

## XVIII International Botanical Congress: Preliminary mail vote and report of Congress action on nomenclature proposals

John McNeill,<sup>1</sup> Nicholas J. Turland,<sup>2</sup> Anna M. Monro<sup>3</sup> & Brendan J. Lepschi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, and Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh, EH3 5LR, Scotland, U.K.

<sup>2</sup> Missouri Botanical Garden, P.O. Box 299, St. Louis, Missouri 63166-0299, U.S.A.

<sup>3</sup> Australian National Herbarium, G.P.O. Box 1600, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, 2601, Australia

Author for correspondence: John McNeill, [jmcneill@rgbe.ac.uk](mailto:jmcneill@rgbe.ac.uk)

### ■ PRELIMINARY MAIL VOTE

A preliminary guiding mail vote on nomenclature proposals is required by Provision 4(a) of Division III (Provisions for the Governance of the *Code*) of the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146: 2006). A “Synopsis of Proposals” was published in *Taxon* 60: 243–286. 2011.

Ballot forms were distributed with the February 2011 issue of *Taxon* to all individual members of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) and mailed from Vienna in early March to other persons who were either members of a permanent nomenclature committee or authors of proposals. The deadline for return of ballots was 31 May 2011. All ballots received by that date were included in the vote count.

Out of approximately 1400 ballots distributed, 140 valid ballots (10%) were returned. There were no ballots returned unsigned so none had to be disregarded. Submission was by mail (112), by fax (12), or as scanned attachments to e-mails

(16). Although electronic submission was not confined to fax (as for the Vienna Congress) there was no change in the proportion using electronic means and the majority of ballots (80% of those returned) continued to be submitted in hard copy by regular mail.

In all, 338 proposals to amend the *Code* at the Melbourne Congress were published in advance, summarized in the “Synopsis of Proposals” and included in the preliminary mail vote, by a small margin the largest number at any Congress since the Paris Congress in 1954 (see Table 1). Apart from a block of 26 proposals for editorial modification of the Glossary (App. VII), there were no special circumstances surrounding the proposals so it would seem that the general trend toward fewer proposals suggested in the report on the decisions in Vienna (McNeill & al. in *Taxon* 54: 1057–1064. 2005) has not been maintained. Of the 338 proposals, 190 were single-authored, 79 had two authors, 58 had three or more authors, and 11 came from The Special Committee on Electronic Publication.

The tabulation below (Table 4 on p. 5 ff.) gives the result of the preliminary mail vote for each proposal, in the

**Table 1.** Comparative statistics on proposals and voting at Congresses over the past 61 years.

Congress	Proposals	Ballots returned	Regular members	Institutional votes (No. of institutions)	Total votes
Melbourne (2011)	338	140	204	396 (162)	600
Vienna (2005)	312	166	198	402 (170)	600
St. Louis (1999)	215	229	297	494 (231)	791
Tokyo (1993)	321	202	95	361 (148)	456
Berlin (1987)	336	160	157	296 (116)	453
Sydney (1981)	213	187	153	328 (135)	485
Leningrad (1975)	161	?	165	381 (156)	546
Seattle (1969)	223 <sup>a</sup>	?	“200 or so” <sup>a</sup>	?	?
Edinburgh (1964)	337 <sup>a</sup>	?	161	202 (87)	363
Montreal (1959)	333 <sup>a</sup>	?	168	266 (101)	434
Paris (1954)	387	355	91	202 (80)	293
Stockholm (1950)	550 <sup>a</sup>	ca. 200	71 <sup>b</sup>	?	?

<sup>a</sup> These figures are taken from the Table on page 37 in Stafleu’s account of the Nomenclature Section in Seattle (in *Taxon* 19: 36–42. 1970); those for the number of proposals are substantially higher than the apparent numbers in the lists of proposals to the Montreal (*Regnum Veg.* 14: 6. 1959) and the Edinburgh (*Regnum Veg.* 30: 6. 1964) Congresses. Other figures are from the contemporary published records.

<sup>b</sup> Based on a count of those in the “Section Nomenclature” photograph (Osvold & Åberg, *Proc. VII Int. Bot. Congr.*: pl. XVI. 1953), provided by Paul van Rijkcevoersel.

sequence “yes”, “no”, “ed.c.” (refer to the Editorial Committee), “sp.c.” (refer to a Special Committee), and the “total” votes cast for that proposal followed by “% no”, the percentage of votes against (discounting abstentions). When the “no” vote was 75% or more, the Section, as with previous Congresses, decided that all such proposals would be ruled as rejected without discussion unless reintroduced from the floor. There were 50 such heavily defeated proposals (15% of the total), of which 7 had a negative vote of 90% or more.

An asterisk (\*) preceding the number voting “ed.c.” indicates that the Rapporteurs, in their comments (see Taxon 60: 243–286. 2011), suggested a special meaning for an “ed.c.” vote.

With 140 ballots submitted the total vote on each proposal shows the proportion of those who wished to express an opinion on that proposal. In general this was relatively constant between about 70% and 80%. There was the usual exception in the case of those proposals only affecting particular groups, such as those dealing only with fungi, for which the range was 60% to 70%. The proposals dealing with electronic publication generated the greatest interest with an average “turn-out” of 85%.

## ■ NOMENCLATURE SECTION PROCEEDINGS AND APPOINTMENTS

The sessions of the Nomenclature Section of the XVIII International Botanical Congress took place in the Copland Theatre, Economics and Commerce Building, University of Melbourne (Parkville campus), Melbourne, Australia, on Monday, 18 July 2011 at 9 a.m. and daily thereafter until Friday, 22 July. The sessions continued until around 5:30 p.m. each day (with half hour breaks in the morning and afternoon and an hour’s break for lunch), except on Friday when the sessions concluded at the end of business, at 4:21 p.m., and were followed by the General Assembly of IAPT. There were 204 registered members in attendance, carrying 396 institutional votes in addition to their personal votes, making a total of 600 possible votes representing 56 countries (see Table 2). Although as at Vienna in 2005 this was a large attendance compared with many previous Congresses, it was substantially smaller than that at St. Louis in 1999 which had a record attendance (see Table 1).

The officers of the Section, appointed in conformity with Division III of the *Code*, were S. Knapp (London, England, U.K., President), J. McNeill (Edinburgh, Scotland, U.K., Rapporteur-général), N.J. Turland (St. Louis, U.S.A., Vice-rapporteur), and B.J. Lepschi (Canberra, Australia, Recorder). The Bureau of Nomenclature further included five vice-presidents appointed by the Section: B. Briggs (Sydney, Australia), W. Gams (Utrecht, Netherlands), D. Geltman (St. Petersburg, Russia), W. Greuter (Berlin, Germany & Palermo, Italy), and G. Smith (Pretoria, South Africa). A.M. Monro (Canberra, Australia) worked closely with the Recorder in the performance of the duties of the position.

The Nominating Committee, appointed by the Section on the nomination of the Bureau of Nomenclature, consisted of 12 members: B. Briggs (Sydney, Australia, Chair),

P.J. Brownsey (Wellington, New Zealand), K. Challis (Kew, U.K.), A.A. Dönmez (Ankara, Turkey), R.H. Fortunato (Buenos Aires, Argentina), H. Glen (Durban, South Africa), Tseng-Chiang Huang (Taipei, Taiwan), P.M. Kirk (Egham, U.K.), R. Magill (St. Louis, U.S.A.), J.H. Wiersema (Beltsville, U.S.A.), S. Demissew (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia), and Xian-Chun Zhang (Beijing, China).

The Section appointed tellers (see Acknowledgements), and adopted the by now traditional procedures of: (1) considering as rejected all proposals that had received 75% or more “no” votes in the preliminary mail vote; (2) requiring that any new motion made from the floor, or re-introduction of such a rejected proposal, be considered only if supported by at least five Section members; and (3) requiring a 60% majority of the votes cast for any amendment to the *Code* to be accepted. The Section also adopted the procedure adopted by the Section in Vienna, but for which there was no previous precedent, of requiring a 60% majority to *reject* a recommendation from the General Committee for inclusion of a name or work in Appendices II–VI of the *Code*.

Following a card vote (373 yes: 172 no, 68.4% yes), the Section approved the *Vienna Code* as published as the basis for its deliberations, the opposition to acceptance being based on the view that the procedure adopted in Vienna for acceptance of recommendations by the General Committee (i.e., the procedure just previously adopted by the Section in Melbourne) was invalid (see, e.g., Moore & al. in Taxon 60: 852–857. 2011, and references therein). This procedure had covered, but had not been limited to, the recommendation that *Acacia* be conserved with *A. penninervis* as type.

