

## **XII International Mycological Congress: Guiding Vote on nomenclature proposals to amend *Chapter F* of the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants***

Tom W. May<sup>1</sup> & Andrew N. Miller<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Royal Botanic Gardens Victoria, 100 Birdwood Ave, Melbourne, Victoria 3004, Australia.

Corresponding author e-mail: tom.may@rbg.vic.gov.au

<sup>2</sup>Illinois Natural History Survey, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois 61820, USA.

### **Abstract**

Results are provided for the Guiding Vote on the seven formal proposals to amend *Chapter F* of the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants* to be decided by the Fungal Nomenclature Session (FNS) of the XII International Mycological Congress in August 2024. The ballot for the Guiding Vote was provided online. There were 165 valid ballots, submitted by mycologists from 30 countries, belonging to 22 eligible groups and societies, along with authors of proposals. One proposal F-005 concerning DNA sequences as types, exceeded the 75% No vote that is the threshold above which proposals are considered rejected by the FNS unless formally re-introduced.

### **Introduction**

The Guiding Vote for the Fungal Nomenclature Session of the XII International Mycological Congress is a ballot to determine the opinions of mycologists about proposals to amend *Chapter F* of the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants* (Turland et al. 2018, see Div. III. Prov. 8.3). Further information on the background to the introduction of the Guiding Vote and the results of the Guiding Vote for IMC11 were provided by May & Miller (2018).

In early July 2024, seven proposals to amend *Chapter F* (May & Hawksworth 2024) along with a Synopsis of Proposals (May & Bensch 2024) were made available ahead of publication in *IMA Fungus* via the website of the International Mycological Society. The proposals will be considered at the Fungal Nomenclature Session of IMC12. The ballot for the Guiding Vote on these proposals was made available online and the link to the ballot was

distributed to eligible groups. The ballot consisted of seven questions, one for each proposal, along with four questions establishing the eligibility of the voter (name, e-mail, institution, and a choice of one or more eligibility groups) and an optional question for comments. For each proposal, the options were: Yes, No, Special-purpose Committee, Editorial Committee, and Abstain. The Guiding Vote opened on 9 July and closed on 2 August 2024.

### **Eligibility**

Eligibility for the Guiding Vote of the IMC is set out in Provision 8 of Division III of the Code (Turland et al. 2018). Eligible voters include: (1) authors of proposals, (2) members of the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi (NCF), (3) members of the International Mycological Association (IMA), and of its Member Mycological Organizations (MMOs), and (4) members of any additional organizations nominated by the Fungal Nomenclature Bureau (FNB). For the IMC12 Guiding Vote, the FNB added the same four organizations added for the IMC11 Guiding Vote, all with an international or continental scope (African Mycological Society, La Asociación Latinoamericana de Micología, International Association for Lichenology, and International Commission on the Taxonomy of Fungi — ICTF)

According to the statutes of the IMA, “Membership in the IMA is open to all full congress registrants of the most recent International Mycological Congress until the following congress, [and] to MMOs ... The individual members of MMOs of the IMA are also members of the IMA” (<http://www.ima-mycology.org/society/statutes>). For the Guiding Vote, the FNB interpreted membership of the IMA as including those registered to attend IMC12, rather than the previous IMC in 2018 (otherwise young mycologists who were not yet active at the time of IMC11 would be disenfranchised, and there would be difficulties in contacting mycologists using e-mail addresses that were six-years old). There are currently 17 IMC MMOs, which resulted in 23 groups or societies, along with authors of proposals, being eligible to participate in the 2024 Guiding Vote.

### **Results**

A total of 166 completed ballots were submitted by the close of voting on 2 August 2024. A check of names and email addresses detected one duplicate ballot, which was removed from the counts presented below. Therefore 165 valid ballots were submitted. We did not carry out an exhaustive check of eligibility of voters, such as against membership registers of the MMOs. This would have been difficult due to confidentiality issues, both about information

collected during the Guiding Vote and also in respect of membership registers of organisations. However, visual inspection of person's names and their indicated eligibility did not reveal any obvious ineligible votes. Given that the Guiding Vote is indicative rather than binding and that votes on all proposals were clear in their outcome (Yes or No), a few ineligible ballots would not have affected the outcome.

We note that there were 19 incomplete ballots. Almost all these ballots had the questions about the proposals completed, but the second page of the ballot, with questions about eligibility was not (or in one case only partially) completed. We cannot determine why ballots were not completed, but presumably it was either (1) because those accessing the ballot had been provided the link, but were not eligible, or (2) because those voting preferred not to provide the requested details of name and email address.

Voting on each proposal is presented in Table 1. The on-line form used for the IMC12 Guiding Vote (and similarly for the IMC11 Guiding Vote) required an answer against all proposals, hence the option of "Abstain". For the Guiding Vote for the International Botanical Congress (Turland *et al.* 2024), the ballot is not on-line and hence those filling out the form can omit a proposal if they do not wish to vote for any of the four options: Yes, No, Special-purpose Committee or Editorial Committee. Therefore, for the IBC Guiding Vote, the percentage of votes for any given proposal is calculated from the total voting for the four options, which varies from proposal to proposal. To mirror those procedures, for the IMC12 Guiding Vote the percentage of votes was calculated from the total for each proposal minus abstentions.

