

to define proper ethical practice in nomenclatural research and to establish procedures of conduct in situations when a threat to scientific integrity could occur. Based on the above comments, we are proposing the following addition to the *Shenzhen Code*.

**(192) Add a new Chapter E in Division II:**

“1. Authors proposing new names should observe the following principles, which together constitute a Code of Ethics.

2. An author should not publish a new name if he or she has reason to believe that another person has already recognized the same taxon and intends to establish a name for it (or that the taxon is to be named in a posthumous work). An author in such a position should communicate with the other person (or their representatives) and only feel free to establish a new name if that person has failed to do so in a reasonable period (not less than a year).

3. An author should not publish a new replacement name (nomen novum) or other substitute name for a junior homonym when

the author of the latter is alive; that author should be informed of the homonymy and be allowed a reasonable time (at least a year) in which to establish a substitute name.

4. No author should propose a name that, to his or her knowledge or reasonable belief, would be likely to give offence on any grounds.

5. Intemperate language should not be used in any discussion or writing which involves nomenclature, and all debates should be conducted in a courteous and friendly manner.

6. Editors and others responsible for the publication of scientific papers should avoid publishing any material which appears to them to contain a breach of the above principles.

7. The observation of these principles is a matter for the proper feelings and conscience of individual scientists, and none of the Permanent Nomenclature Committees (Div. III Prov. 7.1) is empowered to investigate or rule upon alleged breaches of them.”

## (193) Proposal to democratize aspects of the governance of the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants*

Gideon F. Smith,<sup>1</sup> Estrela Figueiredo,<sup>1</sup> Gerry Moore,<sup>2</sup> Leslie R. Landrum,<sup>3</sup> Roy E. Gereau,<sup>4</sup> Jefferson Prado,<sup>5</sup> Sebsebe Demissew,<sup>6</sup> Wendy Applequist,<sup>4</sup> Alejandro Quintanar,<sup>7</sup> Renée Fortunato,<sup>8</sup> Alina Freire-Fierro,<sup>9,10</sup> Jun Wen<sup>11</sup> & Yun-Fei Deng<sup>12</sup>

1 *Ria Olivier Herbarium, Department of Botany, Nelson Mandela University, P.O. Box 77000, Gqeberha, 6031 South Africa*

2 *National Plant Data Team, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 2901 East Gate City Blvd., Greensboro, North Carolina, U.S.A.*

3 *Natural History Collections, School of Life Sciences, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-4108, U.S.A.*

4 *Missouri Botanical Garden, 4344 Shaw Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63110-2291, U.S.A.*

5 *Instituto de Pesquisas Ambientais (IPA), Herbário SP, Av. Miguel Estéfano, 3687, 04301-012, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil*

6 *National Herbarium, Department of Plant Biology and Biodiversity Management, College of Natural Sciences, Addis Ababa University, P.O. Box 3434, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia*

7 *Herbarium MA, Unidad de Herbarios, Real Jardín Botánico de Madrid CSIC, 28014 Madrid, Spain*

8 *Instituto de Botánica Darwinion (CONICET/ANCEFYN), Labardén 200, Casilla de Correo 22, B1642HYD San Isidro, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

9 *CAS President's International Fellowship Initiative, South China Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No.723, Xingke Road, Tianhe District, Guangzhou, 510650, China*

10 *Universidad Regional Amazónica Ikiam, Via a Muyuna km 7, Tena, Ecuador*

11 *Department of Botany, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20013-7012, U.S.A.*

12 *Key Laboratory of Plant Resources Conservation and Sustainable Utilization, South China Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No.723, Xingke Road, Tianhe District, Guangzhou, 510650, China*

Address for correspondence: Gideon F. Smith, [smithgideon1@gmail.com](mailto:smithgideon1@gmail.com)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12855>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

The *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Code)* specifies that the approval of the General Committee (GC) of certain proposals (for conservation or rejection of a name or for suppression of a publication) is “subject to the decision of a later International Botanical Congress” (Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159: Art. 14.15, 34.2, 56.3; see also Art. 38.4, 53.4. 2018). The governance mechanisms included in Division III of the *Code*

were discussed by the Special Committee on By-laws for the Nomenclature Section (By-laws Committee) in the years prior to the Nomenclature Section (NS) held in July 2017 at the XIX International Botanical Congress (IBC) in Shenzhen, China. The By-laws Committee's discussions culminated in a proposal and report (Knapp & al. in *Taxon* 65: 661–664, 665–669. 2016) that substantially revised the governance of the *Code*.