For the revised *Melbourne Code* to arise from the Melbourne Congress, the Editorial Committee was given the usual power to alter wording, Examples, or location of Articles and Recommendations insofar as the meaning was not affected, but was requested to retain the present numbering insofar as possible.

A proposal by the President was accepted, whereby proposals that concerned only Examples (except Voted Examples) that the Section did not explicitly wish to discuss would be referred to the Editorial Committee without a formal vote.

The proposals were considered and acted upon in the sequence in which they appear in the published “Synopsis” (McNeill & Turland in Taxon 60: 243–286. 2011), except when proposals were part of a suite in which the key proposal appeared later in the Synopsis or in cases where action was postponed to allow further deliberations among the proposers or the specialists concerned (as was the case, in particular, for proposals concerning typification of sanctioned names of fungi and of proposals dealing with names of fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle). The full proceedings, based on the audio recordings of the debates, will, as for recent Congresses, be published and offered to all Section members thanks to a contribution from IAPT.

The Section’s decisions are tabulated below, along with the results of the preliminary mail vote. Of the 338 original proposals submitted, 81 were accepted (24%), a more usual success rate than that in Vienna; of these 19 had been more

or less substantially amended. As at Vienna a large number of proposals (103—31%) were referred to the Editorial Committee, including 28 dealing with the Glossary that were referred to that Committee en bloc. On the negative side, 154 proposals (46%) were either rejected, withdrawn, or referred directly to Special Committees; of these 99 were not discussed because they were: (i) rejected automatically on account of an earlier decision (12), (ii) withdrawn (39), or (iii) received more than 75% “no” votes in the preliminary mail vote (48—of the 50 noted above, two, Art. 16 Prop. E and Art. 51 Prop. A, were reintroduced for discussion—and then defeated). Of note was the number of proposals (24) withdrawn in favour of new proposals presented for the first time at the Section meeting and accepted. These related to the rules governing the nomenclature of fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle (Art. 59) and the typification of names of fungi sanctioned under Art. 13 and 15. Apart from these, a relatively small number of entirely new proposals from the floor were successful (see New Proposals Accepted).

The Section resolved to establish five Special Committees to report to the Nomenclature Section of the next Congress. The last committee is a re-establishment of a Special Committee set up at the Vienna Congress, but which did not complete a report to the Section in Melbourne.

- **Special Committee on Publications Using a Largely Mechanical Method of Selection of Types** (Art. 10.5) (especially under the *American Code*)
- **Special Committee on By-laws for the Nomenclature Section** (with a **Subcommittee on Governance of the Code With Respect to Fungi**)
- **Special Committee on Institutional Votes**
- **Special Committee on Registration of Algal and Plant Names** (including fossils)
- **Special Committee on Harmonization of Nomenclature of Cyanophyta/Cyanobacteria** (to be established in association with relevant appointees from the Commission on Prokaryote Nomenclature).

**Table 2.** Geographic statistics on institutional and personal votes at the Melbourne Congress (sorted in descending order by total number of votes).

Country	Institutional votes	Personal votes	Total votes	Country	Institutional votes	Personal votes	Total votes
Australia	40	69	109	Colombia	3	0	3
United States	67	36	103	Estonia	2	1	3
United Kingdom	28	17	45	Japan	2	1	3
South Africa	19	8	27	Norway	2	1	3
Germany	18	4	22	Pakistan	3	0	3
Netherlands	16	5	21	Portugal	2	1	3
Canada	14	6	20	Ethiopia	1	1	2
Brazil	13	3	16	Greece	2	0	2
New Zealand	8	8	16	Iran	2	0	2
India	10	5	15	Kenya	2	0	2
Italy	10	2	12	Mozambique	2	0	2
Austria	8	3	11	Poland	2	0	2
Finland	10	1	11	Romania	1	1	2
Russia	10	1	11	Singapore	2	0	2
Switzerland	7	4	11	Thailand	2	0	2
Belgium	8	2	10	Venezuela	2	0	2
China	0	10	10	Zimbabwe	2	0	2
Mexico	10	0	10	Belarus	1	0	1
France	8	1	9	Bulgaria	0	1	1
Turkey	8	1	9	Chile	1	0	1
Czech Republic	7	1	8	Ecuador	1	0	1
Argentina	6	1	7	Hungary	1	0	1
Denmark	7	0	7	Ireland	1	0	1
Spain	5	1	6	Namibia	1	0	1
Taiwan	0	6	6	Panama	1	0	1
Cuba	5	0	5	Sweden	0	1	1
Slovakia	4	1	5	Uganda	1	0	1
Ukraine	5	0	5				
Armenia	3	0	3	<b>Totals</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>600</b>

**Table 3.** Card votes taken at the Melbourne Nomenclature Section, showing the proportions of institutional and personal votes.

Description	Vote type	Vote			
		Yes	No	Total	% Yes
Vote 1: Ratify <i>Vienna Code</i>	Inst.	247	136	383	64.5%
	Pers.	126	36	162	77.8%
	Total	373	172	545	68.4%
Vote 2: Art. 6 Prop. A, amendment (see note 6 on p. 10)	Inst.	234	119	353	66.3%
	Pers.	91	50	141	64.5%
	Total	325	169	494	65.8%
Vote 3: Art. 9 Prop. E	Inst.	171	167	338	50.6%
	Pers.	51	79	130	39.2%
	Total	222	246	468	47.4%
Vote 4: Art. 10 Prop. A	Inst.	224	107	331	67.7%
	Pers.	70	40	110	63.6%
	Total	294	147	441	66.7%
Vote 5: Art. 14 Prop. G	Inst.	273	110	383	71.3%
	Pers.	95	47	142	66.9%
	Total	368	157	525	70.1%
Vote 6: New proposal on Art. 31 (see note 28 on p. 11)	Inst.	177	184	361	49.0%
	Pers.	80	66	146	54.8%
	Total	257	250	507	50.7%
Vote 7: Art. 7 Prop. L	Inst.	191	136	327	58.4%
	Pers.	65	51	116	56.0%
	Total	256	187	443	57.8%
Vote 8: Art. 46 Prop. A	Inst.	180	152	332	54.2%
	Pers.	64	75	139	46.0%
	Total	244	227	471	51.8%
Vote 9 (card 10): New proposal on <i>Acacia</i> (Turland; see note 35 on p. 11)	Inst.	121	273	394	30.7%
	Pers.	48	123	171	28.1%
	Total	169	396	565	29.9%
Vote 10 (card 11): Art. 46 Prop. I	Inst.	153	164	317	48.3%
	Pers.	56	66	122	45.9%
	Total	209	230	439	47.6%
Vote 11 (card 13): New proposal on Art. 8.4	Inst.	218	98	316	69.0%
	Pers.	72	47	119	60.5%
	Total	290	145	435	66.7%

Most of the decisions taken by the Section were clear cut, and a show of hands was usually conclusive. In a few cases a show of cards was deemed necessary, and 11 formal card votes were requested: that on the approval of the *Vienna Code* referred to above, and 10 others detailed below, of which only 4 resulted in successful proposals. Voting cards for delegates' personal votes were marked with a "P" so that personal and institutional votes could be separately tabulated. This was done in response to interest, prior to the Congress, in the effect of institutional votes (see Smith & al. in Taxon 59: 930–934. 2010; Applequist & al. in Taxon 59: 1567–1570. 2010; Landrum in Taxon 59: 1616. 2010; and Smith & al. in Taxon 60: 213–215. 2011). With the newly established Special Committee on Institutional Votes in mind, separate figures for institutional and personal votes are provided here (Table 3).

At its final session, the Section received the six-year reports of the General Committee and other Permanent Nomenclature Committees (the latter to be published in the full proceedings of the Section meetings, "Report on Botanical Nomenclature—Melbourne 2011"). The Report of the General Committee (see Barrie in Taxon 60: 1211–1214. 2011) included 233 recommendations to conserve and reject names (166 to conserve under Art. 14 and 67 to reject under Art. 56), 16 recommendations that names or epithets were sufficiently alike to be treated as homonyms and 5 that names or epithets were not (Art. 53.5), and 3 recommendations that descriptive statements satisfied the requirement of Art. 32.1(d) for valid publication and 4 that they did not (Art. 32.4). These recommendations were approved by the Section en bloc.

