

---

Subject: Happy Festivus !!

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Mon, 24 Dec 2007 15:42:28 GMT

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

---

t;

>>>>So, 24 hours pass with the senator joining a gro

---

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 24 Dec 2007 17:39:36 GMT

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

---

What we'll do is have you spend one day

>>>>> in hell and one in

>>>>> heaven. Then you can choose where to spend

>>>>> eternity." "Really, I've made

>>>>> up my mind. I want to be in heaven," says the

>>>>> senator. "I'm sorry, bu

---

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 24 Dec 2007 19:45:00 GMT

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

---

nd that the unit employs a switch-mode power supply to power the  
> circuitry.

> Given the amount of exposed steel in the construction of this unit,

> coupled with the fact that it does employ a switch-mode power supply,

> (mounted on the main circuit board, alongside the audio/digital

> circuitry),

> should not this unit have a 3 pin plug, with mains earth tied to the

> chassis????

>

> Where do I go from here? Modify your design and incorporate a grounded

> 3-pin power cord?, or throw the unit in the bin?? Any enlightenment at

> this point would be appreciated.

>

> Regards,

> Kim Webster.

>

> THE REPLY!!!!:

>

> Hi Kim,

>

> I have been thinking for a number of days exactly what to respond with. I

> have decided some facts.

>

---

> The BCA2000 is not our finest work. It was the first audio interface we  
> did.  
> The product is now discontinued and only some what supported.  
>  
> The unit can b

---

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 24 Dec 2007 19:58:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

/>

>optimized=20  
>for the lower level OSX code base (maybe already), or still on Cocoa or  
=  
>whatever=20

>the Logic=20  
>thread, the latter seems to have a bit more weight than it being a =  
>Nuendo-only=20  
>performance issue.</FONT></DIV>

><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Fwiw,</FONT></DIV>  
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Dedric</FONT></DIV>  
><DIV><BR clear=3Dleft><BR></DIV></BODY></HTML>  
>

>Apparently some Logic users see it as misleading (as do quite a few other  
pros I know), and those numbers quote plugin counts. With most DAWs, that  
equates directly to VSTi's (which are also plugins...). It's isn't the  
whole story. The website never says - "you won't get this kind of latency  
with VSTis the way you do with other DAWs on ASIO". ;-)) And that's  
exactly what I said in my post: Apogee only posted \*part\* of the story.

Really, I only posted this for

---

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Mon, 24 Dec 2007 20:00:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

[www.adkproaudio.com/](http://www.adkproaudio.com/)" target="\_blank"><http://www.adkproaudio.com/>>  
>(859) 635-5762I think what they were

---

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!

---

Posted by [Kim](#) on Mon, 24 Dec 2007 20:57:37 GMT

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

---

><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>The reports on Nuendo performance is =  
>quite a bit=20

>faster on XP and ASIO2, but it's running fine at low latency =

>on</FONT></DIV>

><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>OSX/core audio - just about 20-30% =

>XP/ASIO, vs=20

>45 on OSX/core audio at 64, which is almost 50% more, </FONT><FONT =

>face=3DArial=20

>size=3D2>but I'm assuming there are other plugins in that =

>out for=20

>both=20

---

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 24 Dec 2007 23:24:44 GMT

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

---

) - same dual quad =

>>>>hardware configs in both cases. I don't know for sure if some of this

> =

>>>>is Nuendo not being optimized for the lower level OSX code base (maybe

> =

>>>>already), or still on Cocoa or whatever - or if it is truly a limitation

>>> =

>>>>of OSX and core audio. Based on the Logic thread, the latter seems to

> =

>>>>have a bit more weight than it being a Nuendo-only performance issue.

>>>>

>>>>Fwiw,

>>>>Dedric

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

>>>><HTML><HEAD>

>>>><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =

>>>>charset=3Diso-8859-1">

>>>><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.6000.16587" name=3DGENERATOR>  
>>>><STYLE></STYLE>  
>>>></HEAD>  
>>>><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>  
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><A=20  
>>>>href=3D" http://discussions.apple.com/thread.jspa?messageID=3D6693909 #6693=  
>>>>909"> http://discussions.apple.com/thread.jspa?messageID=3D6693909 #6693909=  
>>>></A> (should=20  
>>>>take you to the next to last post on that page)</FONT></DIV>  
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>  
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Apparently Apogee's numbers =  
>>>>are only=20  
>>>>while tracking. Sounds like they only posted part of the story =  
>>>>with their=20  
>>>>great low latency figures.</FONT></DIV>  
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>It is hard to say if this is the case  
> =  
>>>>for everyone=20  
>>>>though, except for Apogee's response when the user called, but since I  
> =  
>>>>brough

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!

