

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

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

[illegible]

The PARIS Forums

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> 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"

TVqQAAMAAAAEAAAA//8AALgAAAAAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
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.
>