The Section also approved the Nominating Committee's slate of candidates for Rapporteur-général and membership of the Permanent Nomenclature Committees for the period 2011–2017, as follows:

**Rapporteur-général for the XIX International Botanical Congress, 2017.** — N.J. Turland (U.S.A.).

**General Committee.** — D.J. Mabberley (Australia, Chair), K. Wilson (Australia, Secretary).—Ex officio members: W.L. Applequist (U.S.A., Committee for Vascular Plants), N. Klazenga (Australia, Committee for Bryophytes), L.L. Norvell (U.S.A., Committee for Fungi), W.F. Prud'homme van Reine (Netherlands, Committee for Algae), P.S. Herendeen (U.S.A., Committee on Fossils), N.J. Turland (U.S.A., Editorial Committee & Rapporteur-général), V.A. Funk (U.S.A., President of IAPT), K. Marhold (Slovakia, Secretary General of IAPT). — Other members: F.R. Barrie (U.S.A.), V. Demoulin (Belgium), L.J. Dorr (U.S.A.), H.F. Glen (South Africa), W. Greuter (Germany/Italy), D.L. Hawksworth (U.K./Spain), H.W. Lack (Germany), De-Zhu Li (China), J. McNeill (U.K.), H. Nagamasu (Japan), A.E. Orchard (Australia), G.T. Prance (U.K.), G. Yatski-evych (U.S.A.), F.O. Zuloaga (Argentina).

**Committee for Vascular Plants.** — [Chair: to be elected], W.L. Applequist (U.S.A., Secretary), R.K. Brummitt (U.K.), P. Daniel (India), G. Davidse (U.S.A.), R. Fortunato (Argentina), K. Gandhi (U.S.A.), C.E. Jarvis (U.K.), N. Kilian (Germany), R. de Mello-Silva (Brazil), H. Ohashi (Japan), G. Perry† (Australia), J. Prado (Brazil), J.P. Roux (South Africa),

† G. Perry died on 22 August 2011.

P.A. Schäfer (France), A. Sennikov (Finland), M. Thulin (Sweden), P. Vorster (South Africa), P.G. Wilson (Australia), Xian-Chun Zhang (China).

**Committee for Bryophytes.** — D.G. Long (U.K., Chair), N. Klazenga (Australia, Secretary), W.R. Buck (U.S.A.), D.P. da Costa (Brazil), D. Glennly (New Zealand), L. Hedenäs (Sweden), M.S. Ignatov (Russia), M. von Konrat (U.S.A.), N.A. Konstantinova (Russia), M.J. Price (Switzerland), J. van Rooy (South Africa), B.C. Tan (U.S.A.), J. Váňa (Czech Republic), Rui-Liang Zhu (China).

**Committee for Algae.** — P.C. Silva (U.S.A., Chair), W.F. Prud'homme van Reine (Netherlands, Secretary), S. Adl (Canada), R.A. Andersen (U.S.A.), J. Bolton (South Africa), P. Compère (Belgium), G. Furnari (Italy), L. Hoffmann (Luxembourg), R. Jahn (Germany), M. Masuda (Japan), F.F. Pedroche (Mexico), A.K.S.K. Prasad (U.S.A.), B. Santelices (Chile), K.L. Vinogradova (Russia), W.J. Woekerling (Australia).

**Committee for Fungi.** — [Chair: to be elected], L.L. Norvell (U.S.A., Secretary), J.L. Crane (U.S.A.), J. Dianese (Brazil), M. Gryzenhout (South Africa), T. Iturriaga (Venezuela), M. Kirchmair (Austria), P.M. Kirk (U.K.), R. Kirschner (Taiwan), Pei-Gui Liu (China), T.W. May (Australia), J. Melot (Iceland), A.M. Minnis (U.S.A.), S.R. Pennycook (New Zealand), C. Printzen (Germany), S.A. Redhead (Canada), S. Ryman (Sweden), D. Triebel (Germany), Yi-Jian Yao (China).

**Committee on Fossils.** — M.J. Head (Canada, Chair), P.S. Herendeen (U.S.A., Secretary), H. Anderson (South Africa), D.J. Batten (U.K.), D.J. Cantrill (Australia), C.J. Cleal (U.K.), R.A. Fensome (Canada), S. Fiest-Burkhardt (Germany), P.G. Gerrienne (Belgium), C. Jaramillo<sup>1</sup> (Panama), J. Kvaček (Czech Republic), S. McLoughlin<sup>1</sup> (Sweden), J.E. Skog (U.S.A.), M. Takahashi<sup>1</sup> (Japan), A. Traverse<sup>2</sup> (U.S.A.).

**Editorial Committee.** — J. McNeill (U.K., Chair), N.J. Turland (U.S.A., Secretary), F.R. Barrie (U.S.A.), W.R. Buck (U.S.A.), V. Demoulin (Belgium), W. Greuter (Germany/Italy), D.L. Hawksworth (U.K./Spain), P.S. Herendeen (U.S.A.), S. Knapp (U.K.), K. Marhold (Slovakia), J. Prado (Brazil), W.F. Prud'homme van Reine (Netherlands), G.E. Smith (South Africa), J.H. Wiersma (U.S.A.).

The Nomenclature Section's decisions, as detailed below, its approval of the General Committee's recommendations, and its nominations for Rapporteur-général and the Permanent Nomenclature Committees were ratified on 30 July 2011 when the XVIII International Botanical Congress adopted the following resolution at its Closing Plenary Session:

“The XVIII International Botanical Congress resolves that the decisions of its Nomenclature Section with respect to the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (now to be the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants*), as well as the appointment of officers and members of the nomenclature committees, made by that section during its meetings, 18–22 July, be accepted, noting with interest that

specified types of electronic publication are now [i.e., from the respective implementation dates] effective for nomenclatural purposes, that descriptions of new taxa may now appear in English or Latin, that, for valid publication, new names of fungi must include citation of an identifier issued by a recognized repository that will register the name, and that the *Code* will henceforth provide for a single name for all fungi and for all fossils falling under its provisions.”

Amendments to the *Code* became effective immediately upon acceptance of this resolution, not upon publication of the present report nor upon publication of the *Melbourne Code* expected in 2012. New and amended rules are retroactive to the starting-point for the relevant group of organisms (Art. 13), unless expressly limited. The following such limitations apply to the decisions made in Melbourne:

**On or after 1 January 2012:**

- Art. 30 Prop. A, as amended (electronic publication)
- New proposals relating to Art. 36 Prop. E (Latin or English description or diagnosis)

**On or after 1 January 2013:**

- Art. 33 Prop. B and Art. 37bis Prop. A (citation of identifier issued by repository for names of fungi)
- New Art. 59.1 in new proposals on fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle

**■ RESULTS OF THE PRELIMINARY MAIL VOTE AND CONGRESS ACTION ON PROPOSALS**

**Table 4.** Abbreviations: acc.amend. = accepted as amended; ed.c. = referred to the Editorial Committee; rej.auto. = rejected automatically because of an earlier decision; rej.m.v. = rejected on mail vote; sp.c. = referred to a Special Committee; \* = Rapporteurs, in their comments (see Taxon 60: 243–286, 2011), suggested a special meaning for an ed.c. vote. Results of card votes are given in the format: (yes votes : no votes, % yes votes). Superscript numbers refer to notes following the table.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
<b>General Proposals</b>							
Prop. A	87	27	4	2	120	23%	acc.amend. <sup>1</sup>
Prop. B	80	25	11	2	118	21%	acc.amend. <sup>2</sup>
Prop. C	90	7	16	7	120	6%	acc.amend. <sup>3</sup>
<b>Preamble</b>							
Prop. A	88	17	7	2	114	15%	acc.amend. <sup>4</sup>
Prop. B	76	3	34	1	114	3%	accepted
<b>Art. 1</b>							
Prop. A	63	8	7	25	103	8%	accepted <sup>5</sup>
Prop. B	44	5	26	25	100	5%	ed.c.
Prop. C	17	45	12	31	105	43%	rejected
Prop. D	12	44	18	28	102	43%	rejected
<b>Art. 6</b>							
Prop. A	110	5	9		124	4%	acc.amend. <sup>6</sup>
Prop. B	106	2	8		116	2%	accepted

<sup>1</sup> Co-opted to the Committee (Div. III. 2) since the Congress.

