

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE FOR FUNGI

7 November, 2006

Dear Fellow CF members,

After a long lapse in communication following my report on the Vienna Congress last year, I am happy to re-activate the Committee for Fungi. From this point onward, expect to receive (and send) communications a minimum of three to four times a year. While the pace of communications often slows in the year after an International Botanical Congress as the new Code is prepared (see below), that pace will accelerate as we approach the next IBC to be held in Melbourne, Australia, in 2011.

As members of the IAPT Editorial Committee, CF Chair Vincent Demoulin and member David Hawksworth were actively involved in preparing the new **Vienna Code**, which is now published (although not all of us have seen it in print). Its citation is:

McNeill, J., Barrie, F. R., Burdet, H. M., Demoulin, V., Hawksworth, D. L., Marhold, K., Nicolson, D. H., Prado, J., Silva, P. C., Skog, J. E., Wiersema, J. H. & Turland, N. J. (eds.) 2006. *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (Vienna Code) adopted by the Seventeenth International Botanical Congress Vienna, Austria, July 2005. (Regnum veg. 146)*. Koeltz Scientific Books, Königstein, Germany. (ISBN 3-906166-48-1).

If you have not already ordered your copy, I urge you to do so. It is available from numerous publishers, including Koeltz Scientific Books (which is linked on the IAPT webpage). Since my communications last fall, there have been a few editorial changes made to the changes in the Code approved in Vienna. One far-reaching editorial change, which affects the potential validity of names in theses, differs slightly from what I reported earlier with regard to Art. 30. Further discussion will be forthcoming.

Additional recent news is that the **Special Committee on Names for Pleomorphic Fungi** was officially launched on October 17, 2006. Members include Chair Amy Rossman, Secretary Scott Redhead, Joe Bischoff, Walter Gams, Cheryl Grgurinovic, David Hawksworth, Tsuyoshi Hosoya, Paul Kirk, José Paulo Sampaio, Keith Seifert, Fred Spiegel and Michael Wingfield. The Committee will consider the impact of modifications (or elimination of) **Art. 59**, and forward their recommendations to the Committee for Fungi and General Committee for further input before presentation to the Nomenclature Section at the 18th Botanical Congress in Melbourne.

Once again, I would like to thank outgoing CF Secretary **Walter Gams** for so effectively clearing away proposals just prior to IBC. Since then, nine new conservation proposals have been published, and more are currently in press. Before I send out the official Commentary for those proposals, however, there is one item that must first be considered.

Prop. 1486 (“Coprinus”, part 2) referred back to the Committee for Fungi for majority vote by the General Committee. (For background, refer to the initial proposal — Taxon 50: 909-910. 2001 — and the Report of the General Committee: 9 — p. 799 in Taxon 55(3): 795- 800. 2006.) Unfortunately, all of us who attended the Vienna Congress completely

overlooked a matter only just now published the August *Taxon*. As Report 9 (cited above) makes clear, the General Committee did not accept all of our Committee for Fungi Report #12 (*Taxon* 54: 520-523. 2005).

Specifically, the General Committee did not accept our recommendation to reject Prop. 1486, which proposed conservation of a new type for *Coprinus*. Prop. 1486 served as an alternative to Prop. 1474. Those of you on the committee at that time will recall that 1474 proposed [a] to reject *Pselliophora* or alternatively [b] to conserve *Coprinopsis* against *Pselliophora* (both with *Agaricus atramentarius* as type). Those who proposed 1486, felt that the earlier proposal would be unnecessary should the Committee recommend (and the Congress ratify) that the type of *Coprinus* move from *C. comatus* to *A. atramentarius* (i.e., if Prop. 1486 [alternative b] passed, Prop. 1474 would be moot).

These two proposals, although not directly opposed to one another were seen as alternative solutions where only one was necessary. After much discussion and several votes, 1474 was recommended by a vote of 9: 3: 2: 1. It was not illogical for the CF Secretary to recommend rejection of 1486 (even though our vote of 6: 7: 1: 1 did not constitute a full majority) after 1474 had been recommended. However, as noted in General Committee Report 9, a 60% vote to approve or reject is required to legitimize a recommendation to the General Committee. Our recommendation for rejection of Prop. 1486 was supported not by a 60% vote. Unfortunately, as only a limited number of copies of General Committee Report 9 were handed out (among other materials) in Vienna, it was not available to most of the attending mycologists. Prop. 1486 essentially “slipped between the cracks” until the General Committee’s report was published last month. The situation was further exacerbated by the fact that since June, 2005, your past and present secretaries both publicized that the debate on *Coprinus* had ended, and the type remained *C. comatus*. Therefore, although CF committee members believed Prop. 1486 to be no longer active, it has never been formally rejected. As a result, unfortunately, Prop. 1486 comes back to the CF.

