

Network  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: December 20, 2018

T. Pauly  
Apple Inc.  
P. Wouters  
Red Hat  
June 18, 2018

## **Split DNS Configuration for IKEv2 draft-ietf-ipsecme-split-dns-08**

### Abstract

This document defines two Configuration Payload Attribute Types for the IKEv2 protocol that add support for private DNS domains. These domains are intended to be resolved using DNS servers reachable through an IPsec connection, while leaving all other DNS resolution unchanged. This approach of resolving a subset of domains using non-public DNS servers is referred to as "Split DNS".

### Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on December 20, 2018.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in [Section 4](#).e of

the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	<a href="#">Requirements Language . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Background . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Protocol Exchange . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	<a href="#">Configuration Request . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	<a href="#">Configuration Reply . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	<a href="#">Mapping DNS Servers to Domains . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.4.</a>	<a href="#">Example Exchanges . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Simple Case . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.4.2.</a>	<a href="#">Requesting Domains and DNSSEC trust anchors . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Payload Formats . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	<a href="#">INTERNAL_DNS_DOMAIN Configuration Attribute Type Request and Reply . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	<a href="#">INTERNAL_DNSSEC_TA Configuration Attribute . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">INTERNAL_DNS_DOMAIN Usage Guidelines . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">INTERNAL_DNSSEC_TA Usage Guidelines . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	<a href="#">References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">9.1.</a>	<a href="#">Normative References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">9.2.</a>	<a href="#">Informative References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
	<a href="#">Authors' Addresses . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">13</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

Split DNS is a common configuration for secure tunnels, such as Virtual Private Networks in which host machines private to an organization can only be resolved using internal DNS resolvers [[RFC2775](#)]. In such configurations, it is often desirable to only resolve hosts within a set of private domains using the tunnel, while letting resolutions for public hosts be handled by a device's default DNS configuration.

The Internet Key Exchange protocol version 2 [[RFC7296](#)] negotiates configuration parameters using Configuration Payload Attribute Types. This document defines two Configuration Payload Attribute Types that add support for trusted Split DNS domains.

The INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute type is used to convey one or more DNS domains that SHOULD be resolved only using the provided DNS nameserver IP addresses, causing these requests to use the IPsec connection.



The INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA attribute type is used to convey DNSSEC trust anchors for those domains.

When only a subset of traffic is routed into a private network using an IPsec SA, these Configuration Payload options can be used to define which private domains are intended to be resolved through the IPsec connection without affecting the client's global DNS resolution.

For the purposes of this document, DNS resolution servers accessible through an IPsec connection will be referred to as "internal DNS servers", and other DNS servers will be referred to as "external DNS servers".

A client using these configuration payloads will be able to request and receive Split DNS configurations using the INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN and INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA configuration attributes. The client device can use the internal DNS server(s) for any DNS queries within the assigned domains. DNS queries for other domains SHOULD be sent to the regular external DNS server.

### **1.1. Requirements Language**

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14](#) [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all captials, as shown here.

## **2. Background**

Split DNS is a common configuration for enterprise VPN deployments, in which only one or a few private DNS domains are accessible and resolvable via an IPsec based VPN connection.

Other tunnel-establishment protocols already support the assignment of Split DNS domains. For example, there are proprietary extensions to IKEv1 that allow a server to assign Split DNS domains to a client. However, the IKEv2 standard does not include a method to configure this option. This document defines a standard way to negotiate this option for IKEv2.

## **3. Protocol Exchange**

In order to negotiate which domains are considered internal to an IKEv2 tunnel, initiators indicate support for Split DNS in their CFG\_REQUEST payloads, and responders assign internal domains (and DNSSEC trust anchors) in their CFG\_REPLY payloads. When Split DNS



has been negotiated, the existing DNS server configuration attributes will be interpreted as internal DNS servers that can resolve hostnames within the internal domains.

### **3.1. Configuration Request**

To indicate support for Split DNS, an initiator includes one more INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes as defined in [Section 4](#) as part of the CFG\_REQUEST payload. If an INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute is included in the CFG\_REQUEST, the initiator SHOULD also include one or more INTERNAL\_IP4\_DNS and INTERNAL\_IP6\_DNS attributes in the CFG\_REQUEST.

The INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute sent by the initiator is usually empty but MAY contain a suggested domain name.

The absence of INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes in the CFG\_REQUEST payload indicates that the initiator does not support or is unwilling to accept Split DNS configuration.

To indicate support for DNSSEC, an initiator includes one or more INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA attributes as defined in [Section 4](#) as part of the CFG\_REQUEST payload. If an INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA attribute is included in the CFG\_REQUEST, the initiator SHOULD also include one or more INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes in the CFG\_REQUEST. If the initiator includes an INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA attribute, but does not include an INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute, the responder MAY still respond with both INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA and INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes.

