OT parts discussion

Posted by kirlian - 2011/11/28 09:44

_____

just curious here...

i've read a lot of posts from people that don't like or understand OT parts and would like to have one "kit" per pattern. the OT was clearly designed with parts in mind from the beginning. i like parts. i have found a few situations where maybe a kit per pattern situation may have been preferable, but for the most part i see a lot of potential.

can some of you that don't like the parts concept tell me why?

==

Re:OT parts discussion

Posted by Rusty - 2011/11/28 09:57

_____

Now, not saying I "don't like" parts... but I really haven't wrapped my head around them / found a use for them just yet.

I can definitely see a use for them when triggering "static" audio (i.e 8x 1 bar loops), or a basic 4x4 kick, but can see where the confusion can come in, on top of all the sample management issues.

This is where I trip up a bit, with having to handle/remember which sample have been utilised, and the sample trig offsets...

So I can see why people would like a "part-per-pattern" mode, or maybe even a "default sample allocation" per pattern, rather then per bank might make it easier.

I think given a good video tutorial on the benefits, and examples of how they can be utilised, people may come round a bit.

==

Re:OT parts discussion

Posted by Justin Valer - 2011/11/28 10:17

_____

The Parts concept is a replacement of the Kits concept, though the destination between the two is quite blurred.

Most users of the Octatrack are legacy users of the Machinedrum. One of the strengths when using the MD lies in the user's ability to save and recall many variations of the same kit quickly.

4 parts per bank = unnecessary work flow restriction to those that have become accustom to working with almost unlimited Kits in the MD.

Parts in the Octratrack were not designed to be used like Kits. Parts are in essence a Live Performance Workspace Configuration. I feel, future O/S updates will emphasise this distinction.

==

Re:OT parts discussion

Posted by MrSysex - 2011/11/28 13:36

_____

I hadn't seen this when I just made my thread about parts.
This is the sort of useful discussion I can get behind. Thanks.

==

Re:OT parts discussion

Posted by RobbieNerve - 2011/11/28 15:33

_____

The complexity of the octatrack (and very limited time the past 8 months) has been a bit of a hurdle for me I have yet to take.

I try to read as much about it on the forum and other places on the web.

What happened to me several times is that I made a pattern with a sliced beats, locks etc etc just like posted earlier in this thread and when I made a second pattern and selected a different sample from the audio pool for that track, the first pattern was messed up because it got the same sample.

The way I see it now is that I just have to lock every sample as well to the trigs.
It's an extra action I have to perform for each trig and all added up it will consume quite some time.

I've got more time on my hands nowadays so I really have to do my best to master the OT.

To be honest, this is the first machine I have ever owned that made my brain hurt.

Guess elektron is quite busy but I'd love to see a good tutorial video how to work with parts / samples in relation to patterns.

.R

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by olafp - 2011/11/28 16:27
_____

RobbieNerve wrote:

Guess elektron is quite busy but I'd love to see a good tutorial video how to work with parts / samples in relation to patterns.

.R

yeah, parts are hard to handle especially when you dont know or understand the real benefit.
comming from a md it feels quite unusual but probably it takes just a good video hint to open unknown territory for some of us.
I too think that elektron is pretty busy at the moment so my suggestion is they should hire SecretMusicUK 2 do this kind of job :-)

He does a superb job on tutorial vids!

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Steril707 - 2011/11/28 16:31
_____

It would be nice to have 16 parts per Bank. Each one autoassigned to a pattern at the start.

Then, you may consider yourself, if you want to have patterns share a part,a nd if not, then have each pattern their own part.

So you would have the flexibility of the partsystem, but not the restrictions.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/28 19:32
_____

kirlian wrote:
can some of you that don't like the parts concept tell me why?

Because it means that you cant have 8 new samples per pattern, just like the MD. That alone makes it a pain in the arse.

Personally I will never need to take a pattern I have already got and play it with another "part". I wrote the pattern for the samples it uses. If I wanted the same pattern with new samples Id copy the pattern to anew one and assign new samples. Essentially the parts idea is a restriction and not an advantage.

Its is also confusing for people who are used to the MD and other samplers/grooveboxes that do things properly.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by dataline - 2011/11/28 19:38
_____

Justin Valer wrote:

Parts in the Octratrack were not designed to be used like Kits. Parts are in essence a Live Performance Workspace Configuration. I feel, future O/S updates will emphasise this distinction.

THIS !!!

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/28 19:45
_____

Justin Valer wrote:
Parts in the Octratrack were not designed to be used like Kits. Parts are in essence a Live Performance Workspace Configuration. I feel, future O/S updates will emphasise this distinction.

Really bad design decision, it in actuality compromises ease of use and serves to annoy their MD user base in my opinion.

If they must have "parts" there should be 16 per bank not 4 and there should be a setting to "lock banks to patterns".

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by dataline - 2011/11/28 19:50
_____

I guess Octatrack and Machinedrum are different machines designed to do different things :)

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/28 19:59
_____

dataline wrote:
I guess Octatrack and Machinedrum are different machines designed to do different things :)

Familiarity of interface between products is a good thing. I think this is something that elektron got wrong with the octa. I like pretty much everything else but to my mind not having a sample setup per pattern is a big oversight and only serves to reduce the octatracks ease of use and general flexibility.

If anything you should be able to save an infinite number of kits (8 tracks with samples, parameter settings, fx settings and scenes) per project and assign them to patterns as you see fit. Now that would be a real step forward.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by electrolegs - 2011/11/28 21:17

_____

There is already enough parts per project as is, but users seem to rarely need/want to use all 16 banks in a project.. Why? Dunno. Ideally, most users would like 16 available by default in a single bank - per pattern. I'm guessing this is mainly down to ease of use pattern chaining on the fly because otherwise you would think 4 per bank over 16 banks would suffice.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by anselmi - 2011/11/28 21:22

_____

AikiGhost wrote:
Personally I will never need to take a pattern I have already got and play it with another "part". I wrote the pattern for the samples it uses. If I wanted the same pattern with new samples Id copy the pattern to anew one and assign new samples. Essentially the parts idea is a restriction and not an advantage

yep, I feel it the same way...the "parts" approach make me go painfully slow and kinda lost track of what IÂ´m doing because of the fear of ruin other patterns

I donÂ´t have this feelings with the other elektron gear or even my korg ESX...thereÂ´s a layout and operation sense that is intuitive and make you to concentrate in the music instead of the technical and operative stuff

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Thomas - 2011/11/28 22:02

_____

If Elektron made the Ot with dedicated part per pattern, and just made it possible to have 64 part/patterns, people would complain about that too. The way i see it is that i get "free patterns" compared to the mnm or md. I know i would be annoyed if i had to use up one part, just because i wanted a small break, or fade in.

It seems that its easier to complain about what it doesnt do, than to just learn how to do what you want. I still remember when i got my first synth. Back then i had to learn how to use it. Instead of complaining about how I want it to perform. Elektron cant win here. If they change something to please some users, other users will complain.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by exuviae - 2011/11/28 22:04

_____

AikiGhost wrote:
Justin Valer wrote:
Parts in the Octratrack were not designed to be used like Kits. Parts are in essence a Live Performance Workspace Configuration. I feel, future O/S updates will emphasise this distinction.

Really bad design decision, it in actuality compromises ease of use and serves to annoy their MD user base in my opinion.

If they must have "parts" there should be 16 per bank not 4 and there should be a setting to "lock banks to patterns".

I would shut up about parts forever if they did exactly this!

EDIT: Lock PARTS to patterns - samples per pattern...yes.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/28 22:09

_____

Thomas wrote:
If Elektron made the Ot with dedicated part per pattern, and just made it possible to have 64 part/patterns, people would complain about that too.

I wouldn't since it would actually be operating as expected.

It seems that its easier to complain about what it doesnt do, than to just learn how to do what you want.

Or you could do both like I am. How can 4 parts per bank be better than 16? I want a bank per pattern and savable assignable banks/kits.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by ipassenger - 2011/11/28 22:32
_____

I'd like parts to behave just like kits do in the MD but they don't stress me out the way the work. Just not sure what it adds having them this way rather just a list of parts(kits) that you can assign to any pattern.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/28 23:38
_____

ipassenger wrote:
I'd like parts to behave just like kits do in the MD but they don't stress me out the way the work. Just not sure what it adds having them this way rather just a list of parts(kits) that you can assign to any pattern.

+1. My (and many others) feelings exactly.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by MrSysex - 2011/11/28 23:47
_____

Thomas wrote:
If Elektron made the Ot with dedicated part per pattern, and just made it possible to have 64 part/patterns, people would complain about that too. The way i see it is that i get "free patterns" compared to the mnm or md. I know i would be annoyed if i had to use up one part, just because i wanted a small break, or fade in.

It seems that its easier to complain about what it doesnt do, than to just learn how to do what you want. I still remember when i got my first synth. Back then i had to learn how to use it. Instead of complaining about how I want it to perform. Elektron cant win here. If they change something to please some users, other users will complain.

