
Subject: Vista Upgrades Available for Download
Posted by [excelav](#) on Tue, 18 Mar 2008 20:18:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

EDS
>>8in card
>>8out card
>>ADAT card
>>(2) C16
>>
>>It's running Par

Subject: Re: Vista Upgrades Available for Download -- WARNING!
Posted by [Mark McDermott](#) on Tue, 18 Mar 2008 22:31:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:
>>> Ted, If I remember right, rendered files were never in dispute, as Brian
>> T
>>> did a 10th generation render and it still canceled out. What was in dispute
>>> was disk bounce in 3.0 versus spdif bounce in 3.0. Sakis held the position
>>> that disk bounce in 3.0 was not as accurate as spdif bounce.
>>> Rod
>>> "Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:
>>>> I just recently started rendering files with native plugins
>>>> after testing the rendered against the edited original and
>>>> flippin

Subject: Re: Vista Upgrades Available for Download -- WARNING!
Posted by [JeffH](#) on Tue, 18 Mar 2008 23:34:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

with or without plugins -
>>>> were as accurate as bounced files. So far so good.
>>>>
>>>> Ted
>>>>
>>As I have listened (not with any great detail mind you) I have not noticed
a difference from the rendered files. I was a bit apprehensive as I have
always taken the "real time" approach to printing stems. Obviously, from
a time consumption stand point it can't be beat.

Tyrone

EK Sound <ask_me@nospam.net> wrote:

>A SPDIF bounce would put Word Clock into the fray... A disc bounce would

>use the Paris internal clock and not make use of any external clock. If

>you had a really high quality clock source, it may make a noticeable

>difference with a SPDIF bounce.

>

>David.

>

>Cujo wrote:

>> Hmm, now I am curious, does anyone else hear a diff?

>> Is the SPDIF file more open and clear?

>>

>>

>> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam
