
Subject: using virsh instead of prlctl
Posted by [freakout](#) on Fri, 29 Oct 2021 14:31:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i tried to use virsh in place of prlctl as supposed by the deprecation messages of prlctl. But virsh does not see all virtual machines/containers - how to fix?

```
[root@sugar ~]# prlctl list
UUID                                STATUS  IP_ADDR  T  NAME
{543306a2-13f5-43e4-a6ce-2a235dd162f2} running 192.168.8.68 CT bon
{0cb5ef24-0619-432c-8ae7-c1441de38d82} running 192.168.8.149 CT cal
{26fdfe18-0437-4249-b7b8-ff2e0d0f19c3} running 192.168.7.153 CT jim
{2d46b4c1-896f-4464-afe7-a276f593e60e} running 192.168.7.152 CT joe
{aeb9425d-1a56-42c9-9ff9-3c0843f900b1} running 192.168.9.26 CT kep
{7fe94c43-4ece-4cc3-bf48-93b4ff46111d} running 192.168.9.155 CT man
{db99f884-30e8-41f6-a917-af5c452d362a} running 192.168.7.156 CT old
{da693adf-56a8-46ac-bb9e-456a8013047d} running - VM pig
{b73a903e-d433-4d78-9f87-a8b07f6b6d0a} running 192.168.7.150 CT sam
{a6717049-2400-4cca-ba79-3963f354fc21} running - VM sca
{aaccedb2-5ac2-4513-954a-0e8233d43f42} running 192.168.8.154 CT top
{d6a41a21-a980-442d-90df-4eb3d1dd1a86} running - VM tro
{c6ac1ec3-e1f7-4fab-8a7c-d9558cc50f51} running 192.168.8.157 CT van
```

```
[root@sugar ~]# virsh list
Id Name State
-----
94 pig running
95 sca running
96 tro running
```

Subject: Re: using virsh instead of prlctl
Posted by [devnull](#) on Sun, 31 Oct 2021 00:00:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello!

Same "problem" here (but since no one was "harmed", this is not - yet - an issue).

It there a way to properly "register" CT "inside" Virsh?

Any hint would be useful.

Good night!

Subject: Re: using virsh instead of prlctl
Posted by [wsap](#) on Wed, 10 Nov 2021 01:44:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It looks to me like Virtuozzo is planning on abandoning their original goal of replacing vzctl with prlctl for *everything* and instead will be supporting:

- virsh for VMs
- vzctl for CTs

So basically just stick with vzctl for containers and all should be well. Seems like a good option to me anyway as few panels and providers actually made the switch from vzctl to prlctl for containers and this will help clearly define the line between VMs and containers nicely. It will very likely even make it easier for control panels to implement VMs and CTs on the same node.