^Yes. this!

electrolegs wrote:
There is already enough parts per project as is, but users seem to rarely need/want to use all 16 banks in a project.. Why? Dunno. Ideally, most users would like 16 available by default in a single bank - per pattern. I'm guessing this is mainly down to ease of use pattern chaining on the fly because otherwise you would think 4 per bank over 16 banks would suffice.

^And this!

exuviae wrote:

EDIT: Lock PARTS to patterns - samples per pattern...yes.

^Absolutely NOT this. It would be so much worse to give up the dynamic flexibility of parts assignment.

Locking parts to a pattern would be much, much worse than it is now. I wouldn't protest more parts per bank, but I think

you're missing something fundamental about the flexibility here, if you only ever want to make each pattern completely different from the others.
It's just a matter of getting used to it, there is a threshold that needs to be crossed, it'll click, and you'll say "OH HAHA I GET IT." Or not. Maybe not.

Elektron were smart in how they set it up. We're all just catching up.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/29 00:02

_____

MrSysex wrote:

exuviae wrote:

EDIT: Lock PARTS to patterns - samples per pattern...yes.

^Absolutely NOT this. It would be so much worse to give up the dynamic flexibility of parts assignment.

You couldnt be more wrong. Lock parts to patterns, but allow reassignment of any "kit" to any pattern/part is how it should work. How its set up now is retarded.

If you want the same pattern with different samples just copy pattern to a new slot and assign a new kit. This would make massively more sense than what we have now.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by dubathonic - 2011/11/29 00:02

_____

Thomas wrote:
The way i see it is that i get "free patterns" compared to the mnm or md. I know i would be annoyed if i had to use up one part, just because i wanted a small break, or fade in.

Call me a relentless optimist, but I feel the same. It was quite intuitive (for me at least) from the outset to to say I've got four patterns per part...to say to myself, OK, I've got a new pattern here, I can compose up to four variations on it. It means I can compose fills and fades, as Thomas mentions. Or create a 16-bar loop with pattern chain, for example, and only dedicate one "kit" (part) to doing it.

Since I frequently write loops that are longer than 4 bars, it works for me. But I appreciate that it doesn't fit some people's musical needs/wants.

FWIW, I still feel like there's too much to learn here generally to get strung out about it. Guitar, saxophone and MD all have their limitations as well, but I remember feeling the same way about each of them: Focus on what's possible, and spend the time trying to get good at that. If the parts-per-project limitation is the biggest issue I have to cope with, I'll count myself satisfied.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by lostinthemanual - 2011/11/29 00:13

_____

64 parts is enough, thats good.
How they are managed is not cool.

Not shure if elektron is restricted by some reasons to handle the parts as is now within 16 banks with 4parts.
having a part per pattern but only 64 parts in total would mean we would just have 4 banks and would loose on total amount of possible patterns. Not shure what i would prefer:
the 4 banks with 1 part for each pattern or how it is now.
Guess i'd take the part per pattern.

does anybody here needs more than 64 pattern per project in real use ?

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by anselmi - 2011/11/29 00:16
_____

too much people feel that the actual parts approach is not the best way to manage the sample kit for a pattern

of course thereÂ´s walkarounds, as usual, but why change a trusted design that they featured so well in their previous gear?

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/29 00:17
_____

lostinthemanual wrote:
does anybody here needs more than 64 pattern per project in real use ?

Some people see the project = live set/album. Rather than project = song. So yes some people do want more than 64 patterns per project.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Thomas - 2011/11/29 01:04
_____

anselmi wrote:
too much people feel that the actual parts approach is not the best way to manage the sample kit for a pattern

of course thereÂ´s walkarounds, as usual, but why change a trusted design that they featured so well in their previous gear?

The problem is that it's mostly the people who don't like it that post their issues. Those of us who are happy with the current functions don't feel the need to make threads about it.

The hardware of the ot is fixed. If getting more parts would result in less memory for samples, would it be worth it? For me it wouldn't. I really don't see the problem with how parts are handled.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/29 01:15
_____

thomas wrote:
The hardware of the ot is fixed. If getting more parts would result in less memory for samples, would it be worth it? For me it wouldn't. I really don't see the problem with how parts are handled.

How can adding the option to have more parts take away from sample memory? That doesn't even make any sense.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by dataline - 2011/11/29 01:18
_____

dubathonic wrote:
Thomas wrote:

Focus on what's possible, and spend the time trying to get good at that.

:kiss:

Of course the OT has limitations, and the biggest one is the Parts at the moment I guess. I did not like this idea at first of this but after spending time with the OT and making more stuff with it, I got used to it and 4 parts per Bank works for me now. Been able to trig different samples on tracks seems to sort out this limitation for me.

But yea, if we had different Parts/Kits for each pattern it would be nice, but as we all know it, Elektron likes to give limitations :D

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Thomas - 2011/11/29 01:23
_____

AikiGhost wrote:
thomas wrote:
The hardware of the ot is fixed. If getting more parts would result in less memory for samples, would it be worth it? For me it wouldn't. I really don't see the problem with how parts are handled.

How can adding the option to have more parts take away from sample memory? That doesn't even make any sense.

Every pattern/part is loaded into the ram, so it would require some memory. So since more parts would use more of the ram, You have to give up something.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kirlian - 2011/11/29 01:32
_____

glad to see all the input.

i haven't found that parts limit me- yet. i'm not doing the math or worried about changing something that seems very conscious on the part of elektron. i can see the value of having a big list of kits to assign to any pattern, but i don't think that having 4 parts per bank constitutes a fundamental limitation in interface or music making, or a major setback in useability. it's just a different concept. i've used the MD and MnM for 3 years and felt very comfortable getting around the OT almost immediately even with the addition of parts. i do think that the parts concept's flexibility can be more appreciated when thinking improvisationally than when thinking about tracking.

i doubt parts will be eliminated from the OT. it says parts right on it. maybe adding more would appease the dislike some feel? maybe making them non-local or not attached to banks? talking about getting rid of them is kinda goofy.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Petur - 2011/11/29 01:34
_____

lostinthemanual wrote:
does anybody here needs more than 64 pattern per project in real use ?

I certainly share parts between patterns quite a lot. So the current workflow actually works really nice for me.

Solving this "issue" by lowering the amounts of patterns in a project from 256 to 64 will definitely make a lot of other users quite upset instead (including me).

The simplest solution should be to make all 64 parts in a project accessible from all banks. That at least wouldn't break the current workflow... except for adding more cumbersome menu diving when selecting parts i guess... not sure if i would like that actually...

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by poonti - 2011/11/29 01:39

_____

If you think of Tracks as Musicians in a Band, and Parts as the Instruments they play during a song, and Patterns as the notes/performance they give, then having your Musicians switch Instruments 4 times during that particular Song's performance should be enough, no?

However, I'm also used to one pattern/one kit from MnM/MD. I can see that the Parts thing causes frustration.

I think the real problem is not the "limitation" of 4 tracks, but rather that it's too easy to wipe out a Part if you're not careful!

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 02:06

_____

For me the issue with parts is not that there are not enough - its the fact that confining samples to parts means that I can't choose how to use samples/available ram, also the fact that scrolling through 128 samples is not fun, and sample locks are pretty klutzy and not as simple as say using sample chains and slice points, also I think the assigning of samples to tracks is needlessly long winded.

I'd quite happily be limited to 1x 128 samples in ram at a time as long as I can assign them how I see fit, I mean really has anyone used or felt the need to use 4 banks of 128 samples in the machine at a time - if the answer to that is yes then I think maybe you need to realise that the OT is a powerhouse at changing samples beyond recognition and even with 128 samples in memory it would easy be possible to do a night long set no problem, and using sample chains can of course give even more timbral possibilities.

And I'm getting tired of people misunderstanding why other users don't like the 'part' concept, no-one is saying it is hard to use or we don't understand it, so you can get of your high horses thinking you have some 'elite jedi powers' because it doesn't bother you :laugh: Put simply some facets of the OT's operation are not as good as they could be, and it seems that the more experienced guys are the ones who are in agreement about some of these issues. In short it would be adding to the OT's power rather than detracting from it if some of these interface tweaks were implemented.

I wish people were this vocal when the chorus was nerfed:laugh:

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by MrSysex - 2011/11/29 02:21

_____

AikiGhost wrote:
MrSysex wrote:

exuviae wrote:

EDIT: Lock PARTS to patterns - samples per pattern...yes.

^Absolutely NOT this. It would be so much worse to give up the dynamic flexibility of parts assignment.

You couldnt be more wrong. Lock parts to patterns, but allow reassignment of any "kit" to any pattern/part is how it should work. How its set up now is retarded.

If you want the same pattern with different samples just copy pattern to a new slot and assign a new kit. This would make massively more sense than what we have now.

I'm not wrong, it's just that you don't like it.
What you're suggesting is completely rewriting the way the OT works. Not only the code that goes into patterns & parts, but the UI. As Kirlian says, PARTS is printed right on the surface of the machine. Parts are not going away. And I stand

by the idea that they are a smart way to work.

Anselmi: "why change a trusted design that they featured so well in their previous gear?"
Because this is a completely different piece of kit. It's far more advanced. Admittedly it's got a stiffer learning curve. But it actually works quite well how it is.

