

IAPT PERMANENT NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE FOR FUNGI

BALLOT 2011-1 **MUST** be received by the Secretary on or before **15 January 2011**

Email your vote to LLNorvell@PNW-MS.com Votes may be returned either in this attachment or within the body of the Email message. Please place **IAPT CF Ballot 2011-1** on the subject line; flag as high priority
NOTE: EVERY committee member MUST return a ballot by deadline or risk replacement!

PART 1: PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE / REJECT

Our votes below govern conservation status of fungal names.

Prop. 1769, to conserve the name *Cortinarius speciosissimus* against *C. rubellus*, *C. orellanoides*, and *C. rainierensis* (*Basidiomycota*).

2 yes **12** no [] abstain [] discussion

Prop. 1861a&b [Please refer to Norv 101218 (p. 18, NCF Commentary 12) for an explanation. Please vote on both alternates: if marking **yes** for one, you must vote **no** on the other.

Prop. 1861a [Nordin & Roux, revised], to conserve the name *Aspicilia farinosa* (Flörke) Flagey with a conserved type [i.e., the Nylander collection labeled as *Lecanora cinerea* var. *calcareae* (*farinosa* Ach.)]. [This alternate stabilizes the name according to current use].

[**3**] yes [**5**] no [**4**] abstain [**2**] discussion

Prop. 1861b [NCF alternate], to conserve the name *Aspicilia farinosa* (Nyl.) Flagey [non *A. farinosa* (Flörke) Flagey] with a conserved type [i.e., the Nylander collection labeled as *Lecanora cinerea* var. *calcareae* (*farinosa* Ach.)]. [This alternate also stabilizes the name according to current use].

[**4**] yes [**4**] no [**4**] abstain [**2**] discussion

Prop. 1863, to conserve the name *Craterellus cinereus* (Pers. : Fr.) Donk with a conserved type against *Craterellus cinereus* Pers. (*Basidiomycota*).

[**13**] yes [] no [**1**] abstain [] discussion

Prop. 1888a (original), to conserve the name *Glomus* (*Fungi*, *Glomeromycota*, *Glomerales*) as being of neuter gender.

[**13**] yes [] no [] abstain [**1**] discussion

Prop. 1896, to conserve the name *Lichen lichenoides* (*Leptogium lichenoides*) against *Lichen tremelloides* and *L. tremella* (lichenized *Ascomycota*).

[**10**] yes [**2**] no [**2**] abstain [] discussion

Prop. 1927a&b [Please refer to NORV 101218 (p. 35, NCF Commentary 12) for an explanation. Please vote on both alternates: if marking **yes** for one, you must vote **no** on the other.

Prop. 1927a [Vellinga & Pennycook], to conserve the name *Agaricus rachodes* (*Basidiomycota*) with that spelling.

[**7**] yes [**7**] no [] abstain [] discussion

Prop. 1927b [NCF alternate], to conserve the above name with 'rhacodes' as the spelling.

[**6**] yes [**8**] no [] abstain [] discussion

PART 2A: PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CODE [excluding Art. 59 (see Part 2B)]

Votes provide information to non-mycologist IAPT members. Final decisions will be made by all IAPT members via mail-in ballots and discussion at the 2011 IBC Nomenclature Section in Melbourne

Props. (018–020), [remaining proposals] to amend the CODE to make clear that it covers the nomenclature of fungi, and to modify its governance with respect to names of organisms treated as fungi.

Prop. (018), to amend Div. III.2 to provide for election of the Permanent Nomenclature Committee for Fungi by an International Mycological Congress.

[10] yes **[4] no** **[] abstain**

Prop. (019), to amend Div. III.4 to permit decisions on proposals relating solely to fungi to be taken at an International Mycological Congress.

[6] yes **[8] no** **[] abstain**

Prop. (020), to insert a new Div. III. 5 and footnote to make such decisions binding on the subsequent IBC Nomenclature Section and maintain a presence on the Editorial Committee.

[6] yes **[7] no** **[1] abstain**

Prop. (190), to amend Art. 45 to make it applicable to groups similar to the *Microsporidia* that are not covered by Props. 48–51.