One of the most contentious issues discussed by the By-laws Committee was at what level the NS would accept the recommendations of the GC. The By-laws Committee was deeply divided, with nine members supporting a supermajority (60%) to *accept* a GC recommendation and eight supporting a supermajority (60%) to *reject* a GC recommendation, and finally settled on a *simple majority* (more than 50%) to accept as a reasonable compromise. In addition, Knapp & al. (l.c.) proposed that: (1) when a report of the GC contains more than one recommendation, the NS may vote separately on an individual recommendation; (2) when a vote to approve a singled-out GC recommendation does not achieve the proposed *simple majority*, that GC recommendation is cancelled, and the matter is referred back to the GC. Thus, every recommendation of the specialist committees (Div. III Prov. 7.1) and the GC and every decision of the NS would require at least a *simple majority* in favour, and would be a democratic process.

The proposal to amend the *Code* by Knapp & al. (l.c.) was accepted by the NS with various amendments (Lindon & al. in *Phyto-Keys* 150: 213–228. 2020) and ratified the following week by the closing plenary session of the IBC (Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159: x. 2018). One change that produced a less democratic outcome than was originally proposed is: a 60% majority of the NS is required to *reject* a portion or portions of the report of the GC, thus allowing the recommendation of the GC to stand even when a clear majority (50.1% to 59.9%) of the NS has voted against it.

We here propose that democracy be established by enabling a NS to approve a GC report, in total, or as (a) singled out provision(s), with a *simple majority*. This will help to foster confidence in the integrity of nomenclatural governance.

**(193) Amend Div. III Prov. 5 by rewording the current Prov. 5.1, 5.2, and 5.4 as follows (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough):**

“5.1. A qualified majority (at least 60%) of votes cast is required for the following decisions:

~~(e) rejecting a singled-out recommendation of the General Committee (see Prov. 5.3);~~

~~(f) rejecting one or more recommendations of the General Committee on conservation, protection, or rejection of names, suppression of works, or binding decisions.”~~

“5.2. A simple majority (more than 50%) of votes cast is required for all other decisions, including the following:

~~(g) accepting recommendations of the General Committee not included in Prov. 5.1(e) or (f);”~~

“5.4. When a vote to ~~reject~~ **accept** a General Committee recommendation ~~achieves~~ **does not achieve** the required majority (Prov. ~~5.1(e) or (f)~~ **5.2(g)**), that recommendation is cancelled and the matter is referred back to the General Committee. Retention or rejection of a name or suppression of a work is no longer authorized (Art. 14.15, 56.3, and 34.2).”

## (194) Proposal to readdress the issue of whether or not the types of basionyms or replaced synonyms of conserved names with conserved types are themselves conserved

John H. Wiersema

Department of Botany, NMNH - MRC 166, Smithsonian Institution, P.O. Box 37012, Washington, D.C., 20013-7012, U.S.A.

Address for correspondence: John H. Wiersema, [wiersemaj@si.edu](mailto:wiersemaj@si.edu)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12856>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

Prior to the 2011 Melbourne Congress, the late esteemed nomenclaturalist Gillian Perry (in *Taxon* 59: 1915–1916. 2010) discovered a previously overlooked issue threatening the perceived homotypy of some 30 names with conserved types and their basionyms then listed in Appendices III and IV of the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006). At that time, it may have simply been assumed that the basionym of a conserved name was automatically homotypic with the conserved name. But for this to remain true when the conserved name was explicitly conserved with a conserved type, the basionym would have to be explicitly conserved similarly. Because 28 of the 30 cases Perry (l.c.) mentioned involved basionyms that applied to subdivisions of genera (App. III) or infraspecific taxa (App. IV), which lacked any provision for their conservation under the *Vienna Code*, she submitted Proposal 243 to remedy this situation, which upon its approval in Melbourne gave rise to most

of the final sentence of current Art. 14.1 (“The name of a subdivision of a genus or of an infraspecific taxon may be conserved with a conserved type and listed in App. III and IV, respectively, when it is the basionym **or replaced synonym** of a name of a genus or species that could not continue to be used in its current sense without conservation”; Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018). The bolded text was added to this Article with acceptance of Proposal 234 (Wiersema & al. in *Taxon* 65: 642–646. 2016) at the Shenzhen Congress.

Perry astutely recognized that while acceptance of her Proposal 243 would provide a future mechanism for ensuring correspondence between listed types of names with conserved types in App. III and IV and those of their basionyms, when these could then be explicitly conserved as such, it could not address the already existing incongruency of types resulting from strict application of then Art. 14, where the listed basionyms (at the same rank) had not been,