As far as I'm concerned, and I think many agree, the only thing that could be improved would be if there were more parts (1 per pattern if desired). We still don't know if OT memory would support this, and it does seem like that could likely take away from available memory alloted to flex sample slots.

I suggest getting used to parts, because they aren't going away.
It's been said again and again, but here we go. If you want a different part for each pattern you use, only make 4 patterns per bank. Work within the current limitations of the structure, and find how to exploit them. You're not going to get much done if you can't accept this. The argument for more parts is valid, certainly, but trying to switch to "kits" or locking parts to patterns simply is not. There's a lot more going on with the idea behind kits than what some people are grasping so far. They are not "retarded," you simply don't understand them. Not you, Darenager, but certainly some people.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Thomas - 2011/11/29 02:24
_____

darenager wrote:

I wish people were this vocal when the chorus was nerfed:laugh:

We have learnt from that experience! ;)

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by boboter - 2011/11/29 02:32
_____

poonti wrote:

I think the real problem is not the "limitation" of 4 tracks, but rather that it's too easy to wipe out a Part if you're not careful!

This!
I can live with the concept as is. But from time to time I screw something up because of it. There is like a tiny but constant fear when creating new patterns...

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 02:58
_____

Some good points raised - Parts going away is pretty unlikely that is for sure, but do they need to go away really? I think the point is that the implementation could be improved - for example within the realistic confines of available ram and file designations why not allow the user to choose how many samples to a part, and how many parts to load in memory dependant upon the users needs (again, within reasonable hardware/software limits)

So some might like to stick with the current scheme of 4 parts each with 128 samples, someone else might like to have 16 parts each with 32 samples etc.

Reading back on my earlier post I come across as a bit grumpy, whilst it is true that I am a grumpy old git, I still love my OT;) And you guys:kiss:

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/29 03:04

_____

Thomas wrote:
AikiGhost wrote:
thomas wrote:
The hardware of the ot is fixed. If getting more parts would result in less memory for samples, would it be worth it? For me it wouldn't. I really don't see the problem with how parts are handled.

How can adding the option to have more parts take away from sample memory? That doesn't even make any sense.

Every pattern/part is loaded into the ram, so it would require some memory. So since more parts would use more of the ram, You have to give up something.

That is only true if you:

A: Use a lot of very long samples
B: Never use static machines for anything

In any case its not the parts that take away the ram its the extra samples you load so this same issue can also occur with the octatrack as it is now.

Anyway we're now talking at crossed purposes you're taking about physical limitations and Im talking about interface design.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/29 03:08

_____

MrSysex wrote:

I'm not wrong, it's just that you don't like it.
What you're suggesting is completely rewriting the way the OT works. Not only the code that goes into patterns & parts, but the UI. As Kirlian says, PARTS is printed right on the surface of the machine. Parts are not going away. And I stand by the idea that they are a smart way to work.

I actually really hate it, I think its a terrible design decision and severely retards the ease of use and general speed of composition with the octatrack. The parts label being printed on the case doesn't mean you cant just have 16 of them 1 per pattern.

 There's a lot more going on with the idea behind kits than what some people are grasping so far. They are not "retarded," you simply don't understand them.

Well if that's the case elektron have done an absolutely abysmal job of explaining what they are supposed to be for and also of explaining to people before the buy an octa that it works in this odd, extremely annoying and "not like our other gear" way.

But I'm sure that as with all elektron gear all this confusion, annoyance and questioning by new users is all by "design".

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kirlian - 2011/11/29 03:46

_____

There is some good info in here. Thanks. I could probably have benefitted more from this thread being titled "OT parts workflow discussion", but there is some very valid discussion here nonetheless . I realize I have brought up a sore point. I haven't been keeping up with the OT threads from this year and my search results didn't quite answer my questions. It's pretty cool to know that elektron is the kind of company that will address the legitimate concerns of its product's users. Since this seems to be a volitile topic, I'll be interested to see if and how elektron addresses it.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by coldfuture - 2011/11/29 03:55
_____

I wish I understood parts at all.

I really don't understand them one bit. I am super gun shy too because I have only messed up my work each time I mess with them so right now I am stuck with essentially one part per bank.

I haven't had the time to dive in and learn the OT because of raising my son, but I am not working on an album and really need to grasp this thing.

I don't know enough to say they are good or bad, but I do agree with the contingent that is frustrated by the OT's dissimilarity with the MD and MnM. I have spent years learning the other 2 and only barely have a handle on all the MnM does... makes learning the OT a bit discouraging.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by N_Rain - 2011/11/29 04:34
_____

One thing that would be nice is if the parts were saved when syncing the project or saving a backup. It's just too easy to forget to save a part and then when you reload it.. oops!

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by anselmi - 2011/11/29 04:52
_____

Thomas wrote:
The hardware of the ot is fixed. If getting more parts would result in less memory for samples, would it be worth it? For me it wouldn't. I really don't see the problem with how parts are handled.

less sample memory for a few parameters and sample address recall? cÂ´mon...

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kraftf - 2011/11/29 05:32
_____

darenager wrote:
For me the issue with parts is not that there are not enough - its the fact that confining samples to parts means that I can't choose how to use samples/available ram, also the fact that scrolling through 128 samples is not fun, and sample locks are pretty klutzy and not as simple as say using sample chains and slice points, also I think the assigning of samples to tracks is needlessly long winded.:

I really don't get what you dislike about parts. You seem to know how to use sample locking but you prefer sample chains from sliced long samples. Do you dislike the way samples are assigned to slots? This however has nothing to do with the parts. Are you pleased with the sample chains?Then parts is no problem for you regarding sample management since you can have too many samples fitted in a small number of slots(each static slot 64 samples, 64*128=8192 samples!!). What is really really your problem regarding parts? Its a fact that all of us would like one part per pattern, but not for sample management. Different fx,lfo,mixer settings is the quest. Different samples can already be achieved through the (cumbersome as you say-I don't agree) sample locking or through the use of slice locking of different chains. You get to pick what's more convenient for u. And lets hope that these methods will get more userfriendly. But they are already there and they are not a workaround to problem, they are the path that you should follow. Please explain what your problem is regarding parts i am still trying to get it and i am so bored of seeing this coming up again and again.

darenager wrote:

I'd quite happily be limited to 1x 128 samples in ram at a time as long as I can assign them how I see fit, I mean really has anyone used or felt the need to use 4 banks of 128 samples in the machine at a time - if the answer to that is yes then I think maybe you need to realise that the OT is a powerhouse at changing samples beyond recognition and even with 128 samples in memory it would easy be possible to do a night long set no problem, and using sample chains can of course give even more timbral possibilities.:

4 banks of 128 samples???What do you mean by samples?Slots??No there are not 512 slots available inside OT. Just 256 slots. this is what you get by using parts: access to slots which are loaded with a sample. Do you mean that any time you change part there should be loaded different samples inside ram. No f... way anybody would want this. Uneccessary delays!I don't know you are talking about i am just speculating. The numbers you are presenting are completely wrong or they are reffering to a a non existent machine state. For the record as I wrote before sample chains can hold 8192 samples limited only by the size of the compact flash.

darenager wrote:
And I'm getting tired of people misunderstanding why other users don't like the 'part' concept, no-one is saying it is hard to use or we don't understand it, so you can get of your high horses thinking you have some 'elite jedi powers' because it doesn't bother you :laugh: Put simply some facets of the OT's operation are not as good as they could be, and it seems that the more experienced guys are the ones who are in agreement about some of these issues. In short it would be adding to the OT's power rather than detracting from it if some of these interface tweaks were implemented.

I wish people were this vocal when the chorus was nerfed:laugh:

And really I am not misunderstanding you, I am just trying to understand what you are saying because I can't digest any arguments against parts from your post. Please kindly explain.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 06:28

_____

KRAFTF

I find it quicker to use slice locks than sample locks, in my case usually shortish chains of 16-64 samples, hold step button turn encoder to what slice, done! vs sample lock, hold step button press up or down to enter list of samples, scroll using buttons to sample desired, press enter. Simply put it is a speed of turning the encoder or pressing a bunch of buttons, I guess personal preference is my point.

I don't have a problem with parts per se, but rather how they currently force a way of working, I don't need or want access to 128 slots on each pattern, I'd be content with parts being more akin to kits, just like any other sampler or drum machine - I can't see any specific advantage to the way parts are set up, but I can see disadvantages - like scrolling thru a long list to find a particular sample, having to think carefully before changing a slot assignment etc.

Regarding your last question, I never use more than 1 part because I don't like the way they work for reasons already mentioned, so my machine is only holding a handful of patterns at a time, so therefore I never switch parts. The way I understand it is there is around 80mb of ram available, all I want is the ability to be able to use that 80mb how I want.

EDIT - Yep I got my numbers mixed up I meant 4 parts drawing on 128 static or 128 flex samples/slots, not banks!

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Ozone - 2011/11/29 06:36

_____

I used to get frustrated with the machinedrum because for 128 patterns you only had 64 kits, so actually you don't get one kit per pattern, you get one kit for every 2 patterns.

