

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

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

Subject: Re: PARIS popping and crackling  
Posted by [Kim W](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 12:08:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

t; to be a lot of favorable talk about it. I'd like to have something w/  
>  
>>> firewire  
>>> so I could do remote stuff w/ my wife's PC laptop but that seems to be  
>a  
>>> whole 'nother can of worms.  
>>>  
>>> Does anyone have experience with sending 24 bit ADAT lightpipe signal  
>into  
>>> Paris' 20 bit ADAT cards' inputs? Does it sound good, bad, indifferent?  
>>>  
>>> I'm also interested in the Mackie Onyx 1200F. 12 Onyx preamps, about  
>a  
>>> gazillion  
>>> other ins and outs, ADAT lightpipe, firewire, control room monitor,  
>>> headphone  
>>> outs. All for around \$1700.  
>>>  
>>> Anyone want to buy my 1975 Martin D28?  
>>>  
>>> Gantt  
>>  
>>  
>Hi Gantt,

I use a Behringer ADA800 through my ADAT card, and it sounds really good.  
Most preamps only have 20 bit resolution anyways because of the noise floor.  
I think the very best preamps can produce 21 real bits. It won't make any  
difference going 20 bit.

All the best,

Mike

"Gantt Kushner" <[ganttmann@comcast.net](mailto:ganttman@comcast.net)> wrote:

>  
>So, I've been reading a bit about the Presonus Digimax FS since there seems  
>to be a lot of favorable talk about it. I'd like to have something w/ firewire  
>so I could do remote stuff w/ my wife's PC laptop but that seems to be a  
>whole 'nother can of worms.  
>  
>Does anyone have experience with sending 24 bit ADAT lightpipe signal into  
>Paris' 20 bit ADAT cards' inputs? Does it sound good, bad, indifferent?  
>

>I'm also interested in the Mackie Onyx 1200F. 12 Onyx preamps, about a gazillion  
>other ins and outs, ADAT lightpipe, firewire, control room monitor, headphone  
>outs. All for around \$1700.  
>  
>Anyo

---

---

Subject: Re: PARIS popping and crackling  
Posted by [Lance Reichert](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 15:13:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

>Anyway, it seems to be working well for me. I also tightened up the start  
>up hardware detection timings because some of them seem to work fine at  
one  
>fifth what they were now that the direct writes are being managed.  
>  
>There are other small changes, too. Let me know if you have a chance to  
>try this and how it goes. There may be hardware configurations that don't  
>like what I've done. But, my IF2 now work, and it wasn't working well as  
>of the last build.  
>  
>I hope this clears up any questions about what I'm doing. I'll try to package  
>these changes into a proper installer once I'm done building, which will  
>probably be soon. I think we're almost there.  
>  
>All the best!  
>  
>Mike

---=\_linux48cd46ec

Content-Type: application/octet-stream; name="PARIS\_StudioControlLibrary.dll"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="PARIS\_StudioControlLibrary.dll"

TVqQAAMAAAEAAAA/8AALgAAAAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAA4fug4AtAnNIbgBTM0hVGhpcyBwcm9ncmFt  
IGNhbm5vdCBiZSB5dW4gaW4gRE9TIG1vZGUuDQ0KJAAAAAAAAABQRQAATAEF  
ABNBzUgAAAAAAAAAAOAAADiELAQQQUAKQBAAA6AQAAAAAwLEBAAQAAAAwAEA

---

Subject: Re: PARIS popping and crackling  
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 15:22:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

;for me because the PSCL was written in a c-like style. It's all structures  
>and functions. It's not object oriented at all, which is what is more common  
>today and what I'm used to. I'm also still a new programmer. So, more  
than  
>once I've thought something was broken or messed up when it probably wasn't.  
> I just didn't understand it correctly.  
>  
>Anyway, what I have done is put locks on all the resources I can find that  
>could be affected by two CPUs trying to change them at the exact same time.  
> I've also discovered that there are certain card resources that the PSCL  
>tries to change directly without going through the scherzo driver. These  
>variables seem to need around 3 miliseconds to "take". I think that under  
>windows 95, the PSCL was directly altering the memory on the cards, but  
Windows  
>XP doesn't allow that. What I think is happening is that Windows is intercepting  
>the attempt to alter the variable and passing it down through the regular  
>mechanisms, and that imposes a delay. If the app moves on and tries to  
do  
>something that requires the value being set properly, things go wrong.  
I'm  
>guess that on a single CPU system, Windows is regularly interrupting to  
manage  
>memory, read files from the disk, update the clock, etc, etc., so these  
delays  
>were "filled in" by windows. I'm just making them explicit.  
>

---