to record tracks in Paris if I have cubase/rme DAW which I am familiar with?

Now, I will try to explain what I miss with cubase/rme setup.

I compose electronic music, and I use a lot of older analog synths and samplers, which sounds VERY nice, much better then newer stuff. When I just route them directly to analog desk, everything is fine. It is really easy to mix a song because every instrument finds its place in the mix easily. Everything sounds full, fat and in-your-face with nice 3D space.

When recording same instruments with RME, I loose this character of original sound. Everything gets behind, tracks sound separated (not "glued" together) but the biggest disadvantage is that I loose a lot of "space" (created with older lexicon reverbs). It is more 2D instead of 3D.

In other words...when I mix analog, it is very easy to find the right level. In digital, it is either to loud or to quiet.

Final question. Does Paris converters/mixbus behave more like analog gear/desk... or closer to sterile cubase/rme digital stuff?

My production is not about hi-fi, details and such... I just look for natural, fat, full bodied sound. Is Paris the right place to look for these? Or is it just closer to analog than Protools but not quite analog?

Regards,

SF

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>I have a Multiface here. I have a Cubase SX template set up a 1.5ms latency
>that I use to patch the Multiface converters into my Paris rig via Paris
>lightpipe for tracking. I like them both. The Paris and Multiface converters
>sound different from each other. I sometimes prefer the Multiface converters
>to the Paris on some sources depending on the source, the mic and the
>preamp.

>
>I always track to Paris using the Paris converters, RME converters and Mytek
>converters, batch convert them to .wavs, import them to a second DAW running
>Cubase, then lightpipe them back to Paris during mixdown. This allows me
to
>take advantage of the PDC and editor in SX and the automation in both
>systems.

>
>There's a lot more to getting this to happen than I have described. If you
>decide you want to go there, I have attached a word.doc that explains how
it
>is done.

>
>I prefer the Paris mix bus to the one in SX and unless you just like the
>sound of the Mackie mixer for some reason, you'll likely be happy with Paris
>if you use it's strengths and accept it's limitations.

>
>Deej

>
>"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:4429187f\$1@linux...

>>
>> Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!

>>
>> I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system
but
>> a little outdated.

>>
>> Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very
>much
>> functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.
>> I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my taste.
>> They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound
>distant,
>> thin and not in front.

>>
>> I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog
>board
>> feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like
a

>good
>> option.
>>
>> My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT
>lightpipe.
>> Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording, MIDI,
>> VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.
>>
>> Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT
>card.
>>
>> Now, there are some questions left...
>>
>> 1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows
>XP)?
>> Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not
>recording.
>>
>> 2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to RME
>> multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee, mytek,
>> lnyx...)
>>
>> 3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)
>>
>> 4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16 channel
>> mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ
>series)
>> and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that
>Paris
>> in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks?
>Paris
>> is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard (near
>> clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with
>Paris
>> system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...
>>
>> Regards,
>> SF
>>
>
>
>

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???
Posted by [cujo](#) on Wed, 29 Mar 2006 13:12:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I also recall a post by one of the intrepid Paris users Dimitrios regarding a Pwoer Supply mod that opened up the converters. Did anyone try this?

"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>Don,
>
>about paris converters sounding that good...do you find DA converters also
>so good? I posted similar question at gearslutz.com and most people trashed
>paris converters...
>
>Aaron&Stewart,
>
>its seems that separate machine is the way to go. Which operating system
>is the best for running Paris 2.2 and which drivers are the best? Is there
>any reason to move to Paris 3.0 if I just use paris for mixing and converters?
>
>Mark,
>
>I already found this paris rig for sale. I will try to arrange to have a
>listen before I buy. What is the resonable price for mec/c16/eds1000/8in/adat
>rig and is it hard to resell if I do not like it? Are Paris components easy
>to resell in Europe?
>
>Deej,
>
>You have very nice DAW setup!
>
>Where exactly Paris magic happens? Is it AD converters, summing or something
>else? Is there any "sonical" reason to record tracks in Paris if I have
cubase/rme
>DAW which I am familiar with?
>
>Now, I will try to explain what I miss with cubase/rme setup.
>
>I compose electronic music, and I use a lot of older analog synths and samplers,
>which sounds VERY nice, much better then newer stuff. When I just route
them
>directly to analog desk, everything is fine. It is really easy to mix a
song
>because every instrument finds its place in the mix easily. Everything sounds
>full, fat and in-your-face with nice 3D space.
>When recording same instruments with RME, I loose this character of original
>sound. Everything gets behind, tracks sound separated (not "glued" together)
>but the biggest disadvantage is that I loose a lot of "space" (created with