[10] yes **[1] no** **[0] abstain**

Prop. (203–213), to permit electronic publications to be effectively published under specified conditions.

[11] yes **[2] no** **[1] abstain**

Prop. (223), to delete Art. 7.8 regarding the typification of sanctioned names.

[1] yes **[10] no** **[3] abstain**

Prop. (224-232), (224) to amend 7.8 to define sanctiotypification and (225–232) add articles or recommendations as needed by passage of (224).

[8] yes **[3] no** **[3] abstain**

PART 2B: PROPOSALS TO AMEND ART. 59

The following options were selected for the ballot sent to the Special Committee (Names of Fungi with a Pleomorphic Life Cycle) by its Secretary, Scott Redhead and ordered according to his Synopsis of current and 2004 Art. 59 proposals (see NCF Mailing 36). I (NCF Secretary) have added summaries of each proposal, but please read the Synopsis and proposals before voting. Those serving both Committees should vote both ballots, returning each to the appropriate Secretary.

Proposal to change the title of a Chapter

Prop. (306), to change the title of Ch. VI to “Names of **anamorphic fungi** or fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle” [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 23)]

[9] yes **[3] no** **[2] abstain**

Proposal to (essentially) return Art. 59 to its prior (St. Louis) version

Prop. (172), to delete Art. 59.7 and all allusions to it and add a Note regarding names already published under it. [Gams et al. 2010. TAXON 59(4): 1297]

[] yes [10] no [4] abstain

Proposals to introduce ‘teleotype’ as substitute for ‘epitype’ in the context of Art. 59.7

Prop. (294), to introduce and define ‘teleotype’ (a special sort of epitype that does not prohibit further epitypification of an original anamorphic type [Redhead, 2010, TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 21])

[11] yes [1] no [2] abstain

Prop. (295), to add paragraph after Art. 9.18 to outline how to correct incorrectly linked teleomorphs with anamorphs [Redhead, 2010, TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 22)]

[11] yes [1] no [2] abstain

Proposals to restrict application of Art. 59.7 (epitypification / teleotypification)

Prop. (173, alternative to 172), to alter Art. 59.7 so that taxa with teleomorph-typified names in otherwise anamorphic genera need not be changed. [Gams & al. 2010, TAXON 59(4): 1297]

[3] yes [8] no [3] abstain

Prop. (174, continuation of 173), to add Rec. 59A.4 to classify a new anamorph under a teleomorph-typified generic name only when no suitable anamorph-typified generic name is available. [Gams & al. 2010, TAXON 59(4): 1297]

[3] yes [9] no [2] abstain

Prop. (307), to remove reference to ‘form-taxon’ from Art. 59.3 [Gams et al., 2010, TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 24)]

[8] yes [4] no [2] abstain

Prop. (308), to qualify that priority status applies re epi/teleotypification with reference to a modified 59.5 [Gams et al., 2010, TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 24)]

[5] yes [7] no [2] abstain

Prop. (309), to remove further references to ‘form-taxa’ and grant flexibility in choosing anamorphic names [Gams et al., 2010, TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 24)]

[6] yes [6] no [2] abstain

Prop. (310), to add examples on *Cryptococcus neoformans* and *Neosartorya* to guide interpretation of changes to 59.5 if (309) is passed [Gams et al., 2010, TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 24)]

[6] yes [7] no [1] abstain

Prop. (311), to add text and examples after 59.7 asking that anamorphic species not be transferred to teleomorphic genera based solely on phylogenetic studies when a suitable anamorphic genus is available [Gams et al., 2010, TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 24)]

[5] yes [7] no [2] abstain

Prop. (312), to add to Rec. 59A.1 to describe a separate name for a new anamorph species in a teleomorphic genus only when the species is more likely to be identified in anamorphic form [Gams et al., 2010, TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 24)]

[5] yes [7] no [2] abstain

Prop. (313), to add Rec. 592.4 granting preference to dual nomenclature to classifying a newly found teleomorph of a previously named anamorph in an appropriate teleomorph genus [Gams et al., 2010, TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 24]

[5] yes [7] no [2] abstain

Proposal to ensure a legitimate name can be published for a holomorph under all circumstances if 59.7 is retained

Prop. (296), to replace “and’ with “or” in Art. 59.7 to break a nomenclatural ‘loop’ [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: #)]

[11] yes [] no [3] abstain

Proposals to prohibit publication of separate, alternative names typified by different morphs.

