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Dear Mr. Chen, Mr. Ranganathan, and Mr. Bencheck

Since the VSM and VSR PDUs are defined by ITU-T, and not by IEEE 802.1, we can offer no opinion on whether this is an appropriate use of that mechanism. Your assumption that MEPs and MIPs are allowed, but not required, to receive and send CFM PDUs with opcodes other than those specified by 802.1, potentially including VSM/VSR, is correct.

Best regards,

Tony Jeffree, Chair IEEE 802.1 Working Group ([tony@jeffree.co.uk](mailto:tony@jeffree.co.uk))

Stephen Haddock, Chair IEEE 802.1 Interworking Task Group ([shaddock@stanfordalumni.org](mailto:shaddock@stanfordalumni.org))