
Subject: Re: Digital Performer Question

Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 19:31:01 GMT

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

nly talking about Pro-Tools. But a little perspective.

There

>> are still alot (read more) Pro-Tool Mix3 setups than HD setups. So, you don;t

>> have to upgrade the various Digi setups if you wan to..

>

>

>Well maybe the converters :)

>>

>> I was talking about PArIs, Pro Tools, Soundscape..Radar.

>>

>Paris would really be the only one that was close enough functionality

>wise to be compared to Pro Tools. The other are really just glorified

>hard disk recorders.

>

>

>> P.S.

>> I personally would not for over the mo

Subject: Re: Digital Performer Question

Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 19:54:55 GMT

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

rism rack.

>

> ;o)Yes of course Dj, but whay have are not giving the user's (customers) what they want.

The user(customers) don;t want more plugings from UAD, but just a faster DSP card to run more of whthe plugins they have..

But, UAD just releases another plugin to seemingly apease the customer base. However, it's not working..

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:

>They are making a profit and having a life with it?

>

>;o)

>

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:4571c8a4\$1@linux...

>>

>> Good Post Decric ..

>>

>> There was this debate (last year) on gearslutz about the UAD card issue

>> and

>> it was an overwhelming fact that most of the users would gladly pay "more"

>> money for a "faster" DSP card..

>>

>> And to be honest, I think I would gladly pay more for the UAD if it had

>> more

>> horsepower than the current model(s).

>>

>> Soemthing n

Subject: Digital Performer Question
Posted by [Gantt Kushner](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 20:04:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

t screens that don't correspond to what's actually playing

> due

>>to latency and praying that I can get thru 10 minutes with no strange

>>noises.

>>

>>

>>Today is one of those days that, if I had 20 or 30 grand t

Subject: Re: Digital Performer Question
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 20:47:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ot quite right in UAD land with concernng the UAD powered

>> plugins

>> business model. Factor in this :

>>

>> -Their plugins have never been hacked, nor iare being sold on the black

>> market.

>>

>> So, unlike other Plugin manufactuers, their seeing a real profit and not

>> loses on plugins.

>> So what gives..??

>>

>>

>> c Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>>>On 12/2/06 9:31 AM, in article 45719c34\$1@linux, "LaMont"

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

>>>
>>>>
>>>> They recently interviewd the UAD guys and the big question was put to
>> them:
>>>> 'Why not add more power to the card'?"
>>>>
>>>> UAD: answer was : Because they could not find a "cost-effective "Dsp

>>&g

Subject: Re: Digital Performer Question
Posted by [Gantt Kushner](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 21:37:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

tion of I/O
>>-optical audio i.o..Nice (more on this later)
>>-DVD/RW.
>>-Space to add 4 more drives..
>>
>>They had it running apple's boot-camp, so I was able to boot into Win Xp
>>pro.
>>
>>Verdict:
>>I am very impressed with this unit. The speed and efficiency that it ran
>>Win-Xp pro was as smooth and fast as I ever seen.
>>
>>The Apple rep : explained to me the me that the on-board audio (via the
optical
>>i/os) were capable of of 24/94 bit sample rate with a very respectable
latency
>>via the use of Audio units drivers. And the S/N rating ranks the on-board
>>audio interface right up there with best of them. I played a few songs
from
>>a cd I brought to test. The mac Pro had a decent pair of M-audio monitors.
>>Man, the audio was professional. The only need that I can see someone needed
>>another audio interface is to add I/o..And it stands, if you only need
2
>>inputs, then the on-board sound interface will more than suffice.
>>
>>On the Os-x side of things, I have to say that I've never, read NEVER :)
>>seen Os-X run this fast!!! :) On previous macs, Os-x always felt a bit
like
>>"a Cheetah stuck in the quick sand"..
>>
>>Now, on these intel -multi-core cpus, this is