Prop. (old-183), to prohibit separate alternative morph names [Hawksworth. 2004, Taxon 53(2): 597; see current Prop. (297)]

[3] yes [8] no [3] abstain

Prop. (297), to add two paragraphs to Art. 59.6 to modify the wording of “old-183” to prohibit simultaneous publication of synonymous anamorph and teleomorph names after a set date [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 22)]

[9] yes [3] no [1] abstain

Prop. (298), if (297) is accepted to delete Art. 59 Note 1 and Exs 3–4 [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 22)]

[8] yes [4] no [2] abstain

Prop. (302), if either Prop. 297 or (old-183) are adopted, to add a new Note ahead Art. of 59.1 to explain in post-Vienna Codes as to why alternative names existed. [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 23)]

[9] yes [3] no [2] abstain

Proposals to remove residual contradictions in post-Vienna Art. 59

Prop. (299), if (297) is accepted to rephrase Art. 59, Ex. 2, to clarify that anamorphic names can apply to the holomorph if teleotypified [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 22)]

[9] yes [2] no [3] abstain

Prop. (300), if (297) is accepted to replace ‘form-taxa’ reference in Art. 59.3 [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 22)]

[8] yes [3] no [3] abstain

Prop. (301), if (297) is accepted, to reword Art. 59.2 to remove a redundant contradiction [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 22–23)]

[11] yes [1] no [2] abstain

Proposal update paragraph 1, but with multiple nuances, each requiring critiques

Prop. (303), to replace Art. 59.1 with text introducing new terminology using standard phylum names and eliminate recognition of parthenogenic ‘carpophores’ as anamorphs [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 23)]

[7] yes [4] no [3] abstain

Proposals to empower a Committee with the judicial power to resolve disputes over application of Art. 59 when the anamorphic or teleomorphic status of a type is ambiguous or debatable. [You should vote either **for** both 304 & 305 or **against** both 304 & 305.]

Prop. (304), to empower a Committee (presumably NCF) to settle controversial debates arising from ambiguity [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 23)]

11] yes **1**] no **2**] abstain

Prop. (305), to add a new paragraph to Art. 14 stating that the type of a name covered by 59.1 may be conserved as either anamorphic or teleomorphic for nomenclatural purposes [Redhead 2010 TAXON 59(6_203–338fastTrack: 23)]

12] yes **1**] no **1**] abstain

Proposals to suggest informal use of anamorph names.

Prop. (old-185), if (297) or (old-183) adopted, to provide for informal use of anamorph names after prohibiting alternative names (Hawksworth) Taxon 53(2): 598 (2004)

8] yes **3**] no **3**] abstain

Prop. (old-186), if (297) or (old-183) adopted, to add a recommendation on handling anamorph names informally (Hawksworth) Taxon 53(2): 598 (2004)

8] yes **3**] no **3**] abstain

Proposal to give license to the Editorial Committee should changes be made to Art. 59

Prop. (old-187), to permit the Editorial Committee to cross-reference changes (Hawksworth) Taxon 53(2): 598 (2004)

10] yes **1**] no **3**] abstain

PART 3: NCF INTERNAL PROTOCOL POLL

The vote below will help guide future NCF commenting procedures after a ballot has been sent to members.

QUESTION: When should members receive comments sent to the Secretary during the official ‘voting period’ (i.e., the time between receipt of the official ballot and a voting deadline)?

VOTE FOR ONE:

11] The NCF Secretary **should share** with all NCF members individual member questions/comments received during the voting period in a timely fashion. An extended commenting period (ending 4 days before the ballot due date) would permit weekly secretarial messages containing deadline reminders and comments received since the previous message, with all comments also contained in the Commentary accompanying the Ballot Report.

3] The NCF Secretary should **withhold** from all NCF members individual member questions / comments received during the voting period. All comments will appear instead in the Commentary accompanying the Ballot Report sent to NCF members after all votes have been received. Although there would be no extended commenting period for members, the Secretary would still send members voting reminders or important information received from proposal authors and the General Committee.