>older lexicon reverbs). It is more 2D instead of 3D.

>In other words...when I mix analog, it is very easy to find the right level.

>In digital, it is either too loud or too quiet.

>

>Final question. Does Paris converters/mixbus behave more like analog gear/desk...
>or closer to sterile cubase/rme digital stuff?

>My production is not about hi-fi, details and such... I just look for natural,
>fat, full bodied sound. Is Paris the right place to look for these?

>Or is it just closer to analog than Protools but not quite analog?

>

>Regards,
>SF

>

>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>>I have a Multiface here. I have a Cubase SX template set up a 1.5ms latency
>>that I use to patch the Multiface converters into my Paris rig via Paris
>>lightpipe for tracking. I like them both. The Paris and Multiface converters
>>sound different from each other. I sometimes prefer the Multiface converters
>>to the Paris on some sources depending on the source, the mic and the
>>preamp.

>>

>>I always track to Paris using the Paris converters, RME converters and
Mytek
>>converters, batch convert them to .wavs, import them to a second DAW running
>>Cubase, then lightpipe them back to Paris during mixdown. This allows me
>to
>>take advantage of the PDC and editor in SX and the automation in both
>>systems.

>>

>>There's a lot more to getting this to happen than I have described. If
you
>>decide you want to go there, I have attached a word.doc that explains how
>it
>>is done.

>>

>>I prefer the Paris mix bus to the one in SX and unless you just like the
>>sound of the Mackie mixer for some reason, you'll likely be happy with
Paris
>>if you use its strengths and accept its limitations.

>>

>>Deej

>>

>>"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:4429187f\$1@linux...
>>>

>>> Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!

>>>

>>> I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system
>but

>>> a little outdated.
>>>
>>> Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very
>>much
>>> functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.
>>> I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my taste.
>>> They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound
>>distant,
>>> thin and not in front.
>>>
>>> I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog
>>board
>>> feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like
>a
>>good
>>> option.
>>>
>>> My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT
>>lightpipe.
>>> Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording, MIDI,
>>> VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.
>>>
>>> Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT
>>card.
>>>
>>> Now, there are some questions left...
>>>
>>> 1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows
>>XP)?
>>> Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not
>>recording.
>>>
>>> 2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to
RME
>>> multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee, mytek,
>>> Inyx...)
>>>
>>> 3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)
>>>
>>> 4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16 channel
>>> mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ
>>series)
>>> and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that
>>Paris
>>> in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks?
>>Paris
>>> is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard (near
>>> clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with

>>Paris
>>> system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> SF
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???
Posted by [SF](#) on Wed, 29 Mar 2006 14:22:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I forgot the link to recent paris thread at gearslutz...

<http://gearslutz.com/board/showthread.php3?t=64177>

"Cujo" <chris@nospamapplemanstudio.com> wrote:

>
>
>I also recall a post by one of the intrepid Paris users Dimitrios regarding
>a Pwoer Supply mod that opened up the converters.
>Did anyone try this?

>
>
>
>"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>
>>Don,
>>
>>about paris converters sounding that good...do you find DA converters also
>>so good? I posted similar question at gearslutz.com and most people trashed
>>paris converters...

>>
>>Aaron&Stewart,
>>
>>its seems that separate machine is the way to go. Which operating system
>>is the best for running Paris 2.2 and which drivers are the best? Is there
>>any reason to move to Paris 3.0 if I just use paris for mixing and converters?

