

## (285) Proposal to streamline proposals to amend the Code that concern only non-voted Examples or the Glossary

Nicholas J. Turland

*Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Museum Berlin, Freie Universität Berlin, Königin-Luise-Str. 6–8, 14195 Berlin, Germany*

Address for correspondence: Nicholas J. Turland, [n.turland@bo.berlin](mailto:n.turland@bo.berlin)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12958>

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

Division III Prov. 5.6 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018) requires proposals to amend the *Code* that concern only Examples (excluding voted Examples) or the Glossary to be automatically referred to the Editorial Committee (EC) at the Nomenclature Section (NS) of the International Botanical Congress (IBC). Such a proposal is not then discussed by the NS unless a member of the NS, supported (seconded) by five other members, proposes to discuss it. This is possible because Div. III Prov. 7.11 clearly defines the mandate of the EC, which “is empowered to make any editorial modification not affecting the meaning of the provisions concerned, e.g. to change the wording of any Article, Note, or Recommendation and to avoid duplication, to add or remove non-voted Examples, and to place Articles, Notes, Recommendations, and Chapters of the *Code* in the most convenient place”. Because the EC is charged with this task, a discussion of Examples or Glossary entries at the NS would, in effect, be attempting to duplicate the EC’s work. It would be an unwise use of the valuable time of members of the NS, many of whom have travelled to the IBC at considerable expense. The NS also has limited time – five working days at recent IBCs – to discuss and vote on hundreds of other proposals.

Currently such proposals may nevertheless be published in *Taxon*. This is a lengthy process requiring review and editing by the Rapporteurs, revision by the authors, editing by the Production Editor and Copy Editors of *Taxon*, issuing and checking page proofs with subsequent corrections, publication in the online and print editions of the journal, inclusion in the “Synopsis of proposals” with comments by the Rapporteurs, inclusion in the preliminary guiding vote, automatic referral to the EC without discussion at the NS and, finally, inclusion in the reports of the NS.

In the “Procedures and timetable for proposals” (Turland & Wiersema in *Taxon* 68: 1372–1373. 2020), the Rapporteurs suggested that such proposals could be submitted without publication

directly to the EC, which is represented prior to the Congress by the Rapporteurs. Over the last three years, several authors of proposals have followed this suggestion. Authors have also kindly complied with the Rapporteurs’ request (Turland & Wiersema, l.c.) to provide internet links to, or scanned copies of, protologues or other literature cited in proposed Examples, thereby helping the EC in its task of verifying the suitability of the Examples. Submission of these proposals directly to the EC has streamlined the process: the Rapporteurs simply check each submission and add it to the file to be dealt with by the EC after the next IBC.

The following proposal would make it explicit that proposals that concern only non-voted Examples or the Glossary would not be published in *Taxon* but would instead be submitted directly to the EC.

### (285) Amend Div. III Prov. 2.1 as follows (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough), add a new Prov. 2.1bis and delete Prov. 5.6:

“2.1. Proposals concerning the Preamble, **and** Divisions I–III, ~~and the Glossary (but see Prov. 2.1bis)~~ are submitted by publication (see Prov. 1.4) to the Nomenclature Section of an International Botanical Congress.”

“2.1bis. Proposals that concern only Examples (excluding voted Examples) or the Glossary are submitted via the Rapporteur and Vice-rapporteur, without publication, to the Editorial Committee, which will consider them and act in accordance with Prov. 7.11.”

~~“5.6. Any proposal to amend the *Code* that concerns only Examples (excluding voted Examples) or the Glossary is automatically referred to the Editorial Committee unless a proposal to discuss it is moved by a member of the Section and supported (seconded) by five other members (but see Prov. 5.5).”~~