At the moment the OT offers the equivalent of 4 patterns per part, but each part also offers 16 scenes, which give a large amount of flexibility, as well as being able to p-lock different samples from the sample library, p-lock pattern data & utilise sample chains.

Even though you get half the kits/parts of the MD, I still reckon there is more flexibility in the OT. It would be perfect if the OT could gain 8 parts per bank, matching it up with the ratio of kits/patterns in the Machinedrum, but I would be surprised

if it ever happened, as at that point I would want the number of sample slots in both flex & static to increase also.

EDIT: Hey Darenger maybe you know this but the quick way to scroll through the sample bank/s is via the 'LEVEL' knob.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Future Thought Tapestries - 2011/11/29 06:41
_____

Guys, i'm new here but i'm out already. This thread & all the OT speil & complexity has left me drained before i've even bought the thing. At least i can move on & buy something different. But good luck to all you brave & intrepid OT explorers.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Rusty - 2011/11/29 06:43
_____

AikiGhost wrote:
lostinthemanual wrote:
does anybody here needs more than 64 pattern per project in real use ?

Some people see the project = live set/album. Rather than project = song. So yes some people do want more than 64 patterns per project.

Me = Yes.

Project = Live Set

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by exuviae - 2011/11/29 06:43
_____

Absolutely NOT this. It would be so much worse to give up the dynamic flexibility of parts assignment.

Locking parts to a pattern would be much, much worse than it is now. I wouldn't protest more parts per bank, but I think you're missing something fundamental about the flexibility here, if you only ever want to make each pattern completely different from the others.
It's just a matter of getting used to it, there is a threshold that needs to be crossed, it'll click, and you'll say "OH HAHA I GET IT." Or not. Maybe not.

Elektron were smart in how they set it up. We're all just catching up

What I never seem to read are some real-world examples of how this "majestical dynamic flexibility" is actually useful and not a hindrance. I am a big fan of doing exercises on my equipment when someone suggests something cool to try, but alas, not this.

It's also important to remember that each person works in their own certain way. What most of us are asking is the OPTION or CHOICE of how Parts and other pieces are allocated or used. They implemented the Personalize feature, so they should continue to use it, no?

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 07:00
_____

Ozone wrote:

EDIT: Hey Darenger maybe you know this but the quick way to scroll through the sample bank/s is via the 'LEVEL' knob.

Yeah, thanks but my point is using a chain for example 16 snares, then assigning that to a track its nice and quick to plock any of those 16 snares on any step. Contrast this with using sample locks, first of all I have to make sure that my 16 snares are in succession in the list, then I ideally would want that list near the lower numbered slots, result I have used 16 slots compared to just one. I know I could just have the chain in one of the slots and then have further flexibility by having another chain in another slot available for locking, but if I wanted to do that I could do it the first way too, but rarely would I need to do that.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Veets - 2011/11/29 07:02
_____

coldfuture wrote:

I really don't understand them one bit. I am super gun shy too because I have only messed up my work each time I mess with them so right now I am stuck with essentially one part per bank.

Just an idea - you might try making a project called PartExperiments or something of that sort. Go ahead and find things out. Mess things up, on purpose. Make four parts: Techno, House, Ambient, Punk ... or Red, Green, Blue, Purple or whatever you feel like. Keep mental notes about what can go wrong and right about saving/loading/changing parts. Splash around, have fun.

Kind of like these guys, except with parts;)
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tpy_pYXSpPA
;)

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Ozone - 2011/11/29 07:15
_____

@ Darenger: Understood. You can't argue though that it's good to have the option to 'sample-lock'.
I have an early OT project that maxed out at 5 banks. I set this up before I cottoned onto the sample chains & ran out of sample slots. Using sample-locks I was able to recycle, & it was useful for setting up smoother transitions between different patterns when i could p-lock a sample from the last pattern into the new one (temporarily).

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by MrSysex - 2011/11/29 07:25
_____

Darenager, I agree that sample locking isn't the quickest way. Sample chains are OK, a bit better. I was hoping for a drum machine / drum kit type machine where you have a folder of samples that make up a kit, and can easily program a monophonic drum line.

Also, the 128 slots might not be needed in each pattern/part, but all the parts in a project have to have their samples taken from the 128 slots (for each machine—flex/static). It's not that you don't need 128 samples for a given pattern, but you are limited to 128 for that project. It's a little different way to go about things, but to me it's not that bad getting used to. And I don't see this way of thinking for the OT going away. It's pretty fundamental, and it works.

Exuviae, you were suggesting having parts tied to each pattern with no option to swap them out. That's what I am vehemently opposed to.
A part contains:
-the default samples assigned to each track
-the page setups for the parameters, including effects
-scenes setup
Switching out a part can give you all sorts of fun options. Whether just hoping for a happy accident, or explicitly setting things up a certain way... maybe you want a whole different set of scenes, of you're big on those. One part could contain scenes that are just different length freeze delays, one contains A/B track fades, etc...
Or you can switch parts out to use a different kit of default samples on each track. That's probably the most obvious one. Or you can copy a part to another part, but set up different efx for that one. And with it comes all the scene setup for

controlling those effects. There are a millions different ways swapping scenes could be useful. Same as changing kits in the MD, but FAR more versatile and powerful. With that comes some initial confusion.

Also, I want to share parts between some patterns. I'll make some patterns that are variations, or different sections of a song, but I don't want to have to save all the tweeks for the part on each pattern separately. If I turn down one track and adjust the filter on another, then save that part & set a restore point, it saves it for all the patterns that share that part. I don't have to do that 4 times. Or 16, if I have a whole bank of patterns sharing a part.

So yes, there's not reason to be opposed to having more parts, but I really don't see the concept going away. I guess one thing about having more parts, is it could get confusing if you do use them in these ways, when you now have 16 to choose from, instead of how it is now when you switch them (just North, South, East, or West).

It seems to me like Elektron thought all this through. They looked at memory availability, and how to best split that up to allow for plenty of versatility, power, as well as RAM sample availability.

It's not so bad, and it's really unfortunate that some people are actually scared off from the OT, just because people can't handle having 4 parts per bank. It's plenty for me, and if you don't ever want to share parts between patterns, then open up a new bank â€" VIOLA: 4 more parts.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by lostinthemanual - 2011/11/29 07:36
_____

Rusty wrote:
AikiGhost wrote:
lostinthemanual wrote:
does anybody here needs more than 64 pattern per project in real use ?

Some people see the project = live set/album. Rather than project = song. So yes some people do want more than 64 patterns per project.

Me = Yes.

Project = Live Set
I see.
I just figured out myself that i better use banks for different "songs" than opening new projects.

doesn't mean i would not like to see one part per pattern. ;)
i'd gladly give up on some Ram for samples but understand if others would not like to.
more flexible ram distribution seems to be the thing for several possible improvements, IMo

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kraftf - 2011/11/29 07:37
_____

darenager wrote:
Ozone wrote:

EDIT: Hey Darenger maybe you know this but the quick way to scroll through the sample bank/s is via the 'LEVEL' knob.

Yeah, thanks but my point is using a chain for example 16 snares, then assigning that to a track its nice and quick to plock any of those 16 snares on any step. Contrast this with using sample locks, first of all I have to make sure that my 16 snares are in succession in the list, then I ideally would want that list near the lower numbered slots, result I have used 16 slots compared to just one. I know I could just have the chain in one of the slots and then have further flexibility by having another chain in another slot available for locking, but if I wanted to do that I could do it the first way too, but rarely would I need to do that.

You didn't get what ozone suggested to you.
He talked about the level knob being faster in operation regarding sample locks and not about the way you work.

By using the LEVEL knob to scroll through the sample slots is way much faster than using the arrows and and hitting the enter button to choose a sample.
Try it before posting again and you'll see the difference.

Furthermore nobody says you have to compare sliced sample chains and sample locking. Each method has its strong points.
Anyway all these are irrelevant to the part discussion. I think you are confused with the part situation the sample locking and the sample chaining.
Maybe what you are just missing is one part per pattern.
I miss that too but only regarding fx, lfo,track and mixer configurations and not for sample management. You can very easily adjust your 256 patterns inside a project playing different samples within one part only. You seem to understand this and you keep saying that you use one part but you don't like the way it works.
Sorry but your arguments seem to me to be irrational.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kraftf - 2011/11/29 07:55
_____

MrSysex wrote:
Darenager, I agree that sample locking isn't the quickest way. Sample chains are OK, a bit better. I was hoping for a drum machine / drum kit type machine where you have a folder of samples that make up a kit, and can easily program a monophonic drum line.

Also, the 128 slots might not be needed in each pattern/part, but all the parts in a project have to have their samples taken from the 128 slots (for each machine flex/static). It's not that you don't need 128 samples for a given pattern, but you are limited to 128 for that project. It's a little different way to go about things, but to me it's not that bad getting used to. And I don't see this way of thinking for the OT going away. It's pretty fundamental, and it works.