>>
>>Mark,
>>
>>I already found this paris rig for sale. I will try to arrange to have
a
>>listen before I buy. What is the resonable price for mec/c16/eds1000/8in/adat

>>rig and is it hard to resell if I do not like it? Are Paris components easy
>>to resell in Europe?
>>
>>Deej,
>>
>>You have very nice DAW setup!
>>
>>Where exactly Paris magic happens? Is it AD converters, summing or something
>>else? Is there any "sonical" reason to record tracks in Paris if I have
>cubase/rme
>>DAW which I am familiar with?
>>
>>Now, I will try to explain what I miss with cubase/rme setup.
>>
>>I compose electronic music, and I use a lot of older analog synths and
samplers,
>>which sounds VERY nice, much better then newer stuff. When I just route
>them
>>directly to analog desk, everything is fine. It is really easy to mix a
>song
>>because every instrument finds its place in the mix easily. Everything
sounds
>>full, fat and in-your-face with nice 3D space.
>>When recording same instruments with RME, I loose this character of original
>>sound. Everything gets behind, tracks sound separated (not "glued" together)
>>but the biggest disadvantage is that I loose a lot of "space" (created
with
>>older lexicon reverbs). It is more 2D instead of 3D.
>>In other words...when I mix analog, it is very easy to find the right level.
>>In digital, it is either to loud or to quiet.
>>
>>Final question. Does Paris converters/mixbus behave more like analog gear/desk...
>>or closer to sterile cubase/rme digital stuff?
>>My production is not about hi-fi, details and such... I just look for natural,
>>fat, full bodied sound. Is Paris the right place to look for these?
>>Or is it just closer to analog than Protools but not quite analog?
>>
>>Regards,
>>SF
>>
>>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>>I have a Multiface here. I have a Cubase SX template set up a 1.5ms latency
>>>that I use to patch the Multiface converters into my Paris rig via Paris
>>>lightpipe for tracking. I like them both. The Paris and Multiface converters
>>>sound different from each other. I sometimes prefer the Multiface converters
>>>to the Paris on some sources depending on the source, the mic and the
>>>preamp.

>>>
>>>I always track to Paris using the Paris converters, RME converters and
>Mytek
>>>converters, batch convert them to .wavs, import them to a second DAW running
>>>Cubase, then lightpipe them back to Paris during mixdown. This allows
me
>>to
>>>take advantage of the PDC and editor in SX and the automation in both
>>>systems.
>>>
>>>There's a lot more to getting this to happen than I have described. If
>you
>>>decide you want to go there, I have attached a word.doc that explains
how
>>it
>>>is done.
>>>
>>>I prefer the Paris mix bus to the one in SX and unless you just like the
>>>sound of the Mackie mixer for some reason, you'll likely be happy with
>Paris
>>>if you use it's strengths and accept it's limitations.
>>>
>>>Deej
>>>
>>>"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:4429187f\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!
>>>>
>>>> I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system
>>but
>>>> a little outdated.
>>>>
>>>> Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very
>>>much
>>>> functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.
>>>> I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my
taste.
>>>> They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound
>>>distant,
>>>> thin and not in front.
>>>>
>>>> I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog
>>>board
>>>> feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like
>>a
>>>good
>>>> option.
>>>>

>>>> My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT
>>>lightpipe.
>>>> Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording,
MIDI,
>>>> VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.
>>>>
>>>> Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT
>>>card.
>>>>
>>>> Now, there are some questions left...
>>>>
>>>> 1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows
>>>XP)?
>>>> Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not
>>>recording.
>>>>
>>>> 2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to
>>>RME
>>>> multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee, mytek,
>>>> Inyx...)
>>>>
>>>> 3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)
>>>>
>>>> 4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16 channel
>>>> mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ
>>>series)
>>>> and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that
>>>Paris
>>>> in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks?
>>>Paris
>>>> is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard
(near
>>>> clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with
>>>Paris
>>>> system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> SF
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Wed, 29 Mar 2006 16:45:53 GMT

Answers below:

"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:442a7b2e\$1@linux...