<sup>2</sup> A. Traverse retired from the Committee in August 2011, having been a member since 1959 and Secretary from 1969 to 1994.

Table 4. Continued.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
<b>Art. 7</b>							
Prop. A	103	5	8		116	4%	accepted
Prop. B	15	23	73		111	21%	ed.c.
Prop. C	77	29	7		113	26%	accepted
Prop. D	16	82	11	1	110	<75%	rejected <sup>7</sup>
Prop. E	65	28	17		110	25%	acc.amend. <sup>8</sup>
Prop. F	12	33	63		108	31%	ed.c.
Prop. G	80	3	29		112	3%	ed.c.
Prop. H	13	74	7	8	102	73%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
Prop. I	38	49	6	7	100	49%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
Prop. J	16	61	15	6	98	62%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
Prop. K	6	14	*86	2	108	13%	ed.c. <sup>10</sup>
Prop. L	39	40	12	8	99	40%	rejected (256:187, 57.8%)
Prop. M	46	6	58		110	5%	withdrawn <sup>11</sup>
<b>Art. 8</b>							
Prop. A	79	17	15		111	15%	accepted
Prop. B	17	44	16	23	100	44%	rejected
Prop. C	20	84	8		112	75%	rej.m.v.
<b>Rec. 8A</b>							
Prop. A	38	52	18	1	109	48%	rejected
Prop. B	8	82	14	2	106	77%	rej.m.v.
Prop. C	8	45	52		105	43%	rej.auto.
Prop. D	34	44	30		108	41%	rejected
<b>Rec. 8B</b>							
Prop. A	88		11	7	106	0%	accepted
<b>Art. 9</b>							
Prop. A	25	38	43		106	36%	rejected
Prop. B	11	30	65		106	28%	ed.c.
Prop. C	33	50	27		110	45%	rejected
Prop. D	4	33	67		104	32%	ed.c.
Prop. E	80	20	4		104	19%	rejected (222:246, 47.4%)
Prop. F	29	17	54	2	102	17%	ed.c.
Prop. G	45	29	26	1	101	29%	ed.c.
Prop. H	37	33	22	12	104	32%	accepted
Prop. I	33	54	7	5	99	55%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
Prop. J	31	48	10	7	96	50%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
Prop. K	30	42	19	6	97	43%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
Prop. L	29	41	21	4	95	43%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
Prop. M	30	42	18	7	97	43%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
Prop. N	10	38	56	3	107	36%	rej.auto.
Prop. O	93	6	7		106	6%	accepted
Prop. P	92	4	12		108	4%	accepted
Prop. Q	78	9	23		110	8%	accepted

Table 4. Continued.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
Prop. R	6	51	50		107	48%	rejected
Prop. S	6	37	*63		106	35%	ed.c.
Prop. T	49	20	37		106	19%	ed.c.
Prop. U	28	38	21	18	105	36%	rej.auto.
Prop. V	74	6	11	7	98	6%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. W	73	6	13	7	99	6%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. X	19	8	77		104	8%	ed.c.
Prop. Y	10	8	88		106	8%	ed.c.
Prop. Z	12	85	10		107	79%	rej.m.v.
Prop. AA	21	84	3		108	78%	rej.m.v.
Prop. BB	18	88	4		110	80%	rej.m.v.
Prop. CC	17	86	6		109	79%	rej.m.v.
Prop. DD	15	92	6		113	81%	rej.m.v.
Prop. EE	7	104	3		114	91%	rej.m.v.
Prop. FF	36	5	*71		112	4%	ed.c. <sup>13</sup>
Prop. GG	4	98	8		110	89%	rej.m.v.
Prop. HH	18	82	8		108	76%	rej.m.v.
Prop. II	12	15	78		105	14%	ed.c.
<b>Rec. 9A</b>							
Prop. A	86	12	13		111	11%	rejected
Prop. B	47	55	10		112	49%	rejected
Prop. C	59	49	7		115	43%	rejected
Prop. D	16	88	11		115	77%	rej.m.v.
<b>Rec. 9C (new)</b>							
Prop. A	39	46	7	10	102	45%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
<b>Art. 10</b>							
Prop. A	12	22	*72		106	21%	accepted (294:147, 66.7%) <sup>14</sup>
Prop. B	3	77	1	24	105	73%	rejected <sup>15</sup>
Prop. C	34	48	7	11	100	48%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
<b>Art. 11</b>							
Prop. A	70	8	32		110	7%	ed.c.
<b>Art. 13</b>							
Prop. A	83	16	5	3	107	15%	acc.amend. <sup>4</sup>
Prop. B	43	20	13	24	100	20%	rejected <sup>16</sup>
Prop. C	18	81	5	6	110	74%	withdrawn <sup>17</sup>
<b>Art. 14</b>							
Prop. A	79	21	7	1	108	19%	accepted
Prop. B	88	11	11		110	10%	acc.amend. <sup>18</sup>
Prop. C	74	2	15	10	101	2%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. D	63	16	26		105	15%	acc.amend. <sup>19</sup>
Prop. E	45	16	45		106	15%	accepted
Prop. F	54	34	18		106	32%	rejected
Prop. G	59	43	5		107	40%	acc.amend. (368:157, 70.1%) <sup>20</sup>

Table 4. Continued.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
Prop. H	60	35	9		104	34%	ed.c. <sup>20</sup>
Prop. I	57	34	17		108	31%	ed.c. <sup>20</sup>
<b>Art. 15</b>							
Prop. A	80	5	8	6	99	5%	accepted
Prop. B	38	23	28	8	97	24%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
Prop. C	34	40	12	12	98	41%	withdrawn <sup>9</sup>
<b>Art. 16</b>							
Prop. A	87	12	7		106	11%	acc.amend. <sup>21</sup>
Prop. B	30	4	71		105	4%	withdrawn
Prop. C	28	4	73		105	4%	ed.c.
Prop. D	36	42	24		102	41%	rejected
Prop. E	15	87	6		108	81%	rejected <sup>22</sup>
Prop. F	22	13	*72	1	108	12%	accepted
Prop. G	30	62	13		105	59%	rej.auto.
<b>Rec. 16A</b>							
Prop. A	83	17	7	4	111	15%	accepted
<b>Rec. 16B</b>							
Prop. A	47	55	8		110	50%	rej.auto.
<b>Art. 18</b>							
Prop. A	10	89	9		108	82%	rej.m.v.
Prop. B	8	9	91		108	8%	ed.c.
Prop. C	37	48	20		105	46%	rejected
Prop. D	11	75	21		107	70%	rejected
Prop. E	31	83	2		116	72%	rejected
Prop. F	30	84	2		116	72%	rej.auto.
Prop. G	31	83	3		117	71%	rej.auto.
<b>Art. 19</b>							
Prop. A	70	27	5		102	26%	accepted
Prop. B	51	28	22		101	28%	ed.c.
Prop. C	52	29	23		104	28%	ed.c.
Prop. D	38	66	3	1	108	61%	rejected
Prop. E	21	62	25		108	57%	rej.auto.
<b>Art. 20</b>							
Prop. A	8	87	17	1	113	77%	rej.m.v.
Prop. B	7	82	23	1	113	73%	rej.auto.
<b>Art. 22</b>							
Prop. A	18	89	3	1	111	80%	rej.m.v.
Prop. B	25	10	74		109	9%	ed.c.
<b>Art. 23</b>							
Prop. A	32	56	17		105	53%	rejected
Prop. B	14	16	79		109	15%	ed.c.
Prop. C	6	47	57		110	43%	withdrawn
<b>Art. 28</b>							
Prop. A	15	12	84		111	11%	ed.c.