We note a high level of abstentions (between 49 and 54) for the four proposals that did not deal with the use of DNA sequences as types, which were F-001, F-002, F-003 and F-004. These four proposals had a high level of support, with a high proportion of Yes votes, at 59.6% for Prop. F-001 and higher than 60% for the other three (noting that the percentage of votes was calculated from the total ballots minus abstentions). The three proposals concerning the use of DNA sequences (or genomes) as types for fungi all received few (one to six) abstentions and high No votes: 80%, 74% and 79% respectively. The cut-off for considerations of proposals at the Fungal Nomenclature Session is 75% and therefore, to be debated, Prop. F-005 will need to be reintroduced at the FNS by one attendee and at least five seconders who are also attending (Div. III, Prov. 5.5).

<b>Question</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>SpC</b>	<b>EdC</b>	<b>Total (-Abstain)</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
Prop. F-001. Enable the same epithet to be retained for different morphs of the same fungus	68	31	27%	8	7	114	51
Prop. F-002. Clarify that a proposal to conserve a name with a conserved type does not require citation of a typification identifier	89	15	13%	7	5	116	49
Prop. F-003. Remove the listing of synonyms from entries for protected names in the appendices to the Code and clarify the processes of protection under Art. F.2.1	81	21	19%	4	5	111	54
Prop. F-004. Clarify the processes of rejection under Art. F.7.1	93	6	5%	10	5	114	51
F-005. Allow the naming of fungi from DNA sequences as types	24	130	80%	1	7	162	3
F-006. Allow genomic sequences to serve as types of names of organisms treated as fungi	30	121	74%	3	10	164	1
F-007. Add a recommendation on the designation of fungal organisms only known from DNA sequence data	39	110	69%	1	9	159	6

Table 1. Responses to the questions in the Guiding Vote. Note that the percentage of No votes for each question is calculated from the total of votes minus abstentions. SpC=Special-purpose Committee; EdC=Editorial Committee.

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Number of voters</b>
Author of proposal	10
International Mycological Association (i.e. registered to attend the International Mycological Congress in Maastricht in 2024)	36
African Mycological Society	2
La Asociación Latinoamericana de Micología	3
Australasian Mycological Society	4
British Mycological Society	19
Danish Mycological Society	1
Dutch Mycological Society	60
Finnish Mycological Society	0
German Society for Mycology	12
Indian Mycological Society	4
Indonesian Mycological Society	0
International Association for Lichenology	17
International Commission on the Taxonomy of Fungi	4
Korean Society of Mycology	2
Mycological Society of America	40
Mycological Society of China	5
Mycological Society of Japan	3
Mycological Society of the Republic of China	3
Nomenclature Committee for Fungi	7
Norwegian Mycological Society	0
Southern African Society for Plant Pathology	3
Swedish Mycological Society	2

Table 2. Summary of answers to question “Please indicate your eligibility to vote by selecting current membership of the following societies or groups (you may select more than one category)”. Note that the total of number of voters from this table will add up to more than the number of submitted ballots, due to some voters being members of more than one organisation.

## References

- May TW, Bensch K (2024) Synopsis of proposals on fungal nomenclature: a review of the proposals concerning Chapter F of the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants submitted to the XII International Mycological Congress, 2024. *IMA Fungus* in press.
- May TW, Hawksworth DL (2024) Proposals for consideration at IMC12 to modify provisions related solely to fungi in *Chapter F* of the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants*. *IMA Fungus* in press.
- May TW, Miller AN (2018) XI International Mycological Congress: Guiding Vote on nomenclature proposals to amend *Chapter F* of the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants*. *IMA Fungus* 9: (xv)–(xxi).
- Turland NJ, Wiersema JH, Barrie FR, Greuter W, Hawksworth DL, et al. (2018) *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Shenzhen Code) adopted by the Nineteenth International Botanical Congress Shenzhen, China, July 2017*. [Regnum Vegetabile no. 159.] Glashütten: Koeltz Botanical Books.
- Turland NJ, Kempa M, Knapp, S, Král'ovičová, E & Wiersema JH (2024) Results of the preliminary guiding vote (“mail vote”) on proposals to amend the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants submitted to the XX International Botanical Congress, Madrid 2024. *Taxon* (in press).

## Acknowledgements

We thank Kasper Luijsterburg (Westerdijk Fungal Biodiversity Institute, IMA webmaster) for placing information about the Guiding Vote on the IMA website. TM thanks Royal Botanic Gardens Victoria for financial support for the subscription to the online ballot portal, and office bearers of the eligible societies for facilitating contact with their members, at relatively short notice.