>

> Don,

>

> about paris converters sounding that good...do you find DA converters also

> so good? I posted similar question at gearslutz.com and most people
trashed

> paris converters...

The D/A converters are subject to jitter and will sound better if you use an external clock. The Lucid GenX6 does a good job of this.

>

> Aaron&Stewart,

>

> its seems that separate machine is the way to go. Which operating system

> is the best for running Paris 2.2 and which drivers are the best? Is there

> any reason to move to Paris 3.0 if I just use paris for mixing and
converters?

If you intend to expand your system to something like mine, you will need to run Windows 98SE or windows ME (I use ME). The Paris XP driver does not recognize more than one ADAT module per MEC and will not recognize an ADAT machine at all..

>

> Mark,

>

> I already found this paris rig for sale. I will try to arrange to have a

> listen before I buy. What is the resonable price for

mec/c16/eds1000/8in/adat

> rig and is it hard to resell if I do not like it? Are Paris components
easy

> to resell in Europe?

EDS - \$250.00 - \$300.00 tops

MEC- \$175.00 - \$250.00 tops

C-16- \$100.00 - \$150.00 tops

A8iT- \$300.00 - \$350.00 tops

ADi- \$250.00 \$300.00 Tops

(subject to free market supply and demand, of course)

I don't know about resale in Europe though)

s there any "sonical" reason to record tracks in Paris if I have cubase/rme

> DAW which I am familiar with?

>
No.

ow, I will try to explain what I miss with cubase/rme setup.

>
> I compose electronic music, and I use a lot of older analog synths and samplers,
> which sounds VERY nice, much better then newer stuff. When I just route them
> directly to analog desk, everything is fine. It is really easy to mix a song
> because every instrument finds its place in the mix easily. Everything sounds
> full, fat and in-your-face with nice 3D space.
> When recording same instruments with RME, I loose this character of original
> sound. Everything gets behind, tracks sound separated (not "glued" together)
> but the biggest disadvantage is that I loose a lot of "space" (created with
> older lexicon reverbs). It is more 2D instead of 3D.
> In other words...when I mix analog, it is very easy to find the right level.
> In digital, it is either to loud or to quiet.

Paris is the same way. You have 5 different gain stage options in the Paris mixer.

analog gear/desk...

> or closer to sterile cubase/rme digital stuff?
> My production is not about hi-fi, details and such... I just look for natural,
> fat, full bodied sound. Is Paris the right place to look for these?
> Or is it just closer to analog than Protools but not quite analog?

It's obviously not analog, but it's very close.

egards,

> SF
>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
> >I have a Multiface here. I have a Cubase SX template set up a 1.5ms latency
> >that I use to patch the Multiface converters into my Paris rig via Paris
> >lightpipe fro tracking. I like them both. The Paris and Multiface converters
> >sound different from each other. I sometimes prefer the Multiface

converters

> >to the Paris on some sources depending on the source, the mic and the
> >preamp.

> >

> >I always track to Paris using the Paris converters, RME converters and
Mytek

> >converters, batch convert them to .wavs, import them to a second DAW
running

> >Cubase, then lightpipe them back to Paris during mixdown. This allows me
> to

> >take advantage of the PDC and editor in SX and the automation in both
> >systems.

> >

> >There's a lot more to getting this to happen than I have described. If
you

> >decide you want to go there, I have attached a word.doc that explains how
> it

> >is done.

> >

> >I prefer the Paris mix bus to the one in SX and unless you just like the
> >sound of the Mackie mixer for some reason, you'll likely be happy with
Paris

> >if you use it's strengths and accept it's limitations.

> >

> >Deej

> >

> >"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:4429187f\$1@linux...

> >>

> >> Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!

> >>

> >> I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system
> but

> >> a little outdated.

> >>

> >> Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very
> >much

> >> functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.

> >> I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my
taste.