Posted by [Kim](#) on Mon, 24 Dec 2007 23:38:42 GMT

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

---

next to last post on that page)  
>>>>  
>>>>Apparently Apogee's numbers are only while tracking. Sounds like they  
> =  
>>>>only posted part of the story with their great low latency figures.  
>>>>It is hard to say if this is the case for everyone though, except for  
> =  
>>>>Apogee's response when the user called, but since I brought it up in the  
>>> =  
>>>>Vista thread, I thought I would pass it along to try and sort through  
> =  
>>>>marketing myth and real world facts. I was actually kind of hoping the  
>>> =  
>>>>Apogee Symphony would smoke at low latency with Core audio and any app,  
>>> =  
>>>>just because it would be cool to have such a breakthrough, but this =  
>>>>really just shows that ASIO is pushing the limits of current OSs =  
>>>>already, and we haven't really exceeded it yet.  
>>>>  
>>>>The reports on Nuendo performance is quite a bit faster on XP and ASIO2,  
>>> =

>>>>but it's running fine at low latency on  
>>>>OSX/core audio - just about 20-30% higher (my adjusted estimate) plugin  
>>> =  
>>>>load on the same hardware, same latency: it's really 76 Nuendo multiband  
>>> =  
>>>>comps at 64 samples on XP/ASIO, vs 45 on OSX/core audio at 64, which is  
>>> =  
>>>>almost 50% more, but I'm assuming there are other plugins in that =  
>>>>benchmark test to compensate for, and vary part of that loading (I'll  
> =  
>>>>have to find out for sure when I have more time

---

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!  
Posted by [Deej](#) on Mon, 24 Dec 2007 23:44:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>The reports on Nuendo performance is  
> =  
>>>>quite a bit=20  
>>>>faster on XP and ASIO2, but it's running fine at low latency =  
>>>>on</FONT></DIV>  
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>OSX/core audio - just about 20-30% =  
>>>>higher (my=20  
>>>>adjusted estimate) plugin load on the same hardware, same=20  
>>>>latency: it's really 76 Nuendo multiband comps at 64 samples on =  
>>>>XP/ASIO, vs=20  
>>>>45 on OSX/core audio at 64, which is almost 50% more, </FONT><FONT =  
>>>>face=3DArial=20  
>>>>size=3D2>but I'm assuming there are other plugins in that =  
>>>>benchmark test to=20  
>>>>compensate for, and vary part of that loading (I'll have to find =  
>>>>out for=20  
>>>>sure when I have more time) - same dual quad hardware configs in =  
>>>>both=20  
>>>>cases. I don't know for sure if some of this is Nuendo not being =  
>>>>optimized=20  
>>>>for the lower level OSX code base (maybe already), or still on Cocoa or  
>>> =  
>>>>whatever=20  
>>>>- or if it is truly a limitation of OSX and core audio. Based on =  
>>>>the Logic=20  
>>>>thread, the latter seems to have a bit more weight than it being a =  
>>>>Nuendo-only=20  
>>>>performance issue.</FONT></DIV>  
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>  
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Fwiw,</FONT></DIV>  
>>>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Dedric</FONT></DIV>

>>>><DIV><BR clear=3Dleft><BR></DIV></BODY></HTML>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>

>Dedric, I think your right, we need to know what users think and are able to do with a system. I'm not trying to blindly defend.

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Um... okay. Sounds like you are just defending Apogee for no good reason,

>esp. considering I didn't attack them, so give me a break with the "not good

>to make assumptions" lecture. For the last time - I posted this so people

>who have a real world interest in working with this kind of gear would know

>what to look out for, and you jump in to defend Apogee's marketing.

>

>If you have experience with real world use as a composer on an Apogee

>Symphony system and think the Logic user misguided in his evalution, I'm

>sure the Logic forum would be most interested in your input.

>

>It's getting way too difficult to post anything that even hints at the word

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 24 Dec 2007 23:57:46 GMT

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

---

e I see any false claim, Apogee's info is here to see. I don't

>>

>>>> see

>>>> them talking about running software instruments.