An initiator MAY convey its current DNSSEC trust anchors for the domain specified in the INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute. If it does not wish to convey this information, it MUST use a length of 0.

The absence of INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA attributes in the CFG\_REQUEST payload indicates that the initiator does not support or is unwilling to accept DNSSEC trust anchor configuration.

### **3.2. Configuration Reply**

Responders MAY send one or more INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes in their CFG\_REPLY payload. If an INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute is included in the CFG\_REPLY, the responder MUST also include one or both of the INTERNAL\_IP4\_DNS and INTERNAL\_IP6\_DNS attributes in the CFG\_REPLY. These DNS server configurations are necessary to define which servers can receive queries for hostnames in internal domains. If the CFG\_REQUEST included an INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute, but the CFG\_REPLY does not include an INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute, the initiator SHOULD behave as if Split DNS configurations are not supported by the server.



Each INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN represents a domain that the DNS servers address listed in INTERNAL\_IP4\_DNS and INTERNAL\_IP6\_DNS can resolve.

If the CFG\_REQUEST included INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes with non-zero lengths, the content MAY be ignored or be interpreted as a suggestion by the responder.

For each DNS domain specified in an INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute, one or more INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA attributes MAY be included by the responder. This attribute lists the corresponding internal DNSSEC trust anchor in the DNS presentation format of a DS record as specified in [[RFC4034](#)]. The INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA attribute MUST immediately follow the INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute that it applies to.

### **[3.3.](#) Mapping DNS Servers to Domains**

All DNS servers provided in the CFG\_REPLY MUST support resolving hostnames within all INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN domains. In other words, the INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes in a CFG\_REPLY payload form a single list of Split DNS domains that applies to the entire list of INTERNAL\_IP4\_DNS and INTERNAL\_IP6\_DNS attributes.

### **[3.4.](#) Example Exchanges**

#### **[3.4.1.](#) Simple Case**

In this example exchange, the initiator requests INTERNAL\_IP4\_DNS and INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes in the CFG\_REQUEST, but does not specify any value for either. This indicates that it supports Split DNS, but has no preference for which DNS requests will be routed through the tunnel.

The responder replies with two DNS server addresses, and two internal domains, "example.com" and "city.other.com".

Any subsequent DNS queries from the initiator for domains such as "www.example.com" SHOULD use 198.51.100.2 or 198.51.100.4 to resolve.





```
CP(CFG_REQUEST) =  
    INTERNAL_IP4_ADDRESS()  
    INTERNAL_IP4_DNS()  
    INTERNAL_DNS_DOMAIN()  
  
CP(CFG_REPLY) =  
    INTERNAL_IP4_ADDRESS(198.51.100.234)  
    INTERNAL_IP4_DNS(198.51.100.2)  
    INTERNAL_IP4_DNS(198.51.100.4)  
    INTERNAL_DNS_DOMAIN(example.com)  
    INTERNAL_DNS_DOMAIN(city.other.com)
```

### **3.4.2. Requesting Domains and DNSSEC trust anchors**

In this example exchange, the initiator requests `INTERNAL_IP4_DNS`, `INTERNAL_DNS_DOMAIN` and `INTERNAL_DNSSEC_TA` attributes in the `CFG_REQUEST`.

Any subsequent DNS queries from the initiator for domains such as "www.example.com" or "city.other.com" would be DNSSEC validated using the DNSSEC trust anchor received in the `CFG_REPLY`.


In this example, the initiator has no existing DNSSEC trust anchors would the requested domain. the "example.com" domain has DNSSEC trust anchors that are returned, while the "other.com" domain has no DNSSEC trust anchors.

```
CP(CFG_REQUEST) =  
    INTERNAL_IP4_ADDRESS()  
    INTERNAL_IP4_DNS()  
    INTERNAL_DNS_DOMAIN()  
    INTERNAL_DNSSEC_TA()  
  
CP(CFG_REPLY) =  
    INTERNAL_IP4_ADDRESS(198.51.100.234)  
    INTERNAL_IP4_DNS(198.51.100.2)  
    INTERNAL_IP4_DNS(198.51.100.4)  
    INTERNAL_DNS_DOMAIN(example.com)  
    INTERNAL_DNSSEC_TA(43547,8,1,B6225AB2CC613E0DCA7962BDC2342EA4...)  
    INTERNAL_DNSSEC_TA(31406,8,2,F78CF3344F72137235098ECBBD08947C...)  
    INTERNAL_DNS_DOMAIN(city.other.com)
```

## **4. Payload Formats**

All multi-octet fields representing integers are laid out in big endian order (also known as "most significant byte first", or "network byte order").



