
Subject: UAD-1 Neve 1081

Posted by [DJ](#) on Mon, 20 Nov 2006 03:09:52 GMT

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

>>>>24, unless there are clock sync problems,
>>>>>>>driver issues, or the DAW is

Subject: Re: UAD-1 Neve 1081

Posted by [DJ](#) on Mon, 20 Nov 2006 18:40:49 GMT

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

/>

> if I insert that at 88.2k, all DSP resources become maxed-out.
> Now I can also kinda see why DeeJ opted for a couple of
> the "Home" (3-DSP) cards & one of the Project (6-DSP) cards,
> because there's also an i/o & routing issue, and so DeeJ ended
> up with a dozen total DSP chips across the three cards he's
> got, plus a bit better i/o flexibility as compared to if he'd
> gotten just one of the Pro (14-DSP) Cards. Now also, keep in
> mind I'm running at 88.2k, so that indeed is going to take more
> DSP horsepower to process in three different Pulsar stages
> (Mixer channels/any plugins/and Mixer bus) than those of you
> running at 44.1 or 48, but if I can only insert TWO big plugins
> or five normal less-DSP-intensive ones on this card, how many
> instances could you get at 44.1k? Far from what we're used to
> in Paris or Native, methinks.
>
> So if you're looking to get into

Subject: Re: UAD-1 Neve 1081

Posted by [Gary Flanigan](#) on Mon, 20 Nov 2006 19:06:07 GMT

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

br />

> select an EQ plugin (of which there are a couple), and there
> are only a couple of plugin slots per channel (depending on
> which Mixer you select).
>
> 4.) The software is not very intuitive, but it's also not
> overly cumbersome, either - once you learn how to speak German,
> you'll be fine LOL j/k... serisouly, though,

Subject: Re: UAD-1 Neve 1081

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Tue, 21 Nov 2006 00:05:49 GMT

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

have a straight

G-series and an "Enhanced" E-series... maybe that means a cleaner Black EQ? I dunno. The E-series weren't noisy, but the G's were cleaner still.

Dynamics-wise, I find the SSL comps pretty useful, but certainly not for everything - I never liked 'em for kick or bass, but they work great on lots of guitar tones & backup vox... things like that - IMO, they tend to thin things out a little bit, so I wouldn't use it on lead vox, either... sometimes a little thinning isn't bad thing, though, esp if you have a metric shitload of tracks running! Oh, snare... the SSL comps are total ass-kickers on snare! (almost forgot!).

Finally the busscomp - if the Duende is \$1,500, and you only like this one thing, then it's worth it, because how much do the hardware ones go for? Or an Alan Smart clone (about \$2,500, right?)?

NeilBill, yep, Cubase on both of 'em, same mix, just summed differently.

....and probably rigged, if you ask Lamont.

:D

Neil

"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:

>I listened to your samples and yes there is a big diff. Is that Cubase
>you're using?

>

>

>"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:459076c2\$1@linux...

>>

>> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:

>>>Hey Neil,

>>>

>>>I missed the origination of this thread. What is