Exuviae, you were suggesting having parts tied to each pattern with no option to swap them out. That's what I am vehemently opposed to.
A part contains:
-the default samples assigned to each track
-the page setups for the parameters, including effects
-scenes setup
Switching out a part can give you all sorts of fun options. Whether just hoping for a happy accident, or explicitly setting things up a certain way... maybe you want a whole different set of scenes, of you're big on those. One part could contain scenes that are just different length freeze delays, one contains A/B track fades, etc...
Or you can switch parts out to use a different kit of default samples on each track. That's probably the most obvious one.
Or you can copy a part to another part, but set up different efx for that one. And with it comes all the scene setup for controlling those effects. There are a millions different ways swapping scenes could be useful. Same as changing kits in the MD, but FAR more versatile and powerful. With that comes some initial confusion.

Also, I want to share parts between some patterns. I'll make some patterns that are variations, or different sections of a song, but I don't want to have to save all the tweeks for the part on each pattern separately. If I turn down one track and adjust the filter on another, then save that part & set a restore point, it saves it for all the patterns that share that part. I don't have to do that 4 times. Or 16, if I have a whole bank of patterns sharing a part.

So yes, there's not reason to be opposed to having more parts, but I really don't see the concept going away. I guess one thing about having more parts, is it could get confusing if you do use them in these ways, when you now have 16 to choose from, instead of how it is now when you switch them (just North, South, East, or West).

It seems to me like Elektron thought all this through. They looked at memory availability, and how to best split that up to allow for plenty of versatility, power, as well as RAM sample availability.

It's not so bad, and it's really unfortunate that some people are actually scared off from the OT, just because people can't handle having 4 parts per bank. It's plenty for me, and if you don't ever want to share parts between patterns, then open up a new bank   VIOLA: 4 more parts.

Totally agree with you.
The whole thread misses the point.

I think people opposing to the part concept are trying to use OT as traditional drum machine sampler and this logic fails

by default. It's so much more than a drum machine.

Anyway I suggest people try to understand parts and save them frequently.
My last 2 cent on this thread.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by lostinthemanual - 2011/11/29 07:58
_____

kraftf wrote:

I miss that too but only regarding fx, lfo,track and mixer configurations and not for sample management.

yeah FX

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 08:16
_____

No I understood he was talking about scrolling the list of slots.

The reason I only use 1 part is because the way that I find them counter intuitive, and as I said before at any time my machine only has a few patterns in it, and most of the time only a small number of samples loaded, again because I don't have the desire to scroll through a list of 128 samples. I am fortunate in that I have plenty of gear including 3 other samplers, so I am really only using my OT for sample mangling that my other 3 samplers cannot handle. If I just want some sampled drums for example I use my MV8800 or RS7000 because it is 100 times quicker - but it is no match for the OT for sound design, fx and some other things.

I guess it comes down to studio use or live use - I don't have a need to have tons of patterns and samples in memory at once, sure it would be nice, but I do know I'd use the OT much more if I could make some kits, load them in make some patterns, then the next day make some new kits assigned to different patterns, and continue like that. The current way with parts seems too cumbersome because if I change a sample used in one pattern it changes it in all patterns that use that part, I can see why for some that may be an advantage but for me its not, often I start with a good idea of what sound I want assign it and use it, if I was more into experimenting then maybe parts would be more useful.

If my point seems irrational then that is because I find the whole part thing irrational - and yes we are in agreement that it would be useless to have a part for each pattern if each could not have its own fx, mixer config etc.

Quoting Anselmi "yep, I feel it the same way...the "parts" approach make me go painfully slow and kinda lost track of what IÂ´m doing because of the fear of ruin other patterns"

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by papertiger - 2011/11/29 08:32
_____

This thread makes me want to kill someone. With an OT.

Maybe Hector will save us all.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 08:38
_____

Yeah I'm beginning to wish I'd never mentioned it :)

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by papertiger - 2011/11/29 08:42
_____

darenager wrote:
Yeah I'm beginning to wish I'd never mentioned it :)

Not at all - I think it's good to have discussions like this thread. My only problem is that I have yet to read an explanation of Parts that makes me want to even delve into understanding them.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 09:12
_____

Parts contain machine track assignments, which samples are assigned to which tracks, track fx and parameter settings, and 16 scenes - basically like a kit but only 4 per bank of 16 patterns.

Then you can have upto 128 samples in flex and 128 static, which you assign to the slots, the slots can be assigned differently between the 4 parts.

Thats it in a nutshell:)

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kraftf - 2011/11/29 09:43
_____

papertiger wrote:
darenager wrote:
Yeah I'm beginning to wish I'd never mentioned it :)

Not at all - I think it's good to have discussions like this thread. My only problem is that I have yet to read an explanation of Parts that makes me want to even delve into understanding them.

Here is a older general explanation of parts with regard to sample assignments

http://elektron-users.com/index.php?option=com_fireboard&func=view&Itemid=28&catid=9&id=155369#155369

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by echopraxia - 2011/11/29 10:13
_____

Hey I'm glad you did bring this up. I am learning a bunch from all this. The search function for this website never seems to give me the answers I seek.

As far as P-locking different samples using the up and down keys or the volume knob. You cannot preview the sample while trying to do this (function+Enter) so if you don't remember if it was sample #20 808snarehi--- or #21 808snarehi-- your just gonna have to guess which is the right one.

I'm gonna try the sample chain method now after reading these comments.

I like the idea that the parts change the FX settings and scene settings. will have to figure out how to setup different recording methods for parts as well. Right now I still don't even know how to actually record B)

It seems like using banks for different sample assignments is the way to go for now if you want a per pattern type of feel then you dive into each bank like patterns are mini sequencers which only adjust the current bank kit's samples.

I feel your pain darenager as scrolling through sample slots for p-locking is how I have been struggling, loosing inspiration. All the menu diving reminds me of my Akai s5000.

Everyone says the next update is gonna blow our pants off so lets see what happens.

I'm also gonna see what parts do for midi tracks if anything.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by polyoptics - 2011/11/29 10:34
_____

There are posters in here with much more experience than me, so I'll just share a similarity I noticed in new workflows as a beginner:

When I first used the MnM and later the MD, it was very strange to me that my sounds were not saved with my patterns, and that I had to save a new 'kit' or remember to save my kit, and that changes to a kit would effect all patterns that used that same kit. I messed up a bunch of patterns this way.

It seems very simple now and I understand the benefit of kits.

Using the OT so far, I feel the exact same way about parts. I get it -- but I am still constructing my own workflow, while trying to see clearly the intended workflow, which is still partially undiscovered/undisclosed.

This thread is a good read, its fun to watch some of the heavy forum hitters post in one place.

;)

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kirlian - 2011/11/29 15:32
_____

papertiger wrote:
This thread makes me want to kill someone. With an OT.

Maybe Hector will save us all.

Wait until you see my next thread topic :evil:

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/29 18:37
_____

kraftf wrote:

Totally agree with you.
The whole thread misses the point.

No YOU miss the point of the thread which is NOT to defend elektron but to get them to do something about it.

I think people opposing to the part concept are trying to use OT as traditional drum machine sampler and this logic fails by default. It's so much more than a drum machine.

Cant it be both?

Anyway I suggest people try to understand parts and save them frequently.
My last 2 cent on this thread.

Nice strawman there. I perfectly well understand parts, I just think they are bullshit. Also, don't let the door hit on the ass on the way out. :)

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 18:42

_____

Try to keep things civil or this thread will turn into pages of rubbish;)

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/11/29 19:04

_____

darenager wrote:
Try to keep things civil or this thread will turn into pages of rubbish;)

If there is one thing I cant stand on forums its people acting as if you're stupid because you disagree with them. A little bugbear of mine.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 19:29

_____

I agree, and it is easy to get drawn into something, all I am asking is that everyone try to refrain from fuelling the fire;)

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by redrum - 2011/11/29 20:01

_____

polyoptics wrote:
There are posters in here with much more experience than me, so I'll just share a similarity I noticed in new workflows as a beginner:

When I first used the MnM and later the MD, it was very strange to me that my sounds were not saved with my patterns, and that I had to save a new 'kit' or remember to save my kit, and that changes to a kit would effect all patterns that used that same kit. I messed up a bunch of patterns this way.

It seems very simple now and I understand the benefit of kits.

Using the OT so far, I feel the exact same way about parts. I get it -- but I am still constructing my own workflow, while trying to see clearly the intended workflow, which is still partially undiscovered/undisclosed.

This thread is a good read, its fun to watch some of the heavy forum hitters post in one place.

;)
I agree when I first got the MD it took a bit of learning and then the mnm was (as is stated frequently even today) more of a leaning curve. Reason would dictate that the OT will be a great leap forwrd and as with all of Elektons gear something that the user must meet the company halfway. In a bit of time we will be defending 'parts' and wondering what all this confussion was about.:)

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kraftf - 2011/11/29 20:10

_____

AikiGhost wrote:
kraftf wrote:

Totally agree with you.
The whole thread misses the point.

No YOU miss the point of the thread which is NOT to defend elektron but to get them to do something about it.

Look man I am not affiliated to electron and I am not a a user in this forum for a long time to be accused with such nonsense. OT is the first machine that I own from these guys. I am not defending Electron I just trying to be constructive a word that's propably missing from your vocabulary.