>>>>

>>>> [http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony\\_performance.p hp](http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony_performance.p hp)

>>>>

>>>> Lowest Latency: 1.6 milliseconds at 96kHz\* (Analog to Analog)

>>>>

>>>> \*Hardware/Session Details:

>>>> . Computer configuration: &#8232;Mac Pro, 2.66GHz Dual-Core with three

>>>>

>>>> internal

>>>> 500 GB, 7200 RPM drives configured as a RAID and 4 GB of ram.

>>>> . Software: &#8232;Logic 7.2.2 session running at 96k.

>>>> . Track count during latency test: &#8232;32 tracks playback, 32 tracks

>>>> recording

>>>> . Plug ins engaged during latency test: &#8232;10 Adaptive Limiters,  
10  
>>>> Linear Phase EQs, 6 Space Designers (default preset)  
>>>> . Buffer setting: &#8232;32  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> [#6693909](http://discussions.apple.com/thread.jspa?messageID=3D6693909)  
=  
>>>>>(should take you to the next to last post on that page)  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Apparently Apogee's numbers are only while tracking. Sounds like they  
>> =  
>>>>>only posted part of the story with their great low latency figures.  
>>>>>It is hard to say if this is the case for everyone though, except for  
>> =  
>>>>>Apogee's response when the user called, but since I brought it up in  
the  
>>>> =  
>>>>>Vista thread, I thought I would pass it along to try and sort through  
>> =  
>>>>>marketing myth and real world facts. I was actually kind of hoping  
the  
>>>> =  
>>>>>Apogee Symphony would smoke at low latency with Core audio and any app,  
>>>> =  
>>>>>just because it would be cool to have such a breakthrough, but this  
=  
>>>>>really just shows that ASIO is pushing the limits of current OSs =  
>>>>>already, and we haven't really exceeded it yet.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>The reports on Nuendo performance is quite a bit faster on XP and ASIO2,  
>>>> =  
>>>>>but it's running fine at low latency on  
>>>>>OSX/core audio - just about 20-30% higher (my adjusted estimate) plugin  
>>>> =  
>>>>>load on the same hardware, same latency: it's really 76 Nuendo multiband  
>>>> =  
>>>>>comps at 64 samples on XP/ASIO, vs 45 on OSX/core audio at 64, which  
is  
>>>> =  
>>>>>almost 50% more, but I'm assuming there are other plugins in that =  
>>>>>benchmark test to compensate for, and vary part of that loading (I'll  
>> =

>>>>>have to find out for sure when I have more time) - same dual quad =  
>>>>>hardware configs in both cases. I don't know for sure if some of this  
>> =  
>>>>>is Nuendo not being optimized for the lower level OSX code base (maybe  
>> =  
>>>>>already), or still on Cocoa or whatever - or if it is truly a limitation  
>>>> =  
>>>>>of OSX and core audio. Based on the Logic thread, the latter seems  
to  
>> =  
>>>>>have a bit more weight than it being a Nuendo-only performance issue.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Fwiw,  
>>>>>Dedric  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">  
>>>>><HTML><HEAD>  
>>>>><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =  
>>>>>charset=3Diso-8859-1">  
>>>>><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.6000.16587" name=3DGENER

---

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!  
Posted by [Kim](#) on Tue, 25 Dec 2007 00:54:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

br />

>"Apple" here, so I'll take future technical discussions to other forums  
with  
>more objectivity and interest in the real world reports rather than  
>marketing interpretation debates.  
>  
>Dedric  
>  
>  
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message  
>news:47c37654\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> Dedric, I see the truth as the truth. It's good to be educated as to  
what  
>> a system is capable of. It's not good to assume things. It is explained  
>> that they are running 26 fx plugins with 32 tracks at 96k with a buffer  
>> setting of 32 and getting 1.6 millisecond of latency using Logic 7.2.2.  
>> If what they are saying is not true somebody should sue them. On the

>> other  
>> hand, if somebody assumes that they can run a different version of Logic  
>> with a different set up and run virtual instruments, I don't think you  
can  
>> expect to get the same results. Apogee is clear about the set up, however  
>> I do think they should have more information and be more clear about the  
>> plugins counts. They should separate the maximum plugin count and the

