Subject: Re: OT: CuBase - export file help needed
Posted by EK Sound on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 00:31:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

nd images broken out, and I'll insert it as Wiki article?I'm helping a couple of friends with their home studio.

One XP box running Cubase with a Firepod. Just built them a second XP box to run Reason and some efx.

The firepod also has s/pdif. If I install a soundcard like the Emu 0404 and connect them both with s/pdif, will that connection not only pass audio but also keep Reason in sync with Cubase?

This is the first time I've tried to tie two boxes together. The main idea is to share the cpu load between two resource-intensive apps.

Thanks.It will keep their *sound cards* in sync so they won't get clicks and pops. If you're looking f

Subject: OT: CuBase - export file help needed
Posted by Ted Gerber on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 01:24:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

t yet. But my understanding is that it can control groups of tracks in a relative fashion, and can add delays to do latency compensation.

Senderella is entirely different. I think I'll write up a wiki entry on it. Effectively senderella is a native aux buss. You can instantiate the plug-in as send or as a return. All the sends will get summed together at the return.

The way I experimented with it

Subject: Re: OT: CuBase - export file help needed
Posted by Yanoska on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 03:03:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

sum all the sends that are set to that channel.

2. if so, would they each be returned to the Insert slot from which they were sent, or could you return them elsewhere on the card submix (assuming open tracks)?

I've only experimented with returning to open tracks. I used native submixes for this as it made sense for FX returns. But, I could envision situations where you might want to put the source tracks on native submixes and return them to EDS submixes. An example here could be grouping a bunch of background vocals and having them return on a pair of channels in an EDS submix. The only gottcha is that the Senderella send is pre-fader so you can't do automation on the sends,

only the returns. This is something I think could be addressed by reading the EDS mixer state, or through Midi automation.

I've also thought of another use for Senderella. I haven't tried it, but perhaps it could be used to create interesting delay based FX. Imagine an insert chain consisting of (top to bottom):
- Senderella return (from sends in another mix)
- A second Senderella return (with pass through...linked to the output of the

---

Subject: Re: OT: CuBase - export file help needed
Posted by Ted Gerber on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 04:43:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

>
Cheers

KrisI created a "stub" page to collect configuration info on the Wiki but it's not too well populated yet. There's lots to be gleaned from artguy Steve's collection and John B's notes, I hope to eventually collect 'em in one place.I just stumbled across (another) big gap in my understanding - this needs plugins to be *wrapped*, right?

I've never done that before - am I wrapping DX plugins so the "present" to PARIS as VSTs? Or is it the other way around? I downloaded the FXpansion 3.3 wrapper from the ParisFAQs site -it seems to be made to wrap VSTs as DXs, so far so good?Senderella is a VST. You should be able to drop it i

---

Subject: Re: OT: CuBase - export file help needed
Posted by David L on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 20:58:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

as been processed, and any audio sent to the Senerella 'return' must wait until the next block of samples to be processed. Since Paris uses block sizes of 2000 samples, this explains the latency values that we are seeing. Note that the sample delays in cases 1,2, and 3 above relate nicely to the early latency readings that I got, but with a twist.

1) for the send on submix 2, and return on submix 1, the latency was 1986 samples. For the opposite (send on submix 1, and return on submix 2) the latency was 14. Conveniently, 1986+14 = 2000.
2)for the send on submix 3 and return on submix 1, the latency was 1988 samples. For the opposite way around the latency was 12. Conveniently, 1988+12 = 2000.
3) For the send on submix 3 and return on submix 2, the latency was 2002 samples. For the opposite, the latency was 2. Conveniently, 2002-2 = 2000.

It's a little puzzling as to why case 3 needs the latency subtracted to equal 2000...but I can think of a couple of theories as to why this happens.

At any rate, to distill this down, what it means to the Senderella user is "Have your returns on higher numbered submixes than your sends".

My whole rationale for investigating this

Subject: Re: OT: CuBase - export file help needed
Posted by Ted Gerber on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 06:36:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

via SPDIF into a presonus Central Station to monitor in Wavelab.
In Paris, I monitor via 24bit output into Central Station.
Conclusion: Using the same plugins with the same settings, there was a very noticeable enhancement in the image and depth of the all Paris mix compared to the Wavelab mix.

Rob_A Yeah, lots of angst over there...

I really wonder though, if the most important conversion is the AD off the top.
All three files began as a performance captured through the Lynx. Therefore, clocking in particular is uniformly stellar.

Applying the old "whatever is upstream counts the most" reasoning, I really think that if these had been tracked through each of the same three cards at source, there would be much more significant difference.

As it is, all three get to work with a very good source. The DA is only half (maybe even less than half) of the equation IMO.

Ted

Hey Rob -

Yeah I think I find the same thing. I'm new to PC, so I've been trying out Wavelab. FWIW, it doesn't seem as open as Peak on the Mac, but that's very subjective. It certainly doesn't have the same depth as Paris in my current set up, but my monitoring chain for the PC needs to be improved a lot.

2 Qs:

on # 7 above, does this mean that you're truncating the 24 bit to 16 bit? Not a big deal, but I'm curious.

As far as the comparison goes, wouldn't monitoring via MEC S/PDIF out to the Central Station be more of an apples to apples comparison?

You can always take both r