> >> They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound
> >distant,

> >> thin and not in front.

> >>

> >> I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to analog
> >board

> >> feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like

> a

> >good

> >> option.
> >>
> >> My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT
> >lightpipe.
> >> Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording,
MIDI,
> >> VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.
> >>
> >> Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and ADAT
> >card.
> >>
> >> Now, there are some questions left...
> >>
> >> 1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows
> >XP)?
> >> Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not
> >recording.
> >>
> >> 2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to
RME
> >> multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee,
mytek,
> >> Inyx...)
> >>
> >> 3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)
> >>
> >> 4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16
channel
> >> mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ
> >series)
> >> and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that
> >Paris
> >> in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog desks?
> >Paris
> >> is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard
(near
> >> clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go with
> >Paris
> >> system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...
> >>
> >> Regards,
> >> SF
> >>
> >
> >
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: Paris mix bus and converter quality? Better than cubase sx / RME ???
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Fri, 31 Mar 2006 11:38:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey SF

Paris is a tool, nothing more nothing less...for the cost of a used Paris rig, you can't even get in the game with anything else that even comes close sonically.

I'd say buy it, try it out, keep it if you like it, sell it if you don't...if you pay the suggested prices DJ quoted you will get your money back should you decided to unload it.

In my very humble and limited experience it will make a nice addition to your SX rig and I truly think you will finally find what you're looking for sonically. Remember it's not the box that makes the mixes.

Don "still working towards that perfect mix" Nafe

"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:442a9843\$1@linux...

>

> I forgot the link to recent paris thread at gearslutz...

>

> <http://gearslutz.com/board/showthread.php3?t=64177>

>

> "Cujo" <chris@nospamapplemanstudio.com> wrote:

>>

>>

>>I also recall a post by one of the intrepid Paris users Dimitrios

>>regarding

>>a Pwoer Supply mod that opened up the converters.

>>Did anyone try this?

>>

>>

>>

>>"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>Don,

>>>

>>>about paris converters sounding that good...do you find DA converters

>>>also

>>>so good? I posted similar question at gearslutz.com and most people

>>>trashed

>>>paris converters...

>>>

>>>Aaron&Stewart,
>>>
>>>its seems that separate machine is the way to go. Which operating system
>>>is the best for running Paris 2.2 and which drivers are the best? Is
>>>there
>>>any reason to move to Paris 3.0 if I just use paris for mixing and
>>>converters?
>>>
>>>Mark,
>>>
>>>I already found this paris rig for sale. I will try to arrange to have
> a
>>>listen before I buy. What is the resonable price for
>>>mec/c16/eds1000/8in/adat
>>>rig and is it hard to resell if I do not like it? Are Paris components
> easy
>>>to resell in Europe?
>>>
>>>Deej,
>>>
>>>You have very nice DAW setup!
>>>
>>>Where exactly Paris magic happens? Is it AD converters, summing or
>>>something
>>>else? Is there any "sonical" reason to record tracks in Paris if I have
>>cubase/rme
>>>DAW which I am familiar with?
>>>
>>>Now, I will try to explain what I miss with cubase/rme setup.
>>>
>>>I compose electronic music, and I use a lot of older analog synths and
> samplers,
>>>which sounds VERY nice, much better then newer stuff. When I just route
>>them
>>>directly to analog desk, everything is fine. It is really easy to mix a
>>song
>>>because every instrument finds its place in the mix easily. Everything
> sounds
>>>full, fat and in-your-face with nice 3D space.
>>>When recording same instruments with RME, I loose this character of
>>>original
>>>sound. Everything gets behind, tracks sound separated (not "glued"
>>>together)
>>>but the biggest disadvantage is that I loose a lot of "space" (created
> with
>>>older lexicon reverbs). It is more 2D instead of 3D.
>>>In other words...when I mix analog, it is very easy to find the right
>>>level.