Table 4. Continued.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
Prop. B	13	9	87		109	8%	ed.c.
Prop. C	15	8	86		109	7%	ed.c.
Prop. D	16	8	85		109	7%	ed.c.
<b>Art. 29</b>							
Prop. A	92	29			121	24%	acc.amend. <sup>23</sup>
Prop. B	77	38	3	3	121	31%	accepted
Prop. C	92	28	1		121	23%	accepted
<b>Rec. 29A</b>							
Prop. A	87	26	4		117	22%	accepted <sup>24</sup>
Prop. B	90	22	6		118	19%	acc.amend. <sup>25</sup>
<b>Art. 30</b>							
Prop. A	91	22	4		117	19%	acc.amend. <sup>26</sup>
Prop. B	92	23	3		118	19%	acc.amend. <sup>27</sup>
Prop. C	12	105	2		119	88%	rej.m.v.
<b>Rec. 30A</b>							
Prop. A	84	30	5		119	25%	accepted
Prop. B	89	20	11		120	17%	accepted
Prop. C	11	106	2		119	89%	rej.m.v.
<b>Art. 31</b>							
Prop. A	95	21	3		119	18%	accepted
Prop. B	92	23	5		120	19%	accepted <sup>28</sup>
<b>Rec. 31A</b>							
Prop. A	11	39	*66		116	34%	rejected
<b>Art. 32</b>							
Prop. A	29	64	14	1	108	59%	rejected
Prop. B	36	39	35		110	35%	rejected
Prop. C	27	69	15		111	62%	withdrawn
Prop. D	48	42	14		104	40%	accepted
Prop. E	79	16	11		106	15%	accepted
Prop. F	26	29	48		103	28%	ed.c.
Prop. G	59	27	22		108	25%	accepted
Prop. H	40	55	11		106	52%	rejected
Prop. I	23	71	10		104	68%	rejected
Prop. J	8	27	72		107	25%	ed.c.
Prop. K	6	80	22	1	109	73%	withdrawn
<b>Rec. 32Bbis (new)</b>							
Prop. A	30	74	5		109	68%	rejected
Prop. B	30	71	8		109	65%	rejected
<b>Art. 33</b>							
Prop. A	17	87	6		110	79%	rej.m.v.
Prop. B	59	23	10	7	99	23%	accepted
Prop. C	95	6	8		109	6%	accepted
Prop. D	60	6	40		106	6%	accepted
Prop. E	64		39		103	0%	ed.c.

Table 4. Continued.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
Prop. F	6	5	93		104	5%	ed.c.
Prop. G	86	5	17		108	5%	accepted
Prop. H	69	6	31		106	6%	accepted
Prop. I	14	48	43		105	46%	withdrawn
Prop. J	8	104	2		114	91%	rej.m.v.
Prop. K	8	97	3		108	90%	rej.m.v.
Prop. L	9	95	5		109	87%	rej.m.v.
Prop. M	64	7	37		108	6%	ed.c.
Prop. N	14	13	81		108	12%	ed.c.
Prop. O	95	9	4		108	8%	accepted
Prop. P	16	25	64		105	24%	ed.c.
<b>Rec. 33A</b>							
Prop. A	83	2	23		108	2%	accepted
Prop. B	12	82	14	1	109	75%	rej.m.v.
<b>Art. 34</b>							
Prop. A	4	95	9		108	88%	rej.m.v.
<b>Art. 35</b>							
Prop. A	49	50	3	2	104	48%	accepted
Prop. B	57	5	44		106	5%	accepted
<b>Art. 36</b>							
Prop. A	20	98			118	83%	rej.m.v.
Prop. B	15	87	8	4	114	76%	rej.m.v.
Prop. C	54	38	9	5	106	36%	accepted
Prop. D	52	39	9	5	105	37%	accepted
Prop. E	65	34	4	5	108	31%	accepted <sup>29</sup>
<b>Rec. 36A</b>							
Prop. A	14	95	3	1	113	84%	rej.m.v.
Prop. B	18	84	6		108	78%	rej.m.v.
Prop. C	50	42	13	1	106	40%	ed.c.
<b>Art. 37</b>							
Prop. A	15	91	2		108	84%	rej.m.v.
Prop. B	10	104	1		115	90%	rej.m.v.
Prop. C	5	105	3		113	93%	rej.m.v.
Prop. D	6	7	93		106	7%	ed.c.
Prop. E	64		42		106	0%	ed.c.
Prop. F	79	1	31		111	1%	ed.c.
<b>Rec. 37A</b>							
Prop. A	83	30	3		116	26%	acc.amend. <sup>30</sup>
Prop. B	18	97	1		116	84%	rej.m.v.
Prop. C	90	20	5		115	17%	accepted
Prop. D	93	17	5		115	15%	accepted
<b>Rec. 37B</b>							
Prop. A	8	101	1	1	111	91%	rej.m.v.

Table 4. Continued.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
<b>Art. 37bis (new)</b>							
Prop. A	60	25	7	10	102	25%	acc.amend. <sup>31</sup>
<b>Rec. 37bisA (new)</b>							
Prop. A	56	24	8	11	99	24%	acc.amend. <sup>32</sup>
Prop. B	55	24	9	11	99	24%	accepted
<b>Art. 38</b>							
Prop. A	55	5	16	19	95	5%	accepted
Prop. B	21	21	36	19	97	22%	ed.c.
Prop. C	28	33	16	20	97	34%	rej.auto.
<b>Art. 41</b>							
Prop. A	48	19	34	3	104	18%	ed.c.
Prop. B	45	17	38	4	104	16%	ed.c.
Prop. C	11	68	23		102	67%	rejected
Prop. D	3	24	42		69	35%	ed.c.
Prop. E	27	21	56		104	20%	ed.c.
Prop. F	29	37	38		104	36%	ed.c.
Prop. G	26	37	39		102	36%	ed.c.
Prop. H	7	75	22		104	72%	ed.c.
Prop. I	33	29	41		103	28%	ed.c.
<b>Art. 42</b>							
Prop. A	29	50	36		115	43%	rejected
Prop. B	42	46	27		115	40%	rej.auto.
Prop. C	35	48	30		113	42%	ed.c.
Prop. D	18	68	22		108	63%	rejected
Prop. E	12	92	6		110	84%	rej.m.v.
Prop. F	7	97	4	1	109	89%	rej.m.v.
Prop. G	34	22	47		103	21%	ed.c.
<b>Art. 43</b>							
Prop. A	7	4	96		107	4%	ed.c.
<b>Art. 44</b>							
Prop. A	9	79	16	1	105	75%	rej.m.v.
<b>Art. 45</b>							
Prop. A	45	11	47	1	104	11%	ed.c.
Prop. B	54	7	27	11	99	7%	accepted
<b>Art. 46</b>							
Prop. A	53	41	11	1	106	39%	rejected (244:227, 51.8%) <sup>33</sup>
Prop. B	42	33	28		103	32%	accepted
Prop. C	43	36	24		103	35%	ed.c.
Prop. D	39	34	28		101	34%	ed.c.
Prop. E	26	25	55		106	24%	ed.c.
Prop. F	30	45	29		104	43%	rejected
Prop. G	24	41	37		102	40%	ed.c.
Prop. H	7	14	83		104	13%	ed.c.



Table 4. Continued.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
Prop. I	59	22	23		104	21%	rejected (209:230, 47.6%)
Prop. J	42	28	34		104	27%	ed.c.
Prop. K	52	27	28		107	25%	accepted
Prop. L	19	79	6		104	76%	rej.m.v.
Prop. M	9	66	27		102	65%	rejected
Prop. N	86	7	13		106	7%	accepted
Prop. O	69	5	30		104	5%	accepted <sup>34</sup>
<b>Rec. 46D</b>							
Prop. A	71	24	14		109	22%	rejected
<b>Art. 48</b>							
Prop. A	83		26	1	110	0%	accepted
Prop. B	66	20	18		104	19%	accepted
Prop. C	2	14	89		105	13%	ed.c.
<b>Art. 49</b>							
Prop. A	7	72	27	1	107	67%	rejected
<b>Art. 51</b>							
Prop. A	11	89	6	1	107	83%	rejected <sup>35</sup>
<b>Art. 52</b>							
Prop. A	17	10	81		108	9%	ed.c.
Prop. B	16	2	90		108	2%	ed.c.
Prop. C	4	97	8		109	89%	rej.m.v.
Prop. D	12	71	26		109	65%	withdrawn <sup>36</sup>
<b>Art. 53</b>							
Prop. A	34	63	8		105	60%	withdrawn
Prop. B	16	50	40	1	107	47%	ed.c.
Prop. C	8	95	8		111	86%	rej.m.v.
Prop. D	8	92	9		109	84%	rej.m.v.
Prop. E	32	50	27		109	46%	accepted <sup>37</sup>
Prop. F	16	67	25		108	62%	rejected
Prop. G	81	16	9	1	107	15%	accepted
Prop. H	62	1	43		106	1%	accepted
<b>Art. 54</b>							
Prop. A	33	53	4	9	99	54%	withdrawn
<b>Art. 55</b>							
Prop. A	74		32		106	0%	ed.c.
<b>Art. 58</b>							
Prop. A	101	4	12		117	3%	accepted
Prop. B	11	4	*94		109	4%	ed.c.
<b>Chapter VI</b>							
Prop. A	72	7	10	4	93	8%	accepted
<b>Art. 59</b>							
Prop. A	2	77	2	3	84	92%	rej.m.v.
Prop. B	11	70	1	4	86	81%	rej.m.v.

