

OPINION 2019 (Case 2899)***Dodecaceria concharum* Örsted, 1843 and *Heterocirrus fimbriatus* Verrill, 1879 (currently *D. fimbriata*) (Annelida, Polychaeta): conservation of usage of the names by the designation of a neotype for *D. concharum* not approved**

Abstract. The Commission has ruled not to approve proposals for the conservation of usage of the names of two cirratulid polychaetes, *Dodecaceria concharum* Örsted, 1843 and *Heterocirrus fimbriatus* Verrill, 1879, by the designation of a neotype for *D. concharum*. No names have been placed on Official Lists or Indexes.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Polychaeta; cirratulid polychaetes; *Dodecaceria*; *Dodecaceria concharum*; *Heterocirrus fimbriatus*.

Ruling

- (1) Proposals put forward for the conservation of the usage of the specific names of *Dodecaceria concharum* Örsted, 1843 and *Heterocirrus fimbriatus* Verrill, 1879 by the designation of a neotype for *D. concharum* were not approved.

History of Case 2899

An application for the conservation of the specific names of *Dodecaceria concharum* Örsted, 1843 and *Heterocirrus fimbriatus* Verrill, 1879 by the designation of a neotype for *D. concharum* was received from P.H. Gibson (*Institute of Cell, Animal and Population Biology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, U.K.*) and David Heppell (*National Museums of Scotland, Edinburgh, U.K.*) on 22 June 1993. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 52: 27–33 (March 1995). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals.

A comment opposing the application from F. Pleijel (*Swedish Museum of Natural History, Stockholm, Sweden* and *Tjärnö Marine Biological Laboratory, Strömstad, Sweden*) and A.S.Y. Mackie (*National Museum of Wales, Cardiff, Wales, U.K.*) was published in BZN 52: 261–262. Heppell & Gibson replied (BZN 52: 329–331) in defence of their proposals.

A further comment opposing the application was received from T. Miura (*Kagoshima University, Kagoshima, Japan*) and A.I. Muir (*The Natural History Museum, London, U.K.*) representing the Nomenclatural Sub-Committee of the International Polychaete Association and was published in BZN 53: 46.

A long and detailed submission was received on 15 December 1995 from M.E. Petersen (*Zoological Museum, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen Ø, Denmark*), J.D. George (*The Natural History Museum, London, U.K.*), J.A. Blake (*ENSR Consulting and Engineering Inc., Woods Hole, MA, U.S.A.*), K. Fauchald (*National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) and K.W. Ockelmann (*Marine Biological Laboratory, University of Copenhagen, Helsingør, Denmark*). This was primarily a taxonomic paper, but it opposed Gibson & Heppell's requests (1), (3) and (4) to the Commission and made counter-proposals

for the designation of neotypes. Dr Petersen et al. were encouraged to publish the taxonomic content of this submission elsewhere before bringing the nomenclatural aspects to the Commission. However, the paper was not published and their counter-proposals were not put to the Commission for a vote.

No further comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 2002 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in *BZN* **52**: 31–32.

At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2002 the votes were as follows: 1 Commissioner voted FOR the proposals, 23 Commissioners voted AGAINST, no votes were received from Böhme, Dupuis and Martins de Souza. Ng was on leave of absence.

No names are placed on Official Lists or Indexes and the issue is left open for subsequent workers to follow the precepts of the Code or to make new proposals to the Commission.