>>>In digital, it is either to loud or to quiet.
>>>
>>>Final question. Does Paris converters/mixbus behave more like analog
>>>gear/desk...
>>>or closer to sterile cubase/rme digital stuff?
>>>My production is not about hi-fi, details and such... I just look for
>>>natural,
>>>fat, full bodied sound. Is Paris the right place to look for these?
>>>Or is it just closer to analog than Protools but not quite analog?
>>>
>>>Regards,
>>>SF
>>>
>>>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>>>I have a Multiface here. I have a Cubase SX template set up a 1.5ms
>>>>latency
>>>>that I use to patch the Multiface converters into my Paris rig via Paris
>>>>lightpipe fro tracking. I like them both. The Paris and Multiface
>>>>converters
>>>>sound different from each other. I sometimes prefer the Multiface
>>>>converters
>>>>to the Paris on some sources depending on the source, the mic and the
>>>>preamp.
>>>>
>>>>I always track to Paris using the Paris converters, RME converters and
>>Mytek
>>>>converters, batch convert them to .wavs, import them to a second DAW
>>>>running
>>>>Cubase, then lightpipe them back to Paris during mixdown. This allows
> me
>>>to
>>>>take advantage of the PDC and editor in SX and the automation in both
>>>>systems.
>>>>
>>>>There's a lot more to getting this to happen than I have described. If
>>you
>>>>decide you want to go there, I have attached a word.doc that explains
> how
>>>it
>>>>is done.
>>>>
>>>>I prefer the Paris mix bus to the one in SX and unless you just like the
>>>>sound of the Mackie mixer for some reason, you'll likely be happy with
>>Paris
>>>>if you use it's strengths and accept it's limitations.
>>>>
>>>>Deej
>>>>

>>>>"SF" <sound_forward@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:4429187f\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> Hi everyone! I just found this great newsgroup!
>>>>
>>>> I have never used Paris but I heard that it is a GREAT sounding system
>>>but
>>>> a little outdated.
>>>>
>>>> Right now I use Cubase SX / RME multiface as my DAW, which I like very
>>>much
>>>> functionally, but I don't like its sonics at all.
>>>> I find RME converters (at least those on multiface) not good for my
> taste.
>>>> They have great detail but they are not very "analogish". They sound
>>>distant,
>>>> thin and not in front.
>>>>
>>>> I would like to get a small mixing system that will be closer to
>>>> analog
>>>board
>>>> feel and sound but with digital board functionality. Paris looks like
>>>a
>>>good
>>>> option.
>>>>
>>>> My plan is to use cubase as DAW and connect it with Paris with ADAT
>>>lightpipe.
>>>> Paris will be used only for mixing and AD-DA converters. Recording,
> MIDI,
>>>> VST plugins and VST instruments will remain in cubase.
>>>>
>>>> Paris rig will consist of one EDS card, c16, mec, 8 analog ins and
>>>> ADAT
>>>card.
>>>>
>>>> Now, there are some questions left...
>>>>
>>>> 1. is it possible to use Paris and cubase sx in same computer (windows
>>>XP)?
>>>> Cubase will be running, and paris will be used only for mix, not
>>>recording.
>>>>
>>>> 2. how good are Paris AD converters on 8 input card in comparison to
>>RME
>>>> multiface and also compared to more expensive converters (apogee,
>>>> mytek,
>>>> Inyx...)
>>>>

>>>>> 3. same question about stock MEC DA converters (20bit)
>>>>>
>>>>> 4. How good is paris for mixing? Right now, I have old Mackie 16
>>>>> channel
>>>>> mixer (which sounds way better than mackie 8-bus series and newer VLZ
>>>>>series)
>>>>> and it sound superior compared to mix inside cubase. Do you think that
>>>>>Paris
>>>>> in-the-box mix can equal or surpass the quality of better analog
>>>>> desks?
>>>>>Paris
>>>>> is known to its similar behaviour to analog boards when pushed hard
> (near
>>>>> clipping). Do you think that I could retire my analog desk if I go
>>>>> with
>>>>>Paris
>>>>> system? I use my analog desk only for line level, not for preamps...
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> SF
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>