**4.1. INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN Configuration Attribute Type Request and Reply**


- o Reserved (1 bit) - Defined in IKEv2 RFC [[RFC7296](#)].
- o Attribute Type (15 bits) set to value 25 for INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN.
- o Length (2 octets) - Length of domain name.
- o Domain Name (0 or more octets) - A Fully Qualified Domain Name used for Split DNS rules, such as "example.com", in DNS presentation format and optionally using IDNA [[RFC5890](#)] for Internationalized Domain Names. Implementors need to be careful that this value is not null-terminated.

**4.2. INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA Configuration Attribute**


An INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA Configuration Attribute can either be empty, or it can contain one Trust Anchor by containing a non-zero Length with a DNSKEY Key Tag, DNSKEY Algorithm, Digest Type and Digest Data fields.



An empty INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA CFG attribute:



A non-empty INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA CFG attribute:



- o Reserved (1 bit) - Defined in IKEv2 RFC [[RFC7296](#)].
- o Attribute Type (15 bits) set to value 26 for INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA.
- o Length (0 or 2 octets) - Length of DNSSEC Trust Anchor data (4 octets plus the length of the Digest Data).
- o DNSKEY Key Tag value (0 or 2 octets) - Delegation Signer (DS) Key Tag as specified in [[RFC4034](#) Section 5.1].
- o DNSKEY Algorithm (0 or 1 octet) - DNSKEY algorithm value from the IANA DNS Security Algorithm Numbers Registry.
- o Digest Type (0 or 1 octet) - DS algorithm value from the IANA Delegation Signer (DS) Resource Record (RR) Type Digest Algorithms Registry.
- o Digest Data (0 or more octets) - The DNSKEY digest as specified in [[RFC4034](#) Section 5.1] in presentation format.

INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA payloads MUST immediately follow an INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN payload. As the INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA format itself does not contain the domain name, it relies on the preceding INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN to provide the domain for which it specifies the trust anchor.



## 5. INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN Usage Guidelines

If a CFG\_REPLY payload contains no INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes, the client MAY use the provided INTERNAL\_IP4\_DNS or INTERNAL\_IP6\_DNS servers as the default DNS server(s) for all queries.

If a client is configured by local policy to only accept a limited number of INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN values, the client MUST ignore any other INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN values.

For each INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN entry in a CFG\_REPLY payload that is not prohibited by local policy, the client MUST use the provided INTERNAL\_IP4\_DNS or INTERNAL\_IP6\_DNS DNS servers as the only resolvers for the listed domains and its sub-domains and it MUST NOT attempt to resolve the provided DNS domains using its external DNS servers.

If the initiator host is configured to block DNS answers containing IP addresses from special IP address ranges such as those of [\[RFC1918\]](#), the initiator SHOULD allow the DNS domains listed in the INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes to contain those Special IP addresses.

If a CFG\_REPLY contains one or more INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes and its local policy does not forbid these values, the client MUST configure its DNS resolver to resolve those domains and all their subdomains using only the DNS resolver(s) listed in that CFG\_REPLY message. If those resolvers fail, those names MUST NOT be resolved using any other DNS resolvers. Other domain names SHOULD be resolved using some other external DNS resolver(s), configured independently from IKE. Queries for these other domains MAY be sent to the internal DNS resolver(s) listed in that CFG\_REPLY message, but have no guarantee of being answered. For example, if the INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute specifies "example.com", then "example.com", "www.example.com" and "mail.eng.example.com" MUST be resolved using the internal DNS resolver(s), but "anotherexample.com" and "ample.com" SHOULD NOT be resolved using the internal resolver and SHOULD use the system's external DNS resolver(s).

When an IKE SA is terminated, the DNS forwarding MUST be unconfigured. This includes deleting the DNS forwarding rules; flushing all cached data for DNS domains provided by the INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute, including negative cache entries; removing any obtained DNSSEC trust anchors from the list of trust anchors; and clearing the outstanding DNS request queue.

INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attributes SHOULD only be used on split tunnel configurations where only a subset of traffic is routed into a private remote network using the IPsec connection. If all traffic is





routed over the IPsec connection, the existing global INTERNAL\_IP4\_DNS and INTERNAL\_IP6\_DNS can be used without creating specific DNS exemptions.

## **6. INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA Usage Guidelines**

Installing an INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA trust anchor can be seen as the equivalent of installing an Enterprise Certificate Agency (CA) certificate. It allows the remote IKE/IPsec server to modify DNS answers including its DNSSEC cryptographic signatures by overriding existing DNS information with trust anchor conveyed via IKE and (temporarily) installed on the IKE client. Of specific concern is the overriding of [[RFC6698](#)] based TLSA records, which represent a confirmation or override of an existing WebPKI TLS certificate. Other DNS record types that convey cryptographic materials (public keys or fingerprints) are OPENPGPKEY, SMIMEA, SSHP and IPSECKEY records.

