
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).

Is 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.