Table 4. Continued.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
Prop. C	64	11	4	5	84	13%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. D	35	38	4	7	84	45%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. E	34	38	6	7	85	45%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. F	61	14	4	6	85	16%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. G	59	14	4	5	82	17%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. H	58	13	5	6	82	16%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. I	32	40	6	7	85	47%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. J	50	16	10	7	83	19%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. K	61	10	7	6	84	12%	withdrawn <sup>12</sup>
Prop. L	21	55	2	6	84	65%	rej.auto.
Prop. M	13	65	2	6	86	76%	rej.m.v.
Prop. N	10	66	2	6	84	79%	rej.m.v.
Prop. O	10	65	4	5	84	77%	rej.m.v.
Prop. P	11	64	4	5	84	76%	rej.m.v.
<b>Rec. 59A</b>							
Prop. A	10	69	3	3	85	81%	rej.m.v.
Prop. B	9	70	2	3	84	83%	rej.m.v.
Prop. C	13	67	2	3	85	79%	rej.m.v.
<b>Art. 60</b>							
Prop. A	37	60	13		110	55%	rejected
Prop. B	25	73	10		108	68%	rejected
Prop. C	54	33	22		109	30%	ed.c.
Prop. D	32	12	64		108	11%	ed.c.
Prop. E	69	17	16		102	17%	rejected
Prop. F	78	13	17		108	12%	ed.c.
Prop. G	57	20	33		110	18%	acc.amend. <sup>38</sup>
Prop. H	31	16	62		109	15%	ed.c.
Prop. I	36	33	35		104	32%	ed.c.
Prop. J	26	57	23		106	54%	rejected
Prop. K	15	49	41	2	107	46%	ed.c.
Prop. L	62	12	31		105	11%	ed.c.
Prop. M	66	6	35		107	6%	ed.c.
Prop. N	42	8	55		105	8%	ed.c.
<b>Rec. 60C</b>							
Prop. A	51	29	29		109	27%	withdrawn
<b>Rec. 60H</b>							
Prop. A	31	68	8		107	64%	rejected
<b>Rec. 60I (new)</b>							
Prop. A	34	52	22		108	48%	withdrawn
<b>Art. 61</b>							
Prop. A	10	54	40		104	52%	ed.c.
Prop. B	9	67	33		109	61%	rejected
<b>Art. 62</b>							
Prop. A	21	60	25		106	57%	rejected

Table 4. Continued.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
<b>Div. III</b>							
Prop. A	77	6	5	11	99	6%	accepted
Prop. B	93	14	2		109	13%	sp.c. <sup>39</sup>
Prop. C	81	28	1		110	25%	sp.c. <sup>39</sup>
Prop. D	18	85	2	1	106	80%	rej.m.v.
Prop. E	35	54	12	4	105	51%	sp.c. <sup>39</sup>
Prop. F	57	36	6	5	104	35%	sp.c. <sup>40</sup>
Prop. G	27	64	3	6	100	64%	sp.c. <sup>40</sup>
Prop. H	28	61	3	7	99	62%	sp.c. <sup>40</sup>
<b>Art. H.1</b>							
Prop. A	20	73	7	2	102	72%	withdrawn <sup>17</sup>
<b>Art. H.2</b>							
Prop. A	19	72	8	1	100	72%	withdrawn <sup>17</sup>
<b>Art. H.6</b>							
Prop. A	18	69	11	2	100	69%	withdrawn <sup>17</sup>
<b>App. III</b>							
Prop. A	45	7	53		105	7%	ed.c.
Prop. B	54	6	43		103	6%	accepted
Prop. C	52	5	46		103	5%	accepted
Prop. D	30	18	57		105	17%	accepted
Prop. E	31	18	56		105	17%	accepted
<b>App. IV</b>							
Prop. A	52	2	45		99	2%	accepted
<b>App. VII (Glossary)</b>							
Prop. A	10	12	87		109	11%	ed.c.
Prop. B	17	5	88		110	5%	ed.c.
Prop. C	7	17	87		111	15%	ed.c.
Prop. D	13	1	94		108	1%	ed.c.
Prop. E	6	14	89		109	13%	ed.c.
Prop. F	11	10	89		110	9%	ed.c.
Prop. G	5	16	89		110	15%	ed.c.
Prop. H	14		95		109	0%	ed.c.
Prop. I	8	12	89		109	11%	ed.c.
Prop. J	20		89		109	0%	ed.c.
Prop. K	10	10	89		109	9%	ed.c.
Prop. L	8	11	91		110	10%	ed.c.
Prop. M	6	13	91		110	12%	ed.c.
Prop. N	11	9	89		109	8%	ed.c.
Prop. O	20		88		108	0%	ed.c.
Prop. P	12	9	87		108	8%	ed.c.
Prop. Q	7	9	93		109	8%	ed.c.
Prop. R	7	11	91		109	10%	ed.c.
Prop. S	12	1	96		109	1%	ed.c.
Prop. T	7	1	101		109	1%	ed.c.

Table 4. Continued.

	yes	no	ed.c.	sp.c.	total	% no	Congress action
Prop. U	10	10	89		109	9%	ed.c.
Prop. V	7	11	91		109	10%	ed.c.
Prop. W	8	12	88		108	11%	ed.c.
Prop. X	7	6	97		110	5%	ed.c.
Prop. Y	9	11	88		108	10%	ed.c.
Prop. Z	9	10	90		109	9%	ed.c.
Prop. AA	16	37	50		103	36%	ed.c.
Prop. BB	13	32	55		100	32%	ed.c.

## Notes on congress action

1. General Prop. A was amended to reflect the desirability of recognizing phycology as well as mycology in the title and the other specified places in the *Code*. A new proposal was, however, accepted later in the proceedings, by which the title would change from *International Code of Botanical, Mycological, and Phycological Nomenclature* to *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants* (see New Proposals Accepted).
2. General Prop. B was amended so that it required the Editorial Committee to replace “plant(s)” as appropriate by “organism(s)” rather than by “and fungus/fungi”.
3. General Prop. C was amended so that the words “fossil plants” are changed to “plant, fungal or algal fossils”.
4. Preamble Prop. A was amended by deleting the word “phylum” before “*Microsporidia*” and Art. 13 Prop. A was amended to read “Names of *Microsporidia* are governed ...”.
5. Art. 1 Prop. A was accepted on the understanding that fossil-taxa exclude diatoms, and that this would be made clear by the Editorial Committee.
6. Art. 6 Prop. A was amended on a card vote (325 : 169, 65.8%) to adopt “replacement name” and “new status” rather than “nomen novum” and “status novus” as the preferred terms in Art. 6.10 and 6.11, respectively, and correspondingly elsewhere. It was later pointed out by the Rapporteurs that “new status” required editorial correction to “name with a new status” or “name at a new rank”, and that this would be dealt with by the Editorial Committee as part of its mandate to restructure and reword Chapter IV Section 2 (see New Proposals Accepted).
7. Art. 7 Prop. D received only 74.5% “no” votes in the preliminary mail vote. This was noted; it was discussed and then rejected on a show of hands.
8. Art. 7 Prop. E was amended by inserting “of a new taxon” after “A name” at the beginning.
9. Art. 7 Prop. H–J, Art. 9 Prop. I–M, Rec. 9C Prop. A, Art. 10 Prop. C, and Art. 15 Prop. B and C were withdrawn by the proposers in favour of a new set of proposals on the typification of sanctioned names that was accepted by the Section (see New Proposals Accepted).
10. Art. 7 Prop. K was referred to the Editorial Committee as