AikiGhost wrote:
kraftf wrote:

I think people opposing to the part concept are trying to use OT as traditional drum machine sampler and this logic fails by default. It's so much more than a drum machine.

Cant it be both?
You see what I mean?
I stated that it is much more than a sampling drum machine and you are asking if it can't be both.
For something to be more than a sampling drum machine it has to be one at first. You are not paying attention to what I am saying and you just wanna do your thing.
Anyway I am not following the path of controversy with you. I am a way too happy user of OT and my requests for its improvement are much more probable to become true than yours.
Lastly I would say enjoy your OT experience since you know it so well as you say.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by dataline - 2011/11/29 20:12
_____

:watch:

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by ipassenger - 2011/11/29 20:18
_____

Isn't it all to do with the scenes?

There is nothing stopping you from copying a part from Bank A to a part in Bank B, which at first thought seems odd, why take up extra space with a copy of the part, you might as well use the MD/MnM method of gloablly available Kits (Parts).

But i think the reasoning for the banks storing their Parts (or kits) locally is that the Scenes are stored with the Bank not the parts. Therefore if you use the example above copying the Part is only half the picture if your using scenes to provide movement, really use need to copy some if not all of them as well.

So the logic behind the parts over kits makes sense to me.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kraftf - 2011/11/29 20:39
_____

ipassenger wrote:
Isn't it all to do with the scenes?

There is nothing stopping you from copying a part from Bank A to a part in Bank B, which at first thought seems odd, why

take up extra space with a copy of the part, you might as well use the MD/MnM method of gloablly available Kits (Parts).

But i think the reasoning for the banks storing their Parts (or kits) locally is that the Scenes are stored with the Bank not the parts. Therefore if you use the example above copying the Part is only half the picture if your using scenes to provide movement, really use need to copy some if not all of them as well.

So the logic behind the parts over kits makes sense to me.

The scenes as far as I know are stored with the parts.
Maybe a global part for all banks would be more useful than it is now restricted to one bank.
I think that's something worth discussing.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by ipassenger - 2011/11/29 20:55
_____

kraftf wrote:
The scenes as far as I know are stored with the parts.
Maybe a global part for all banks would be more useful than it is now restricted to one bank.
I think that's something worth discussing.

Ahh... In that case I'll stay quiet. :laugh:

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 21:06
_____

Inspired by this thread I have been experimenting with parts again today, and some aspects of them do make a lot of sense, particularly for live use, and some of my issues were partly down to lack of patience and a bit of amnesia (:laugh:) but loading an empty project and experimenting with them without a care of losing any work I did have some fun. But my overall feeling is that I still would prefer that perhaps parts were organised differently, maybe the separation of parts from slots and just have them for scenes, fx type, machine selection etc, and have patterns hold the specific slot for each of the tracks, and I still very much feel that sample/slot assignment is a bit long winded and could be clarified.

Also I still feel it is too easy to mess something up by inadvertantly overwriting a slot in a part.

Regarding sample locks - I think a massive improvment could be made by simply bringing up the sample lock list by default when you hold a trig in record mode - it already does this once sample locks have been placed, but it would be very nice for it to do it right away making less button pressing necessary.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by papertiger - 2011/11/29 22:03
_____

echopraxia wrote:
As far as P-locking different samples using the up and down keys or the volume knob. You cannot preview the sample while trying to do this (function+Enter) so if you don't remember if it was sample #20 808snarehi--- or #21 808snarehi-- your just gonna have to guess which is the right one.

This is a big deal for me and I've been meaning to send Elektron an email about it. Send me an email at 12bitlibrarian at g to the mail dot com if you want to discuss. That's gmail, btw. :)

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kraftf - 2011/11/29 22:38
_____

darenager wrote:
Inspired by this thread I have been experimenting with parts again today, and some aspects of them do make a lot of sense, particularly for live use, and some of my issues were partly down to lack of patience and a bit of amnesia (:laugh:) but loading an empty project and experimenting with them without a care of losing any work I did have some fun. But my overall feeling is that I still would prefer that perhaps parts were organised differently, maybe the separation of parts from slots and just have them for scenes, fx type, machine selection etc, and have patterns hold the specific slot for each of the tracks, and I still very much feel that sample/slot assignment is a bit long winded and could be clarified.

Also I still feel it is too easy to mess something up by inadvertantly overwriting a slot in a part.

Regarding sample locks - I think a massive improvment could be made by simply bringing up the sample lock list by default when you hold a trig in record mode - it already does this once sample locks have been placed, but it would be very nice for it to do it right away making less button pressing necessary.

Now you are making more sense to me!!
Totally agree with you about bringing up the the sample slot by default when you press a trig. Another thing they could possibly do is real time trigs. To be more specific:
A realtime trig could disable temporarily the track playing when pressed and give playback to itself on a selectable by option grid for e.g 8/16th long. That way we could preview all the scrolling in sample slots in sync with the pattern. Don't know if this is easy to implement but it would be super cool to have it.
Also agree that pattern should have sample assignments locked to them as well as mutes and tempo. And this could also be user selectable through the personalize page.
I think we are getting more constructive here.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/29 23:29
_____

To be honest my intention was for it always to be constructive, that is after all the point of this forum, and I'm not too egotistical to not take stuff in and even admit I'm wrong or that I misunderstood something if that was the case.

Yes I think a lot of what is being said is of the same sentiment, but unfortunately sometimes our different experiences can lead to different ways of saying and doing things and possibly a bit of confusion and misunderstanding.

Back on topic:

I have a very good feeling that a lot of what is being wished will come in future updates, a very long time ago I asked for samples slots to be p-lockable, sample locks are almost there but a few small additions such as having slot available as an LFO target could prove to be very interesting too.

Sample chains are of course very handy, but the trade off is some preparation is required, it would be nice to have a machine to faciltate their creation - we can do it manually right on the OT by using sample locks and resampling, then manually slicing and saving as a new sample, but it sure would be great if the machine would do this automatically, then assign a special chain playback machine that has a parameter in place of slice which shows the names of the sample in each slice - possibly on the same area of screen used to display sample locks. The difference between this and actual sample locks is that only 1 sample slot (albeit a longer one) is required and therefore slot assignment becomes much more efficient and simple, and a few chains themselves could also be sample locked giving a much greater choice of possible sounds on a step. This chain machine could double as a kind of granular machine if very short slices were used, with perhaps some small modification to the envelope to control any pops etc.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kraftf - 2011/11/30 00:03
_____

darenager wrote:
To be honest my intention was for it always to be constructive, that is after all the point of this forum, and I'm not too egotistical to not take stuff in and even admit I'm wrong or that I misunderstood something if that was the case.

Yes I think a lot of what is being said is of the same sentiment, but unfortunately sometimes our different experiences can lead to different ways of saying and doing things and possibly a bit of confusion and misunderstanding.

Back on topic:

I have a very good feeling that a lot of what is being wished will come in future updates, a very long time ago I asked for samples slots to be p-lockable, sample locks are almost there but a few small additions such as having slot available as an LFO target could prove to be very interesting too.

Sample chains are of course very handy, but the trade off is some preparation is required, it would be nice to have a machine to faciltate their creation - we can do it manually right on the OT by using sample locks and resampling, then manually slicing and saving as a new sample, but it sure would be great if the machine would do this automatically, then assign a special chain playback machine that has a parameter in place of slice which shows the names of the sample in each slice - possibly on the same area of screen used to display sample locks. The difference between this and actual sample locks is that only 1 sample slot (albeit a longer one) is required and therefore slot assignment becomes much more efficient and simple, and a few chains themselves could also be sample locked giving a much greater choice of possible sounds on a step. This chain machine could double as a kind of granular machine if very short slices were used, with perhaps some small modification to the envelope to control any pops etc.

I didn't doubt at any moment about your intentions of being constructive.
I just doubted about the solidness of your arguments regarding parts.
Please also note that my language isn't native English. So, many thoughts of mine can come out a bit distorted and maybe sometime offensive for someone. If this has happened I would like to apologize.
Sample chains as I have already expressed have their strong points. Somone can easily fit a whole track inside one sample slot. If only there was a merge option of the sample buffers or an audio editor function that could join sample files then sample chaing would become priceless.
The handling of sample chains is a bit tricky but very rewarding. And with the os updates i think it will become unbeatable.
Your thoughts about the granular machine are very nice but I think should come in at a later state of updates along with all the requests about loopers and new stuff. However loopers is a feature that has been promised and a lot of people might be waiting for it.
The things that should be prioritized now are the issues of optimizing existing features. Like the parts that have been the great issue of this thread.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/30 00:22
_____

Fair points, and certainly no hard feelings here;)

A sucessful thread is about the sharing of experiences, knowledge and opinions, I think this has been the case here, your 'determination' and arguments certainly made me re-look at some of these points raised and from a different perspective, so a big thanks for that;)

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by anselmi - 2011/11/30 00:32
_____

I wish the OTÂ´s file management system would be simpler...

in example, my ESX is dead simple and functional...you got 1 sample pool and 256 patterns per "session"...you just select a part, browse the sample and thatÂ´s all...

saving the pattern just save the associated samples with it, so when you dial the pattern it just plays the samples...easy...

