

ONE FUNGUS = WHICH NAME?

- czyli słów kilka o zmianach w nomenklaturze grzybów



Amsterdam

12-13 kwietnia 2012

Seria konferencji

- 1F=1N
 - „*One Fungus = One Name*” – *Amsterdam Declaration*
- 1F=?N
 - „*One Fungus = Which Name?*”
- 1F=?G
 - „*One Fungus = Which Genus?*”
 - 10-11.04.2013 Amsterdam



CBS Symposium



CBS Symposium



Seria konferencji

- 1F=1N
 - „*One Fungus = One Name*” – *Amsterdam Declaration*
- **1F=?N**
 - „***One Fungus = Which Name?***”
- 1F=?G
 - „*One Fungus = Which Genus?*”
 - 10-11.04.2013 Amsterdam



CBS Symposium



CBS Symposium



Program

- *One fungus which name: how do we proceed? (David L. Hawksworth)*
- *Post-Melbourne fungal nomenclature: an overview (Lorelei Norvell).*
- *Why hyphomycete taxonomy is now more important than ever (Keith A. Seifert).*
- *The nomenclature side of fungal databases, registration, etc (Joost A. Stalpers, Paul M. Kirk).*
- *Single names in Hypocreales and Diaporthales (Amy Y. Rossman).*
- *Applications of old anamorph-typified names of genera and species (Uwe Braun).*
- *A strategy for fungal names with teleomorphanamorph connections (Xing-Zhang Liu).*
- *The future of fungal biodiversity research (Pedro W. Crous).*
- *Naming environmental nucleic acid species (ENAS) (John W. Taylor).*
- *The value of epitypification (Kevin D. Hyde).*
- *An official DNA barcode for fungi (Conrad Schoch).*
- *1000 fungal genomes and beyond (Joey Spatafora).*

Program

- **One fungus which name: how do we proceed?** (David L. Hawksworth)
- **Post-Melbourne fungal nomenclature: an overview** (Lorelei Norvell).
- *Why hyphomycete taxonomy is now more important than ever* (Keith A. Seifert).
- **The nomenclature side of fungal databases, registration, etc.** (Joost A. Stalpers, Paul M. Kirk).
- *Single names in Hypocreales and Diaporthales* (Amy Y. Rossman).
- *Applications of old anamorph-typified names of genera and species* (Uwe Braun).
- **A strategy for fungal names with teleomorph anamorph connections** (Xing-Zhang Liu).
- *The future of fungal biodiversity research* (Pedro W. Crous).
- *Naming environmental nucleic acid species (ENAS)* (John W. Taylor).
- *The value of epitypification* (Kevin D. Hyde).
- **An official DNA barcode for fungi** (Conrad Schoch).
- *1000 fungal genomes and beyond* (Joey Spatafora).

An official DNA barcode for fungi

Nuclear ribosomal internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region as a universal DNA barcode marker for *Fungi*

Conrad L. Schoch^{a,1}, Keith A. Seifert^{b,1}, Sabine Huhndorf^c, Vincent Robert^d, John L. Spouge^a, C. André Levesque^b, Wen Chen^b, and Fungal Barcoding Consortium^{a,2}

^aNational Center for Biotechnology Information, National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD 20892; ^bBiodiversity (Mycology and Microbiology), Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa, ON, Canada K1A 0C6; ^cDepartment of Botany, The Field Museum, Chicago, IL 60605; and ^dCentraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures Fungal Biodiversity Centre (CBS-KNAW), 3508 AD, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Edited* by Daniel H. Janzen, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, and approved February 24, 2012 (received for review October 18, 2011)

Six DNA regions were evaluated as potential DNA barcodes for *Fungi*, the second largest kingdom of eukaryotic life, by a multinational, multilaboratory consortium. The region of the mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit 1 used as the animal barcode was excluded as a potential marker, because it is difficult to amplify in fungi, often includes large introns, and can be insufficiently variable. Three subunits from the nuclear ribosomal RNA cistron were compared together with regions of three representative protein-

the intron of the *tmK* gene. This system sets a precedent for reconsidering *COI* as the default fungal barcode.

COI functions reasonably well as a barcode in some fungal genera, such as *Penicillium*, with reliable primers and adequate species resolution (67% in this young lineage) (9); however, results in the few other groups examined experimentally are inconsistent, and cloning is often required (10). The degenerate primers applicable to many *Ascomycota* (11) are difficult to as-

One fungus which name: how do we proceed?



CBS Symposium

Melbourne Code – lipiec 2011

- International Code of Nomenclature for Algae, **Fungi** and Plants:
 - zmiana nazwy kodu z IBN na ICNAFP
 - artykuł 59: „one fungus=one name” – The Amsterdam Declaration”
 - artykuł 36: tylko angielski opis diagnostyczny
 - artykuł 37: obowiązkowa rejestracja nowych nazw taksonów (www.mycobank.org)
 - artykuły 19-31: dozwolona publikacja nowego gatunku tylko on-line (nr doi)
 - ...



Melbourne Code – lipiec 2011

- International Code of Nomenclature for Algae, **Fungi** and Plants:
 - zmiana nazwy kodu z IBN na ICNAFP
 - **artykuł 59: „one fungus=one name” – The Amsterdam Declaration”**
 - artykuł 36: tylko angielski opis diagnostyczny
 - artykuł 37: obowiązkowa rejestracja nowych nazw taksonów (www.mycobank.org)
 - artykuły 19-31: dozwolona publikacja nowego gatunku tylko on-line (nr doi)
 - ...



Artykuł 59

- jedna nazwa dla holomorfy, nazwy alternatywne tracą ważność, ale..

Replace Article 59 with:

ART. 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.

ART. 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.

problem „widely used”

- nazwą obowiązującą będzie nazwa powszechniej używana, ale... co to znaczy „powszechniej”?
- listy:
 - „accepted lists” – *names not conserved but treated as conserved*
- problem tworzenia list nazw zaakceptowanych
 - grupy robocze
- bazy on-line
- propozycje list: www.cbs.knaw.nl
- procedury tworzenia list i inne ważne ustalenia:
 - <http://www.imafungus.org/Issue/31/05.pdf>

Propozycje list

- www.cbs.knaw.nl

Uncorrected data of anamorph-teleomorph connections extracted from MycoBank and Index Fungorum.

The present data sheets are meant to stimulate discussion in the afternoon sessions of the "One Fungus = Which Name" meeting. Dates relate to the genus, not the species. For most genera, nothing is known relating to the potential polyphasic status of their type species. Connections are based on literature, and many have not been proven in culture, or at DNA level.

These data have not been checked, and contain errors.



Sordariomycetes



Saccharomycetes



Pezizomycetes



Leotiomycetes



Basal basidiomycetes



Eurotiomycetes



Dothideomycetes



Puccinomycetes



Agaricomycetes



other Ascomycetes

Dziękuję za uwagę!

