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.