IANA review turned up one comment: the lack of a Domain Name Reservation Considerations section

There was one, but I screwed it up: it adopts the Domain Name Reservation Considerations section of RFC6761 (which doesn’t exist) rather than RFC8375 (home.arpa).

Goal here was to avoid restating what is already said in RFC8375
Change:

- <name>Special-Use Domain Name Considerations for service.arpa</name>
+ <name>Domain Name Reservation Considerations</name>
+ <t>[Note to the RFC Editor: please remove this and the following paragraph prior to publication.]</t>
+ <t>[Note to IANA: this section documents the domain name reservation considerations as required by RFC6761. If you combine the contents of this section with the contents of the same section of RFC8375 as proposed below, you should have a complete set of considerations. The text is not duplicated here for the sake of brevity.</t>
+ <t> </t>
- <t><xref target="RFC6761" section="6.1" sectionFormat="of"/></t> provides detailed information for handling of locally-served domains, of which 'service.arpa.' is an example. The considerations described in this section of RFC6761 apply identically to 'default.service.arpa.', with the following additional considerations:
+ <xref target="RFC8375" section="4" sectionFormat="of"/> provides detailed information for handling of locally-served domains, of which 'service.arpa.' is an example. The considerations described in this section of RFC8375 apply identically to 'service.arpa.', with the following additional considerations:
One last-call comment from Esko Dijk, who felt the text about 4- and 8-byte formats was confusing

Proposed fix:
- <t>Note that both the 4-byte and 8-byte variant are valid on both clients and servers. If a server receives a 4-byte variant, it MUST respond with a 4-byte variant. If a client sends an 8-byte variant, it MUST accept either an 8-byte variant or a 4-byte variant in the response. If it receives a 4-byte variant, it MUST assume that both the key lease and update lease values are the same on the server.</t>
+ <t>Note that both the 4-byte and 8-byte variant are valid on both clients and servers, but clients and servers may exist that do not support the newer 8-byte variant. Therefore, clients and servers that do support this variant must account for the possibility that the server with which they are communicating does not.</t>
+ <t>A client that receives a 4-byte variant from a server when it sent an 8-byte variant MUST treat the 4-byte variant as specifying both the lease time and the key lease time. A server that supports the 8-byte variant MUST treat the 4-byte variant as specifying both the lease time and the key lease time. When a server receives a 4-byte variant, it MUST respond with a 4-byte variant. In this case the key and the other records expire at the same time.</t>
Request:

• These changes are useful but do not change the meaning of the document
• Can we address further comments during IETF last call?
• If so, let’s click publish!