I wish the OTÂ´s file management system would be simpler...

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by dataline - 2011/11/30 00:34
_____

:happyday:

 :beer: :beer: :beer:

One way I like to work without having the fear of destroying any other PARTs is to have an IDEA in each of the BANKs. By selecting an empty BANK, I can start something new without having the danger of destroying previous PARTs .

If then I want to work on one of the ideas, I would go to that BANK and start making few patterns for each of the 4 PARTs.

Also when I am building a tune in a BANK, I would limit myself to use PART1 for the first 4 patterns, PART 2 for the second 4 patterns and so on...Of course I would be copying and pasting parts in between and make alterations to them :)

Not sure if this was covered here but thought I would chip in :)

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by ipassenger - 2011/11/30 00:50
_____

dataline wrote:
:happyday:

 :beer: :beer: :beer:

One way I like to work without having the fear of destroying any other PARTs is to have an IDEA in each of the BANKs. By selecting an empty BANK, I can start something new without having the danger of destroying previous PARTs .

If then I want to work on one of the ideas, I would go to that BANK and start making few patterns for each of the 4 PARTs.

Also when I am building a tune in a BANK, I would limit myself to use PART1 for the first 4 patterns, PART 2 for the second 4 patterns and so on...Of course I would be copying and pasting parts in between and make alterations to them :)

Not sure if this was covered here but thought I would chip in :)

^^ this is what i do... pretty much.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by poonti - 2011/11/30 01:07
_____

anselmi wrote:
I wish the OTÂ´s file management system would be simpler...

in example, my ESX is dead simple and functional...you got 1 sample pool and 256 patterns per "session"...you just select a part, browse the sample and thatÂ´s all...

saving the pattern just save the associated samples with it, so when you dial the pattern it just plays the samples...easy...

I wish the OTÂ´s file management system would be simpler...
^ This! And it even does "sample chaining" and slicing by Transients (which I used to hold more drum kits). Now I don't miss my ESX's sound, but I do miss its simplicity. Anyway, OT is a different beast altogether, and I don't think it will ever be as simple to use as a Tribe, so we better get used to the way it works. :side:

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by MrSysex - 2011/11/30 01:27
_____

darenager wrote:

Sample chains are of course very handy, but the trade off is some preparation is required, it would be nice to have a machine to facilitate their creation - we can do it manually right on the OT by using sample locks and resampling, then manually slicing and saving as a new sample, but it sure would be great if the machine would do this automatically, then assign a special chain playback machine that has a parameter in place of slice which shows the names of the sample in each slice - possibly on the same area of screen used to display sample locks. The difference between this and actual sample locks is that only 1 sample slot (albeit a longer one) is required and therefore slot assignment becomes much more efficient and simple, and a few chains themselves could also be sample locked giving a much greater choice of possible sounds on a step. This chain machine could double as a kind of granular machine if very short slices were used, with perhaps some small modification to the envelope to control any pops etc.

This is kind of what I was hoping for, a sort of kit machine.
Imagine having a folder that is turned into a (drum?) machine, each sample inside the folder is comparable to a slice, only it has a name. Maybe the folders would have to be limited to a certain size (MB and/or number if files) to work with available RAM... Even if it could only be 16x1 second samples, this could be very nice.
Before using sample chains I thought about this a lot. Sample chains are helpful, but still not perfectly ideal for drum programming; they're more of a workaround.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/30 01:42
_____

Indeed, and if the samples are mono I think quite a few sounds could reside in a few chains, things like kicks, snares, and percussion are often less than 1 second in duration so it would be quite handy to have a longish (32 or 64) slice chain for those type of sound, then say another chain for cymbals, hats and longer sounds.

Going back to parts for a second the midi tracks are also subject to part settings, it would be good if you could have the option to have midi tracks ignore part settings, maybe in an option setting.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by MrSysex - 2011/11/30 02:03
_____

darenager wrote:

Going back to parts for a second the midi tracks are also subject to part settings, it would be good if you could have the option to have midi tracks ignore part settings, maybe in an option setting.

This could get confusing, though I don't know that I have a better option to offer.
User customization options are nice, but there's something to be said for machine-wide uniformity. I just think of MIDI tracks as another machine type, with parts, albeit no audio effects. And I imagine there could be instances where you may want to have different midi setups (defined by parts) with different patterns/songs/however you want to think of them. I guess what is there works for me, and I'm getting more comfortable with it every day.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/30 02:11
_____

The idea being that the setup information is stored per project, because I agree that sometimes it is useful, so by making it project specific nothing is lost. Or another idea could be that internal tracks and midi track part settimgs could be copied and pasted independent from eachother, so if you have spent a while doing your midi config and building a sample/machine assignment in part 1, and in part 2 you just want the midi the same, you just copy the midi part only.

==

Re:OT parts discussion

Posted by kirlian - 2011/11/30 02:27
_____

ipassenger wrote:
dataline wrote:
:happyday:

 :beer: :beer: :beer:

One way I like to work without having the fear of destroying any other PARTs is to have an IDEA in each of the BANKs. By selecting an empty BANK, I can start something new without having the danger of destroying previous PARTs .

If then I want to work on one of the ideas, I would go to that BANK and start making few patterns for each of the 4 PARTs.

Also when I am building a tune in a BANK, I would limit myself to use PART1 for the first 4 patterns, PART 2 for the second 4 patterns and so on...Of course I would be copying and pasting parts in between and make alterations to them :)

Not sure if this was covered here but thought I would chip in :)

^^ this is what i do... pretty much.

that's pretty much how i have been working as well. i was struggling to find a way to say it. well put!

 ideas per bank, developments, contrasting ideas, song sections all are covered by the 16 patterns available... basically one bank per any given track i am working on is how i am rolling at this point. realistically, i probably wouldn't ever need more than 4 parts and eight patterns on a track i build in OT anyway. 16 if i am very ambitous. throw in scenes, sample locks, sample chaining ant slices and i have more power than i could ever need for my working methods. this is essentially why i have no issue with parts.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by lostinthemanual - 2011/11/30 02:41
_____

kirlian wrote:
ipassenger wrote:
dataline wrote:
:happyday:

 :beer: :beer: :beer:

One way I like to work without having the fear of destroying any other PARTs is to have an IDEA in each of the BANKs. By selecting an empty BANK, I can start something new without having the danger of destroying previous PARTs .

If then I want to work on one of the ideas, I would go to that BANK and start making few patterns for each of the 4 PARTs.

Also when I am building a tune in a BANK, I would limit myself to use PART1 for the first 4 patterns, PART 2 for the second 4 patterns and so on...Of course I would be copying and pasting parts in between and make alterations to them :)

Not sure if this was covered here but thought I would chip in :)

^^ this is what i do... pretty much.

that's pretty much how i have been working as well..

me too now.
But it took me a long time to find the best workflow for me.
part1 = pattern1, part2= pattern 5, part3= pattern 9, part4 = pattern 13,
so i allways know whcih parts are where and i don't kill them anymore.

now we need at least better copy functions from bank to bank.

copy entire bank to other bank
copy one pattern and its part to other bank
still, one part per pattern would make things much easier

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kirlian - 2011/11/30 03:09
_____

poonti wrote:
anselmi wrote:
I wish the OTÂ´s file management system would be simpler...

in example, my ESX is dead simple and functional...you got 1 sample pool and 256 patterns per "session"...you just select a part, browse the sample and thatÂ´s all...

saving the pattern just save the associated samples with it, so when you dial the pattern it just plays the samples...easy...

I wish the OTÂ´s file management system would be simpler...
^ This! And it even does "sample chaining" and slicing by Transients (which I used to hold more drum kits). Now I don't miss my ESX's sound, but I do miss its simplicity. Anyway, OT is a different beast altogether, and I don't think it will ever be as simple to use as a Tribe, so we better get used to the way it works. :side:

It has always been understood by anyone getting into elektron that you need to program it to get great results. Dig deep and you will be rewarded with incredible sounds. It's like an eusers nerd mantra. So why now is it a problem that a few extra button pushes is taking away from the OT's simplicity? It certainly doesn't stop people like dataline from doing fantastic live work with it. Why on earth would the OT ever be compared to an esx:blink: because its a sampling sequencer with effects? That's about it. I felt cramped and severely limited by the esx. That's why I went elektron when I sold it. Anyway, a few button pushes should be child's play to you, anselmi! Based on your synth experience that is.

There is a significant and important distinction between an interface being simple, and an interface being clear.   a simple interface will give you less control of of the inner workings, or make access to the inner working more complicated (or in some rare Cases give you knob or button per function while still allowing you to take it all in in one glance like the nord lead) A clear interface will give you clear, understandable access to the inner workings no matter how simple or complex they are and regardless of a user's understanding of them. I think the OT has a clear and easy interface and users just aren't sure how to apply this new development of parts.

I definitely agree with a few of the perspectives on why 4 parts per bank is a problem, but making the OT simpler to make it more like a product or concept it is vastly superior to is just plain unelektron an not nearly nerdy enough for these halls.

