

Report of the Nomenclature Committee for Algae: 16 – On proposals to amend the *Code*

Willem F. Prud'homme van Reine

Naturalis Biodiversity Center, P.O. Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands; Willem.Prudhommevanreine@naturalis.nl

DOI <https://doi.org/10.12705/661.18>

Summary The Committee reviewed 12 published proposals to amend the *Code* at the XIX IBC in July 2017 that related particularly to algae and expressed its support for four and its opposition to the other eight.

The Nomenclature Committee for Algae was requested by Nicholas Turland, Rapporteur-général, Nomenclature Section, XIX International Botanical Congress 2017 to provide opinions on the following 12 proposals published in *Taxon* and pertaining directly to the algae in order to provide guidance to the rapporteurs in their preparation of the Synopsis of Proposals for the 2017 revision of the *Code*.

Outcomes of Committee deliberations are summarized below as well as the results of the ballot we had on the proposals. One member asked permission to abstain; thus 12 votes have been received. Votes are recorded in the order yes (recommended) – no (not recommended) – abstentions.

(049) Vote: 11–1–1, **recommended**. This proposal is to amend Art. 16.3, on automatically typified names for algae so that the endings for the name of a division or phylum would end in “-*phyta*” and not, as at present, “-*phycota*” and similarly a subdivision or subphylum in “-*phytina*”, not “-*phycotina*”. The proposal does not apply to descriptive names. Most names in common use with endings “-*phyta*” and “-*phytina*” as well as those ending with “-*phyceae*” and “-*phycidae*” are descriptive names, however. Therefore this proposal may be unnecessary. Is there any practical advantage in requiring automatically typified names (see Art. 16.1) of algal groups to have particular terminations and then allow descriptive names (also see Art. 16.1) to have other sorts of terminations? It would make more sense if there were consistency in terminations for all names of algal phyla/divisions and subphyla/subdivisions. However, there is no proposal to change Art. 16.1 in this regard. The results of such a change have anyway first to be discussed and considered by the wider community and thus such a change cannot be the result of a proposal from the floor at the Nomenclature Section.

Maintaining *-phycota* and *-phycotina* as the mandatory endings for all names of algal phyla and subphyla would give more emphasis to treating “algae” separate from “fungi” and from “plants”, which was preferred by a minority of our members, although the term “mandatory” was not liked by them. Nevertheless, almost all NCA members choose to recommend Proposal (049) that, instead, requires the same mandatory endings as for plant groups, although some considered it, nevertheless, not to be complete because it does not cover the descriptive names.

The proposal makes clear that there is no consensus as to what “plants” and “protists” and “algae” are (or even about the nomenclatural boundaries of the Kingdom *Fungi*). One NCA member stated that: “All plants are algae, but not all algae are plants.” There are no definitions of these terms in the Glossary of the *Code*. In the debate on these boundaries we also discussed the *Saprolegniaceae*, which are also known as “water fungi”; but these do not belong to the monophyletic *Fungi* (“real fungi”). They belong to the *Stramopila* and are

now often listed as “*Pseudofungi*”. Which Permanent Nomenclature Committee would consider proposals on members of that group?

(082) Vote: 1–11–1 and **(083)** Vote: 0–12–1. These proposals concern the problems of ambi-regnal nomenclature and cross-*Code* illegitimacy. Proposal (082) would make a name published on or after 1 January 2019 for an alga or fungus illegitimate if it were a later homonym of a bacterial or protozoan name, while Proposal (083) is a logical corollary rewording of Rec. 54A.1. Both are **not recommended**. The more comprehensive proposals on this topic are Proposals (360) and (361) by the same author (see below), although there is a different implementation time. If these proposals, (360) and (361), were adopted, the proposals (082) and (083) would be substantially redundant.

(230), **(231)**, **(232)**, and **(233)** Each with the vote 2–10–1 (**not recommended**). This is a set of proposals to explicitly exclude from the *ICN* four groups of protozoans that potentially may cause confusion, although they will bring *ICN* in line with modern practice. The proposals do not contain references or evidence to support reasons to exclude these groups. The proposals regulate taxonomy rather than nomenclature.

(280) and **(281)** Both voted 1–11–1, (**not recommended**). These proposals are an attempt (with associated examples) to define “treatment as algae, fungi, or plants”. The Committee considered that these proposals would only cause confusion if incorporated into the *ICN*.

In relation to Proposal (280), the proposed addition to Art. 54.1 (c) does not include explanations of what a “simple statement on affinities” is, what an “explicit statement on the treatment” is or what “associated nomenclatural proposals” are, and thus would only cause confusion if incorporated into the *Code*.

There also are problems with the two examples that form Proposal (281). In relation to Ex. 1, the purpose of the *Index nominum genericorum* is to record generic names of plants (including algae and fungi), not to provide explicit statements on treatment or on associated nomenclatural proposals. A reader cannot tell from Proposal (281) if *Micromonas* Borrel (1902) is validly published and thus whether there is an issue of homonymy with the later Manton & Parke name.

In relation to Ex. 2, the Nozaki & al. 2003 paper explicitly includes (p. 495) a statement for a revised concept of Plantae (i.e., the Division Plantae) with an explicit reference to Fig. 5 in which the names “*Kinetoplastida*”, “*Heterolobosea*”, “*Apicomplexa*”, and “*Ciliophora*” appear as members. Whatever the good intentions of Nozaki & al. were, their published actions are what have to be considered, and these actions unequivocally included “*Kinetoplastida*”, “*Heterolobosea*”, “*Apicomplexa*”, and “*Ciliophora*” in the Plantae.

(360) and **(361)** Both voted 11–1–1, **recommended**. These proposals are about homonymy between different *Codes*. It is proposed that a name published on or after 1 January 2025 for any organism covered under this *Code* is illegitimate if it is a later homonym of a name available under either the prokaryote *Code* or the zoological *Code*. Several NCA members suggested an earlier date than 1 January 2025, viz. 1 January 2019, as is proposed in Proposal (375) for cultures preserved in a metabolically inactive state: there is, according to these members, no need for a six-year delay. Only one member, however, voted against the two Proposals (360) and (375).

(375) Vote 10–1–2, **recommended**. This proposal is about the name of a new species published on or after 1 January 2019 of which the type is a culture and would require for valid publication that the protologue include a statement that the culture is preserved (and where) in a metabolically inactive state. There is currently no means of knowing with certainty whether or not a culture included in the type citation of a new fungal or algal species has in fact been preserved in a metabolically inactive state.