Proxmox vs Nutanix vs VMware

This isn't a feature comparison.

It's a constraint problem.

>_ Virtualization Architecture

VMware pricing changed everything.

- Broadcom moved to subscription-only licensing
- Features bundled into VCF tiers — pay for what you don't use
- 5-year cost models stopped working overnight
- Per-core pricing at scale changed the enterprise math

Now every team is re-evaluating.

The answer used to be obvious. It isn't anymore.

This is NOT a feature comparison.

vMotion vs AHV Live Migration vs KVM Live Migration

vSAN vs Nutanix DSF vs Ceph / ZFS

NSX-T vs Nutanix Flow vs Linux bridges / OVS

That comparison is useful after you've chosen a platform.

It doesn't help you choose.

It's a constraint problem.

Which set of constraints are you willing to live with?

VMware → **Cost constraint**
Each option breaks differently.

Nutanix → **Operational constraint**
Each option breaks differently.

Proxmox → **Capability constraint**
Each option breaks differently.

VMware

Cost constraint

What you keep:

- Mature platform — years of operational muscle memory
- Deep tooling integrations across backup, monitoring, DR
- Large pool of certified VMware administrators

The constraint:

- Broadcom controls the pricing model
- Subscription-only — no perpetual option
- What you'll pay in 18 months: unknown

→ Stay if you have EA coverage. Exit on your timeline — not Broadcom's.

Nutanix

Operational constraint

What you get:

- Converged stack — no separate storage/networking license
- Strong Day-2 automation via Prism
- Proven enterprise HA and DR (Async / NearSync)

The constraint:

- Nutanix owns the full stack — single vendor
- CVM: 4 vCPU + 16-32GB per node, not available to workloads
- High-I/O migration stutter is a real cutover risk

→ Model the CVM tax before you spec the nodes. It shows up under load.

Proxmox

Capability constraint

What you get:

- Open source — no license cost
- KVM underneath — same as most cloud providers
- Strong ZFS integration, active community

The constraint:

- 2-node clusters aren't actually HA — quorum math
- Ceph needs min nodes, separate network, expertise to tune
- Enterprise DR requires engineering — not included

→ **The license is free. The operational overhead isn't. Go in clear-eyed.**

Azure VMware Solution

The fourth constraint nobody talks about

What you keep:

- vSphere, vSAN, and NSX-T — unchanged
- Your runbooks and operational model
- Your team's VMware expertise

What you give up:

- Control of the physical layer — Microsoft owns it
- Egress economics — data leaving Azure costs
- Two vendors above your workloads: MSFT + Broadcom

→ **Full constraint breakdown in the companion post: AVS vs Native Azure.**

No platform wins.

There are only constraints you've chosen
and constraints you've inherited.

→ VMware
Stay if ELA gives you predictability. Exit on your timeline.

→ Nutanix
Move if you need enterprise HCI without engineering the stack.

→ Proxmox
Build if your team has the depth and the cost floor matters.

Name your constraint. Choose accordingly. Build for it explicitly.

Full breakdown on the blog

Constraint model. Decision framework. Migration failure modes. AVS fourth option.

Proxmox vs Nutanix vs VMware:

The Post-Broadcom Constraints No One Explains

Link in first comment →

---

rack2cloud.com

`>_ Virtualization Architecture`