>> latency  
>> test, it's a bit confusing.  
>>  
>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>>> Apparently some Logic users see it as misleading (as do quite a few other  
>>  
>>> pros I know), and those numbers quote plugin counts. With most DAWs,  
that  
>>  
>>> equates directly to VSTi's (which are also plugins...). It's isn't the  
>>  
>>> whole story. The website never says - "you won't get this kind of latency  
>>  
>>> with VSTis the way you do with other DAWs on ASIO". ;-)) And that's  
>>> exactly what I said in my post: Apogee only posted \*part\* of the story.  
>>>  
>>> Really, I only posted this for those that might be interested in actually  
>>  
>>> knowing what systems will do vs. what marketing would lead you to believe.  
>>  
>>> These are the kind of real world reports that make or break a buying  
>>> decision for those of us looking for really powerful systems and wanting  
>> to  
>>> know exactly what we are getting, not just assume because we love the  
>>> company behind it....  
>>>  
>>> If you track all day for living, it sounds like a great system (but so  
is  
>> an  
>>> RME MADI rig). If you run VSTi's, investigate it more and try before  
you  
>>  
>>> buy, or look elsewhere in known waters (ASIO 2 systems), at least for  
now  
>>  
>>> until there's either more info and/or Apogee beefs up their  
>>> system/drivers.  
>>>  
>>> The point isn't to defend or attack anyone - it's just to get to the

>>>bottom  
>>  
>>>of what products \*really\* do so we know before we buy.  
>>>As long as customers defend manufacturers out of blind loyalty, getting  
>> an  
>>>honest answer and better products from those developers will only get  
more  
>>  
>>>and more difficult.  
>>>  
>>>Dedric  
>>>  
>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message  
>>>news:47c35daf\$1@linux...  
>>>>  
>>>> I not sur

---

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!  
Posted by [Deej](#) on Tue, 25 Dec 2007 00:59:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Door Drive G4 mac (single processor) on Ebay about  
>>a  
>>>>year  
>>>>>ago, with the idea of making it my Paris machine, but I thought I would  
>>>>>test  
>>>>>it first without Paris. At first it seemed to work fine, but it soon  
>>started  
>>>>>freezing up, usually after a few hours of use. I opened the case and  
>>put  
>>>>>a 12" fan pointed directly at the processor, and it worked perfectly  
>>for  
>>>>>awhile, but after a few months it was back to the old tricks. Definitely  
>>>>>heat related, as it's worse on hot days or if I keep my computer closet  
>>>>>closed  
>>>>>with the light on.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Any ideas on what I might try?  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Thanks,  
>>>>>Dale  
>>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>I would call 800 SOS APPLE and see what the restore disk would cost. I would  
tell them you misplaced them. At one time they would send them out for free.

"dale" <dalebradleycello@yahoo.com> wrote:

>

>OS 9 (Classic) is installed (on more than one HD), but when I go to system  
>Preferences / Startup Disk, the only Systems that show up to select to boot  
>with are the OS X ones. It's my understanding that even a dragged-over system  
>9 will work for classic, but to make system 9 bootable, the original disks  
>(set of 4, I think) that came with the MDD must be used.

>

>What I'm wondering is, can these original MDD disks be copied? If not, then  
>I guess I will bid high to try and snag the ones on Ebay.

>

>Dale

>

>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>Did you check to see if OS9 is already installed? You can check by going  
>>to system preferences, Start up disk. If there is an OS9 folder in there,  
>>click on it and hit restart. I don't however think this will help you  
with

>>OSX freeze ups. I would make an appointment at the Genus bar at your Apple  
>>store and have them look at it.

>>

>>"dale" <dalebradleycello@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>I downloaded the firmware update, but when I run the installer it says

>I

>>must

>>>be booted into system 9. It is my understanding that in order to install  
>>>a bootable system 9, I need the original install disk(s). I have a single  
>>>install disk, but I've checked several apple forums, and unless I am missing  
>>>something, the system 9 install stuff must be on a different disk that

>I

>>>don't have. The local Mac store won't sell me a replacement disk(s), but  
>>>they say they will install system 9 onto my machine for \$45.

>>>

>>>Obviously, it would be preferable to have the disk(s) so I can re-install  
>>>system 9 if/when necessary in the future.

>>>

>>>I looked on Ebay, and there is a set of 4 install disks for MDD that  
is

>>>up for sale, which I will try to bid on.

>>>

>>>Does anyone have any other ideas on how to get these disks?