Ready: flame me!!:)

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/30 04:57
_____

:laugh: Don your flameproof suit sir!

Nah, I can see what you are saying, and I don't think anyone is displeased with the results they are getting. I think there are a few factors at play here, a lot of the frustrations from guys who have had it a while also stem from the number of operational changes versus the amount of free time to spend re-learning: The double edged sword of being an early adopter:laugh:

But you are right that these machines are deep and supposed to be so, mastery takes many hours, but still some user interface tweaks without losing features would be welcome, right?

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by anselmi - 2011/11/30 07:37
_____

kirlian wrote:
poonti wrote:
anselmi wrote:
I wish the OTÂ´s file management system would be simpler...

in example, my ESX is dead simple and functional...you got 1 sample pool and 256 patterns per "session"...you just select a part, browse the sample and thatÂ´s all...

saving the pattern just save the associated samples with it, so when you dial the pattern it just plays the samples...easy...

I wish the OTÂ´s file management system would be simpler...
^ This! And it even does "sample chaining" and slicing by Transients (which I used to hold more drum kits). Now I don't miss my ESX's sound, but I do miss its simplicity. Anyway, OT is a different beast altogether, and I don't think it will ever be as simple to use as a Tribe, so we better get used to the way it works. :side:

It has always been understood by anyone getting into elektron that you need to program it to get great results. Dig deep and you will be rewarded with incredible sounds. It's like an eusers nerd mantra. So why now is it a problem that a few extra button pushes is taking away from the OT's simplicity? It certainly doesn't stop people like dataline from doing fantastic live work with it. Why on earth would the OT ever be compared to an esx:blink: because its a sampling sequencer with effects? That's about it. I felt cramped and severely limited by the esx. That's why I went elektron when I sold it. Anyway, a few button pushes should be child's play to you, anselmi! Based on your synth experience that is.

There is a significant and important distinction between an interface being simple, and an interface being clear.   a simple interface will give you less control of of the inner workings, or make access to the inner working more complicated (or in some rare Cases give you knob or button per function while still allowing you to take it all in in one glance like the nord lead) A clear interface will give you clear, understandable access to the inner workings no matter how simple or complex they are and regardless of a user's understanding of them. I think the OT has a clear and easy interface and users just aren't sure how to apply this new development of parts.

I definitely agree with a few of the perspectives on why 4 parts per bank is a problem, but making the OT simpler to make it more like a product or concept it is vastly superior to is just plain unelektron an not nearly nerdy enough for these halls.

Ready: flame me!!:)

I donÂ´t have problem with diving into gear in search of new stuff...I got modular synths, other elektron gear and most of the rest of my stuff are in the complex side

I agre with you about the interface thing, and I think the MD and MnM are clear, the OT donÂ´t....itÂ´s innecesary convoluted

I believe one of the elektron strong points is (was) the user interface...they make complex stuff feels simple, clear, intuitive...all this goodies was praised several times in the past in this very forum

I feel all this is kinda gone with the OT and I canÂ´t see why...they keep the sample and the sequencer sections in the clear and intuitive way we all know and love but the sample management seems to be made by yamaha:S

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Rusty - 2011/11/30 11:29
_____

darenager wrote:
Regarding sample locks - I think a massive improvment could be made by simply bringing up the sample lock list by default when you hold a trig in record mode - it already does this once sample locks have been placed, but it would be very nice for it to do it right away making less button pressing necessary.

I think this is a good suggestion.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by MrSysex - 2011/11/30 12:46

_____

Rusty wrote:
darenager wrote:
Regarding sample locks - I think a massive improvment could be made by simply bringing up the sample lock list by default when you hold a trig in record mode - it already does this once sample locks have been placed, but it would be very nice for it to do it right away making less button pressing necessary.

I think this is a good suggestion.

Instead of editing parameter locks when you first hold down a step?
It's only 1 button press away to get to the list (UP).
If it were the other way around, as you're suggesting, I bet you might start thinking "hmm, I wish I didn't have to press that one extra button just to do normal parameter locks."
The way it is now, you hold the step and have access to all the various parameters to lock; the way you're suggesting you only have access (without button presses) to one- which sample to lock. Or am I reading you wrong?

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by darenager - 2011/11/30 17:44
_____

^ Er, on my machine when the sample lock window is open I can still see all the other parameters too, so nothing would be lost. Certainly would not be worth it if sample lock window obscured parameters.

Yeah I know it is only holding 2 buttons, (trig+ up or down) but if it can be achieved just holding 1 button its easier to remember, more efficient and frees up the trig+ up/down button combo for some other function.

EDIT p59 in the manual - that window, not the sample browser window that we use to load the slots, which would obscure the parameters.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by lostinthemanual - 2011/11/30 23:41
_____

In regard how much work it makes to manage the parts so that you are really on the save side ,when generating a new series of pattern with all the experimenting going on within that work
I really really wish to get a part per pattern !

i was today on the Octa.
4 parts per bank with 16 banks is enough for much music,
but the management as is makes unnecessary workload.
It's a factor that really counts IMHO !

elektron please bring that part per pattern.
Your FX is powerful, very good to use in very musical way, one part per pattern just the only logic way to go.
I mean, do i like to have different FX settings per pattern ?
different mute and level settings per pattern ?
one part per pattern please, less RAM for samples

edit: i lik eto experiment on patterns without beeing afraid that i kill another pattern, or first have to copy and paste, maybe to other banks, bevore i can experiment.....
where's the logic ?

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by AikiGhost - 2011/12/01 02:12
_____

lostinthemanual wrote:
elektron please bring that part per pattern.
Your FX is powerful, very good to use in very musical way, one part per pattern just the only logic way to go.
I mean, do i like to have different FX settings per pattern ?
different mute and level settings per pattern ?
one part per pattern please, less RAM for samples

Couldn't agree more.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kraftf - 2011/12/01 04:01
_____

I have asked ELECTRON for their official answer about the possibility of having 1 part per pattern.
Also aked if not possible then what about a global 64 part set for all patterns.
Then again if not possible asked if sample slot selection can be disconnected from the parts and become a per part
setting along with scene selection, mutes and mixer level?
I hope they answer my question. Will let you know about it.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by Bathrobe - 2011/12/01 07:10
_____

what if youÂ´d have 4 patterns per bank and and each pattern has itÂ´s own part?

well, you have that now. itÂ´s just a matter of setting it up and saving that as a template, isnÂ´t it?

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by echopraxia - 2011/12/01 07:36
_____

what if youÂ´d have 4 patterns per bank and and each pattern has itÂ´s own part?

well, you have that now. itÂ´s just a matter of setting it up and saving that as a template, isnÂ´t it?

Yes, the last part you selected for the pattern will be the part that is selected when you come back to that particular
pattern. So you can have any of the 4 parts automatically load with whatever pattern you are using. So you can go from
pattern 1, part 1 to pattern 9, part 4 without having to switch any parts after you change to a different pattern. I did end up
doing this the first time I messed with parts and having to totally differnt songs in the same bank kinda threw me off. But I
am also completely new to elektrons. Only been messing for a week now.

The more I knock my noodle around parts the more they make sense. I think you just have to think of banks as your
songs for different sample kits and leave parts to just about everything else.

I think using parts to assign input parameters and thur machines and different fx and even more scenes might make the
most sense.

===

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by kraftf - 2011/12/05 19:18
_____

kraftf wrote:
I have asked ELECTRON for their official answer about the possibility of having 1 part per pattern.
Also aked if not possible then what about a global 64 part set for all patterns.
Then again if not possible asked if sample slot selection can be disconnected from the parts and become a per part
setting along with scene selection, mutes and mixer level?

I hope they answer my question. Will let you know about it.

Electron team kindly answered my question stating that anything is possible.
However the decision for having 4 parts per bank has been greatly considered in the design process and is thought to be enough for every user's needs. One reason they say that they did not choose to have 1 part per pattern is the fact that patterns would have to load every time their fx causing long decays in reverbs and delays to cut off abruptly.
Well although this is true I think that the possibility of having access to 256 parts per project would be ideal for all users as long as there is an option to tie whichever pattern to whichever part you want to. Just like how it is handled now with the difference that the parts would be 256 and global for all patterns instead of 4 per 16 patterns(1 bank)
So after receiving this answer I would say all of you that would like to extend the number and usability of parts send your requests to Electron. They will probably consider it if they get high feedback regarding this issue.

==

Re:OT parts discussion
Posted by MrSysex - 2011/12/06 06:03
_____

That's interesting, and makes sense.
Ideally, switching parts would be hardly noticeable (or not at all). I'm sure it's something they strive for.

I just submitted a bug the other day that sounds like it might be related to something similar.
When switching banks with one pattern playing into another, some of the samples on the first step weren't triggered immediately. I had copied the part from one bank to the pattern on the next bank, but of course it's just a copy, and still has to load when you switch banks. They couldn't immediately reproduce it from my description but I zipped up a project and sent it in. We'll see what they say. The guy working on it was very helpful & quick to reply, but did mention he was out of office until later this month.

==