IKE clients MUST ignore any received INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA requests for a FDQN for which it did not receive and accept an INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN Configuration Payload.

DNS records can be used to publish specific records containing trust anchors for applications. The most common record type is the TLSA record specified in [[RFC6698](#)]. This DNS record type publishes which CA certificate or EE certificate to expect for a certain host name. These records are protected by DNSSEC and thus can be trusted by the application. Whether to trust TLSA records instead of the traditional WebPKI depends on the local policy of the client. By accepting an INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA trust anchor via IKE from the remote IKE server, the IPsec client might be allowing the remote IKE server to override the trusted certificates for TLS. The same applies to other public key or fingerprint based DNS records, such as OPENPGPKEY, SMIMEA or IPSECKEY records.

In most deployment scenario's, the IKE client has an expectation that it is connecting, using a split-network setup, to a specific organisation or enterprise. A recommended policy would be to only accept INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA directives from that organization's DNS names. However, this might not be possible in all deployment scenarios, such as one where the IKE server is handing out a number of domains that are not within one parent domain.

## **7. Security Considerations**

The use of Split DNS configurations assigned by an IKEv2 responder is predicated on the trust established during IKE SA authentication. However, if IKEv2 is being negotiated with an anonymous or unknown



endpoint (such as for Opportunistic Security [[RFC7435](#)]), the initiator MUST ignore Split DNS configurations assigned by the responder.

If a host connected to an authenticated IKE peer is connecting to another IKE peer that attempts to claim the same domain via the INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute, the IKE connection SHOULD only process the DNS information if the two connections are part of the same logical entity. Otherwise, the client SHOULD refuse the DNS information and potentially warn the end-user.

If the initiator is using DNSSEC validation for a domain in its public DNS view, and it requests and receives an INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN attribute without an INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA, it will need to reconfigure its DNS resolver to allow for an insecure delegation. It SHOULD NOT accept insecure delegations for domains that are DNSSEC signed in the public DNS view, for which it has not explicitly requested such deletion by specifying the domain specifically using a INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN(domain) request.

Deployments that configure INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN domains should pay close attention to their use of indirect reference RRtypes such as CNAME, DNAME, MX or SRV records so that resolving works as intended when all, some, or none of the IPsec connections are established.

The content of INTERNAL\_DNS\_DOMAIN and INTERNAL\_DNSSEC\_TA may be passed to another (DNS) program for processing. As with any network input, the content SHOULD be considered untrusted and handled accordingly.

8. IANA Considerations

This document defines two new IKEv2 Configuration Payload Attribute Types, which are allocated from the "IKEv2 Configuration Payload Attribute Types" namespace.

Value	Attribute Type	Multi-		Reference
		Valued	Length	
25	INTERNAL_DNS_DOMAIN	YES	0 or more	[this document]
26	INTERNAL_DNSSEC_TA	YES	0 or more	[this document]

Figure 1



## **9. References**

### **9.1. Normative References**

- [RFC1918] Rekhter, Y., Moskowitz, B., Karrenberg, D., de Groot, G., and E. Lear, "Address Allocation for Private Internets", [BCP 5](#), [RFC 1918](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC1918, February 1996, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1918>>.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC4034] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "Resource Records for the DNS Security Extensions", [RFC 4034](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4034, March 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4034>>.
- [RFC5890] Klensin, J., "Internationalized Domain Names for Applications (IDNA): Definitions and Document Framework", [RFC 5890](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5890, August 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5890>>.
- [RFC6698] Hoffman, P. and J. Schlyter, "The DNS-Based Authentication of Named Entities (DANE) Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol: TLSA", [RFC 6698](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6698, August 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6698>>.
- [RFC7296] Kaufman, C., Hoffman, P., Nir, Y., Eronen, P., and T. Kivinen, "Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2)", STD 79, [RFC 7296](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7296, October 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7296>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

### **9.2. Informative References**

- [RFC2775] Carpenter, B., "Internet Transparency", [RFC 2775](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2775, February 2000, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2775>>.
- [RFC7435] Dukhovni, V., "Opportunistic Security: Some Protection Most of the Time", [RFC 7435](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7435, December 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7435>>.



Authors' Addresses

Tommy Pauly  
Apple Inc.  
One Apple Park Way  
Cupertino, California 95014  
US

Email: [tpauly@apple.com](mailto:tpauly@apple.com)

Paul Wouters  
Red Hat

Email: [pwouters@redhat.com](mailto:pwouters@redhat.com)