>>>

>>>Thanks,

>>>Dale

>>>

>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>Mac OSX has protected memory, so I'd check the support site for the latest  
>>>>firmware. Is the machine locking up running OSX? Do you have an Apple  
>>>retail  
>>>>store near you?  
>>>>  
>>>>"dale" <dalebradleycello@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>thanks James,  
>>>>>  
>>>>>If I make this machine my Paris rig, I will be running OS9, but have  
>not  
>>>>>tried that yet. I'm currently running 10.4.9, but also using Classic.  
>>I  
>>>>think  
>>>>>it freezes up with classic running or not---but I can try not us

---

---

Subject: Re: Happy Festivus !!  
Posted by [Deej](#) on Tue, 25 Dec 2007 01:01:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ing  
Classic  
>>>>>and see if that makes a difference. Do you think I need to change some  
>>>kind  
>>>>>of settings in classic? Or allocate more memory to OS9 apps? I thought  
>>>OSX  
>>>>>automatically handled memory.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Thanks,  
>>>>>Dale  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>My Dual Mirror door G4 dual 1.25 runs hot as well,but I've never had  
>>problems  
>>>>>>with freeze up. Your problem may be hardware/heat related, but my  
first  
>>>>>>guess is software. There was a firmware down load related to heat  
and  
>>>>noise.  
>>>>>> I would check Apple's support site for the latest firmware. Are  
you  
>>>>freezing

>>>>>when running OS 9 or OSX? If your freezing in OS9, don't forget that  
>>>OS  
>>>>>9 does not have protected memory, so you may need to allocate more  
memory  
>>>>>to programs. It was the biggest flaw with Mac OS 9 and prior, users  
>>would  
>>>>>forget to up the memory for all the programs they are running and they'd  
>>>>>get a lock up or crash.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>I hope this helps!  
>>>>>  
>>>>>James  
>>>>>  
>>>>>"dale" <dalebradleycello@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>To James & all you mac guys,  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>I bought a Mirror Door Drive G4 mac (single processor) on Ebay about  
>>>a  
>>>>year  
>>>>>>ago, with the idea of making it my Paris machine, but I thought I  
would  
>>>>>>test  
>>>>>>it first without Paris. At first it seemed to work fine, but it soon  
>>>started  
>>>>>>freezing up, usually after a few hours of use. I opened the case and  
>>>put  
>>>>>>a 12" fan pointed directly at the processor, and it worked perfectly  
>>>for  
>>>>>>awhile, but after a few months it was back to the old tricks. Definitely  
>>>>>>heat related, as it's worse on hot days or if I keep my computer closet  
>>>>>>closed  
>>>>>>with the light on.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>Any ideas on what I might try?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>Thanks,  
>>>>>>Dale  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:  
>I'm sorry I ever posted this - wrong forum.  
>  
>Dedric  
>

I know how you feel!

>  
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote in message news:47c4bb50\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> Thank you Chris for stating what I have been saying for years now.  
>>  
>> All this tech talk :(\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$) about low latency on native solutions,  
is  
>> very costly AND, I might add, as Thad has said on numerous occasions,  
have  
>> gained nothing!! due to that fact that we are all beholdng to MS Vista/XP  
>> and OSX..  
>>  
>> On the Nuendo.com website 10 mile post on system performance specs is  
  
>> sickening!.  
>> Who cares? All, one should want is  
>>  
>> A stable running system, that performs the task thats needed.  
>>  
>> I'm with the get Protools HD(X) and be done with it. There are those on  
  
>> this  
>> and other sites how have sunk major\$\$\$\$ trying to "perice-Mill\_ a working  
>> DAW hat outperforms ProTools HD. That's cool, but I would these folks  
have  
>> spent "More" money than just buying a super hot-rod ProTools HD6..  
>>  
>> Note: Out 2 HD rigs on G5's also run Nuendo(Via Digis Asio drivers)..Runs  
>> great, and is as stable as ever. I can mix a 70 track project with alot  
of  
>> plugins on that baby. So, Getting a ProTools HD rig is not 'So Closed"  
as  
>> some here believes.  
>>  
>> Back to the subject:  
>> If you were to do a search on Gearsutz on the symphony, yooou'd see that  
>> I slammed that card saying that "for a 1k or even 700 dollars, "What am  
I  
>> getting".. No DSP, nothing but a glorified half baked mixer that allows  
  
>> you  
>> to play itunes .. Not impressed.  
>>  
>> While we're onthe subject, I think RME's total mix should be simplified