- recommended by the Rapporteurs to implement the intent by inserting “(See also Art. 7.11)” at the end of Art. 9.21.
11. Art. 7 Prop. M was withdrawn by the proposer in light of acceptance of the amendment to Art. 6 Prop. A.
  12. Art. 9 Prop. V and W, Art. 14 Prop. C, and Art. 59 Prop. C–K were withdrawn by the proposer in light of acceptance of new proposals on Art. 59 abolishing dual nomenclature for fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle.
  13. Art. 9 Prop. FF was referred to the Editorial Committee to implement the Rapporteurs’ suggestion that the definitions proposed be incorporated in a Recommendation.
  14. Art. 10 Prop. A: the suggestion of the Rapporteurs that the whole of Art. 10.5(a) might be deleted was proposed as an amendment and was defeated, prior to acceptance of the original proposal on a card vote.
  15. Art. 10 Prop. B was rejected, but the Section accepted the Rapporteurs’ suggestion that a Special Committee be established to develop a list of works that are deemed to have followed the *American Code* (Arthur & al. in *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club* 31: 249–290. 1904; 34: 167–178. 1907), in which the method of type selection is “considered to be largely mechanical” (the Special Committee on Publications Using a Largely Mechanical Method of Selection of Types).
  16. Art. 13 Prop. B was later referred to the Special Committee on Harmonization of Nomenclature of *Cyanophyta/Cyanobacteria* re-established later in the proceedings to report to the XIX IBC.
  17. Art. 13 Prop. C, Art. H.1 Prop. A, Art. H.2 Prop. A, and Art. H.6 Prop. A, were withdrawn by the proposers on account of the negative mail vote.
  18. Art. 14 Prop. B was accepted with the words “except in the case of correctable errors” appended.
  19. Art. 14 Prop. D was accepted with “authors together with the places and dates of publication” reduced to “places of publication” and the additional words “, except under the provisions of Art. 14.12, including names that otherwise would not be validly published” appended.
  20. Art. 14 Prop. G, prior to its acceptance on a card vote, was amended to read “The Editorial Committee has the option to produce the Appendices to the *Code* in electronic form only.” Art. 14 Prop. H and I were then referred to the Editorial Committee for implementation in light of the amended version of Prop. G that had been accepted.
  21. Art. 16 Prop. A was accepted as substantially amended so that the first portion of the second sentence of Art. 16.1 will read: “Such names may be either (a) automatically typified names, formed from the genitive singular of a name of an included genus by replacing the genitive singular inflection (Latin *-ae*, *-i*, *-us*, *-is*; transliterated Greek *-ou*, *-os*, *-es*, *-as*, or *-ous*, and its equivalent *-eos*) with the appropriate termination;”.
  22. Art. 16 Prop. E was reintroduced for discussion and then rejected.
  23. Art. 29 Prop. A was amended by the addition after “Portable Document Format” of the words “or a successor international standard format communicated by the General Committee”.
  24. Rec. 29A Prop. A: “PDF/A archival standard (ISO 19005–1:2005)” was amended by deletion of “–1:2005” which was noted by the proposer as being unnecessary.
  25. Rec. 29A Prop. B was amended so that the first clause reads: “Authors should preferably publish in publications that are archived, ...” and clause (a) changed to: “(a) The material should be placed in multiple trusted online digital repositories, e.g. an ISO-certified repository;” and an additional clause inserted: “(c) Deposition of printed copies in libraries in more than one area of the world and preferably on different continents is also advisable.”
  26. Art. 30 Prop. A was amended by the replacement of “1 January 2013” with “1 January 2012”.
  27. Art. 30 Prop. B was amended by the addition of the words “associated with or within the publication” after “evidence”.
  28. A new proposal to add a new rule to Art. 31 was made from the floor: “In the event that electronic and printed versions published on the same date differ in either content or pagination, the electronic version has precedence.” After discussion, this was rejected on a card vote (257 : 250, 50.7%).
  29. Art. 36 Prop. E was later extended to cover all organisms treated under the *Code*, and the starting date brought forward to 1 January 2012 (see New Proposals Accepted).
  30. Rec. 37A Prop. A was amended so that the new paragraph would begin: “A number permanently identifying the specimen, if available, of the holotype ...”
  31. Art. 37bis Prop. A was amended by editorial clarification of the wording of Art. 37bis.1, and by appending to Art. 37bis.2 the clause “, when accessioned and published information for an identifier differ the published information shall be considered definitive”, and by the deletion of the asterisked footnote in Art. 37bis.3.
  32. Rec. 37bisA Prop. A was amended by the replacement of “(a) deposit minimal elements of information ...” by “(a) deposit the required elements of information ...”
  33. Art. 46 Prop. A was amended to form a Recommendation: “Author citations should not be used after names of taxa above the rank of family.” The proposal so amended was rejected on a card vote.
  34. Art. 46 Prop. O: it was specifically requested that the Editorial Committee amend the wording of the new Note to make it more understandable.
  35. Art. 51 Prop. A received a 83% “No” vote in the preliminary mail vote but was reintroduced for discussion at the request of more than five members. It was thereafter rejected overwhelmingly on a show of hands. A number of members of the Section then proposed that the other published proposal relating to *Acacia* (Turland in *Taxon* 60: 913–914. 2011) be considered. After discussion, in which “*Protoacacia*” was replaced by “*Acanthacacia*” as a friendly amendment, the proposal was rejected on a card vote (169 : 396, 29.9%).
  36. Art. 52 Prop. D was withdrawn on the understanding that the Editorial Committee would consider the Example included in it.
  37. Art. 53 Prop. E was accepted subject to the Editorial Committee considering whether the various adjectival forms

with the stems “*tibet...*” and “*thibet...*” need be included in the *Code*.

38. Art. 60 Prop. G was accepted with the addition at the end of the sentence “Abbreviated names and epithets are to be expanded in conformity with botanical tradition.”
39. Div. III Prop. B, C, and E were referred to a new Special Committee on by-laws for the Nomenclature Section.
40. Div. III Prop. F–H were withdrawn by the proposers on the understanding that they would be considered by a new Subcommittee on Governance of the *Code* with Respect to Fungi, to operate within the Special Committee on By-laws for the Nomenclature Section.

## ■ NEW PROPOSALS ACCEPTED

In addition to the previously published proposals, the following proposals made during the sessions of the Nomenclature Section in Melbourne were accepted by the Congress or, where so indicated, were referred to the Editorial Committee. These include two substantial sets of proposals, one dealing with typification of names of fungi sanctioned under the provisions of Art. 13 and 15, and the other, including a modification to it, dealing with names of fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle. These appear first in the enumeration below:

### Typification of sanctioned names

The following set of new proposals on the typification of sanctioned names was accepted (new wording in **bold**):

#### Reword Art. 7.8 and position as Art. 8.1bis:

“**8.1bis. The type of a name of a species or infraspecific taxon** adopted in one of the works specified in Art. 13.1(d), and thereby sanctioned (Art. 15), may be **selected from among the elements** associated with the name in **the protologue and/or the sanctioning treatment.**”

#### Add a sentence at the end of Art. 9.2:

“9.2. A lectotype is .... **For sanctioned names, a lectotype may be selected from among elements associated with either or both the protologue and the sanctioning treatment.**”

#### Amend Art. 10.2:

“10.2. If in the protologue of the name of a genus or of any subdivision of a genus the holotype or lectotype of one or more previously or simultaneously published species name(s) is definitely included (see Art. 10.3), the type must be chosen (Art. 7.10 and 7.11) from among these types unless: **a)** the type was indicated (Art. 22.6, 22.7, 37.1 and 37.3) or designated by the author of the name; **b) the name was sanctioned, in which case the type may also be chosen from among the types of species names included in the sanctioning treatment.** If no type of a previously or simultaneously published species name was definitely included, a type must be otherwise chosen, but the choice is to be superseded if it can be demonstrated that the selected type is not conspecific with any of the material

associated with the protologue **or associated with a name in a sanctioning treatment.**”

#### Amend Art. 10.5:

“10.5. The author who first designates a type of a name of a genus or subdivision of a genus must be followed, but the choice may be superseded if (a) it can be shown that it is in serious conflict with the protologue (**or, for a sanctioned name, typified under Art. 8.1bis, with the sanctioning treatment**) and another element is available which is not in conflict with the protologue, or (b) that it was based on a largely mechanical method of selection.” [The struck-out text was deleted by the acceptance of Art. 10 Prop. A.]