Those of you on the Committee prior to Vienna no doubt recall that debate over 1474 vs 1486 extended over several years, consumed many pages of comments, and was, at times, rather heated. For those reasons, we are somewhat reluctant to bring it back for full debate. This situation has been discussed among both CF and General Committee members. The Secretary of the General Committee has suggested that a potentially stressful situation might be resolved by holding a special ballot on Prop.1486 in order to obtain the required 60% vote.

Therefore, I submit to you a special ballot on Prop. 1486, which accompanies this letter. The ballot contains two parts:

Part 1 (Prop. 1486) is straightforward: please vote on this as you would on our regular ballots. (But do read the paragraph below.)

Part 2 (Procedural Poll for continued discussion of 1486) asks for your opinion on how best to resume our discussion if the results from Part 1 do not show a 60% preference for one option. Should we initiate a fresh debate or resume our old one? A fresh debate means that only opinions submitted by current Committee members

would be included in the circulating Commentaries. Resumption means that our Commentaries would also include the 8 single-spaced pages of discussion presented between 2001 and 2005.

I shall not send the November 2006 Commentary until I receive either 17 ballots or 11 votes for one option. (We now have 17 members on our committee; 10 members constitute only 58.8% while 11 votes comprise 64.7%, the minimum number for acceptance by the General Committee.) It is imperative that **all members vote as soon as possible**. I strongly urge each member to vote either **yes** or **no**. An abstention in this vote will equate with a vote for “more discussion needed”.

My recommendation is to reject Proj. 1486, so that the committee can devote time to our new proposals.

New proposals to conserve / reject: The following proposals will be included in our forthcoming Commentary. As always, you do not need to wait for arrival of the Commentary to send me your opinions on any of the published proposals.

Prop. 1708, to conserve the name *Perenniporia* against *Physisporus* with a conserved type (*Basidiomycota*). Proposed by Cony Decock & Joost Stalpers. Taxon 55(1): 227. 2006. [See also Decock & Stalpers, 2006, Taxon 55(3): 759-778 for a detailed discussion of the taxonomy.]

Prop. 1709, to conserve the name *Chroogomphus* against *Brauniellula* (*Gomphidiaceae*, *Agaricales*, *Basidiomycota*). Proposed by M. Catherine Aime & Orson K. Miller (+). Taxon 55(1): 228-229. 2006.

Prop. 1719, to conserve the name *Spilomium graphideorum* with a conserved type to safeguard the current usage of the generic names *Lecanographa* and *Milospium* (*Fungi*). Proposed by David L. Hawksworth. Taxon 55(2): 528-529. 2006.

Prop. 1730, to conserve the name *Strigula schizospora* against *S. gibberosa* (*Ascomycota: Pyrenulales: Strigulaceae*). Proposed by Robert Lücking. Taxon 55(3): 801. 2006. **Prop. 1731**, to conserve the name *Lichenochora* against *Paralaestadia* (*Fungi*). Proposed by Nikolaus Hoffmann, Josef Hafellner & David L. Hawksworth. Taxon 55(3): 802. 2006.

Prop. 1732, to conserve the name *Pseudocercospora* against *Stigmina* and *Phaeoisariopsis* (*Hyphomycetes*). Proposed by Uwe Braun & Pedro W. Crous. Taxon 55(3): 803. 2006.

Props. 1733–1735 are presented together under one title: Proposals to conserve the names *Chrysomyxa empetri*, *C. piperiana*, and *C. ledicola* (*Uredinales*) with teleomorph types against their anamorph homonyms. Proposed by Patricia Crane. Taxon 55(3): 804–805.

[SECRETARY'S COMMENT: Discussion pertaining to the three proposals as a unit will be placed after the above header. Comments directed to only one proposal will be placed after the appropriate header below.]

(1733) *Chrysomyxa empetri* vs. *Chrysomyxa empetri* (p. 804)

(1734) *Chrysomyxa piperiana* vs. *Chrysomyxa piperiana* (p. 804-5)

(1735) *Chrysomyxa ledicola* +type vs. *Chrysomyxa ledicola a* (p. 805)

I look forward to receiving your ballots regarding disposition of Prop. 1486 within the next few days.

Warm regards, Lorelei Norvell, Secretary
Permanent Nomenclature Committee for Fungi