#### Add a new Article 48.1bis:

“**48.1bis. Where a sanctioning author accepted an earlier name but did not include, even implicitly, any element associated with its protologue, or when the protologue did not include the subsequently designated type of the sanctioned name, the sanctioning author is considered to have created a later homonym, treated as conserved under Art. 15.1.**”

### Fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle

The following set of proposals relating to fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle was accepted (with editorial amendments approved by the proposers incorporated here):

#### Replace the entire Article 59 with:

“59.1. On and after 1 January 2013, all names of fungi, including fungi with mitotic asexual morphs (anamorphs) as well as a meiotic sexual morph (teleomorph), must conform to all the provisions of this *Code* that are not restricted in application to other groups of organisms or from which names of fungi are not specifically excluded.

“*Note 1.* Previous editions of this *Code* provided for separate names for so called “form-taxa”, asexual forms (anamorphs) of certain pleomorphic fungi, and restricted the names applicable to the whole fungus to those typified by a teleomorph. All legitimate fungal names are now treated equally for the purposes of establishing priority, regardless of the life history stage of the type.

“59.2. Names published prior to 1 January 2013 for the same taxon of non lichenized *Ascomycota* and *Basidiomycota* with the intent or implied intent of applying to, or being typified by separate morphs (e.g., anamorph, synanamorph or teleomorph) are not considered to be alternative names under Art. 34.2; nor are they to be treated as nomenclaturally superfluous under Art. 52.1. If they are otherwise legitimate, they compete in providing the correct name for the taxon under Art. 11.3 and 11.4.”

**Modify Art. 34.2:** At the end of the first sentence add “(but see Art. 59.2)”.

**Modify Art. 52.1:** After mention of Art. 52.3 add “and 59.2”.

**Corollaries:**

Modify Art. 1.3 by deleting the phrase, “As in the case of form-taxa for asexual forms (anamorphs) of certain pleomorphic fungi (Art. 59).”

Modify Art. 7.4 by deleting reference to Art. 59.6.

Modify Art. 7.9 by removing reference to Art. 59 and removing Note 1.

Modify Art. 9.7 by removing, “(but see also Art. 59.7)”.

Modify Art. 11.1 by removing “form-taxa of fungi and” reference to Art. 59.4 and 59.5.

Modify Art. 11.3 by removing reference to Art. 59.

Modify Art. 51.1 by deleting the phrase “, or (in pleomorphic fungi with names governed by Art. 59) because the morph represented by its type is not in accordance with that of the type of the generic name.”

**Add to Article 14 (new):**

“14.n. For organisms treated as fungi under this *Code*, lists of names may be submitted to the General Committee, which will refer them to the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi for examination by subcommittees established by that Committee in consultation with the General Committee and appropriate international bodies. Accepted names on these lists, which become permanent as Appendices XX–YY once reviewed by the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi and the General Committee, are to be listed with their types together with those competing synonyms (including sanctioned names) against which they are treated as conserved. For lists of rejected names see Art. 56.n.”

**Add to Art. 56 (new)** [specifically referred to the Editorial Committee for wording and placement]:

“56.n. For organisms treated as fungi under this *Code*, lists of rejected names may also be included in the Appendices established under Art. 14.n. Such names are to be treated as though rejected outright under Art. 56.1 and may become eligible for use only by conservation under Art. 14.”

**Add a new paragraph to Art. 57:**

57.2. In pleomorphic fungi, in cases where, prior to 1 January 2013, both teleomorph-typified and anamorph-typified names were widely used for a taxon, an anamorph-typified name that has priority must not be taken up until retention of the teleomorph-typified name has been considered by the General Committee and rejected.

**Lichenized fungi**

Subsequent to acceptance of the proposals on fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle, the following modifying proposal was accepted:

“14.n[bis]. Lichenized fungi, and those fungi traditionally associated with them taxonomically (e.g. *Mycocaliciaceae*, but not lichenicolous fungi), are exempt from the newly accepted provisions in Art. 14.n, 56.n, and 57.2.”

**Other new proposals**

Amend **the title of the *Code*** to become “*The International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants*”. This reflected the view of the Section that the revised title of the *Code* had become unduly cumbersome after the acceptance of the amended General Prop. A.

Amend **Art. 6.4** second sentence, **18.3**, and **19.5** to read (deleted text ~~struck-out~~; new text in **bold**):

“6.4. ... A name which according to this *Code* was illegitimate when published cannot become legitimate later unless it (**or, in the case of names of families or subdivisions of families, the name on which it is based**) is conserved or sanctioned.”

“18.3. A name of a family based on an illegitimate generic name is illegitimate unless it **or the generic name upon which it is based** is conserved.”

“19.5. A name of a subdivision of a family based on an illegitimate generic name ~~that is not the base of a conserved family name~~ is illegitimate **unless the generic name upon which it is based is conserved or is the base of a conserved family name**.”

Add the words in bold to **Art. 8.4** (accepted after a card vote: 290 : 145, 66.7%):

“8.4. Type specimens of names of taxa must be preserved permanently and may not be living plants or cultures. However, cultures of fungi and algae, if preserved in a metabolically inactive state (e.g. by lyophilization or deepfreezing to **remain alive in that inactive state**), are acceptable as types.”

Delete from **Art. 11.8** reference to “subfossils”, and also delete from the Glossary.

Establish an Appendix to list binding decisions made under **Art. 32.4** on valid publication of names.

Give the Editorial Committee a mandate to restructure and reword **Chapter IV Section 2** (Art. 32–45, Conditions and Dates of Valid Publication of Names) to make it more coherent but without changing the meaning except where expressly agreed by this Nomenclature Section.

Extend **Art. 36 Prop. E**, as accepted by the Section, to include all organisms covered by the *Code*; i.e., in order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon of any organism covered by the *Code*, published on or after 1 January 2013, must be accompanied by an English or Latin description or diagnosis.

Bring forward the starting date in the above new proposal on **Art. 36** from 1 January 2013 to 1 January 2012.

Convert **Art. 46 Note 4** into a rule, appropriately worded.

Replace “is permissible” in the third sentence of **Art. 60.6** with “is an optional phonetic device that is not considered to alter the spelling and is thus permissible.”

In **Art. 62 \*Ex. 1** replace “*Eucalyptus* L’Hér., which lacks a botanical tradition” with “*Eucalyptus* L’Hér., which has a botanical tradition, even if limited in time”. This was referred to the Editorial Committee.

Change the name of the Permanent Nomenclature Committee for Fossil Plants (**Div. III. 2**) to the Permanent Nomenclature Committee on Fossils.

As noted above, proposals were accepted to establish five **Special Committees** to report to the Nomenclature Section of the XIX International Botanical Congress (to be held in Shenzhen, China, in July 2017). These are on (1) publications using a largely mechanical method of selection of types (Art. 10.5) (especially under the *American Code*), (2) by-laws for the Nomenclature Section (with a Subcommittee on governance of the *Code* with respect to fungi), (3) institutional votes, (4) registration of algal and plant names (including fossils) and (5) harmonization of nomenclature of *Cyanophyta/Cyanobacteria*.

## ■ ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to: Alessandra Ricciuti Lamonea (former Managing Secretary, IAPT Central Office, Vienna) for handling the preliminary mail vote, for notification and distribution of institutional

votes, and for providing the relevant statistics on both; Daphne Dass (University of Vienna) for helping with the count and cross-checking of the mail vote; the tellers (Bronwyn Collins, CANB; Christina Flann, WAG; Maria de Lourdes Rico Arce, K; and Nadia Talent, TRT); and those, all from the University of Melbourne unless otherwise noted, without whom the meeting could not have taken place: Erin Batty, Michael Bayly, Gillian Brown, Meredith Cosgrove (CANB/ABRS), Karen Muscat, Daniel Ohlsen, Frank Udovicic, and Annabel Wheeler (CANB/ABRS) who assisted with microphones and voting; Michael Bayly, who made the electronic record of proceedings; Rose Barrett, Stephane Conway, Trisha Downing, Emma Lewis, and David Meagher for their help with the registration desk and the book displays, Andrew Drinnan who organized the electronic recording and Erin Batty who assisted the local organizer, Prof. Pauline Ladiges, but above all to the last-named for her outstanding work in organizing and being personally involved in all the multitude of detail that made the hosting of the Nomenclature Section meetings in the University of Melbourne such a great success.

JMcN’s and NJT’s attendance at the Nomenclature Section of the XVIII IBC in Melbourne was supported in part by the International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT).

Thanks are also due to David L. Hawksworth (London, U.K./Madrid, Spain), Scott Redhead (Ottawa, Canada), and Paul van Rijckevorsel (Utrecht, Netherlands) for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this report.