OPINION 2212 (Case 3267)

Cherax tenuimanus Smith, 1912 (Crustacea, Decapoda, PARASTACIDAE): proposed designation of neotype not accepted and usage not conserved

Abstract. An application to conserve the specific name *Cherax tenuimanus* Smith, 1912 by designation of neotypes for this species and for *Cherax cainii* Austin in Austin & Ryan, 2002, two species of freshwater crayfish or 'marron' important in the Australian aquaculture industry, was not approved. Type fixations for *Cherax tenuimanus* Smith, 1912 and *Cherax cainii* Austin in Austin & Ryan, 2002 are maintained.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Crustacea; Decapoda; PARASTACIDAE; *Cherax*; *Cherax tenuimanus*; *Cherax cainii*; freshwater crayfish; marron; aquaculture; Australia.

Ruling

(1) It is hereby ruled that the type fixations for the following nominal species are maintained:
   (a) *Cherax tenuimanus* Smith, 1912;
   (b) *Cherax cainii* Austin in Austin & Ryan, 2002.

(2) The following names are placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *tenuimanus* Smith, 1912, as published in the binomen *Cherax tenuimanus*;
   (b) *cainii* Austin in Austin & Ryan, 2002, as published in the binomen *Cherax cainii* and as defined by the holotype WAM C 28348 in the Western Australian Museum.

History of Case 3267

An application to conserve the specific name *Cherax tenuimanus* Smith, 1912 for a species of freshwater crayfish or 'marron' was received from Brett W. Molony (*Secretariat of the Pacific Community, New Caledonia*), Brian Jones, Craig S. Lawrence and Vicki A. Gouteff (*West Australian Fisheries and Marine Research Laboratories, Australia*) on 27 January 2003. After correspondence the case was published in BZN **63**: 231–235 (December 2006). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments on this case were received.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 2007 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN **63**: 233. At the close of voting on 1 December 2007 the majority of Commissioners had voted FOR the Case (12 For, 10 Against), but failed to reach the required two-thirds majority for it to be approved. In this first voting round, Alonso-Zarazaga, voting against the proposals, commented that he could not

see the need for designating a neotype for a species described in 2002 because it did not meet the requirements of the suspected identity of the other species. Alonso-Zarazaga also said that Austin's action was completely in accordance with the Code when he restricted the identity of *C. tenuimanus* to the less distributed species, and that it was simply a matter of getting used to this. He further noted the lack of interest this application had aroused among concerned people. Kottelat, voting for the proposals, commented that the exact type localities, as defined by neotype designations, should have been indicated in the proposal. Rosenberg, voting against the proposals, said that he would have voted for a neotype for *C. tenuimanus* but not for *C. cainii*, but it was not clear to him that split voting was allowed without the options being stated. Furthermore, the type localities of the proposed neotypes were not stated explicitly, but just said to be 'the same localities as the original material', so it would not be easy to verify what the type localities were. As type localities are properties of the type specimens, the label data for the proposed neotypes should have been given. Grygier, voting against the proposals, said that the proposed solution makes more use of the plenary power than is necessary. Instead of switching names between the two nominal taxa they pertain to, and cancelling all the current type designations, he believes that it would be less confusing in the long run if the Commission ratified a designation of the present holotype of *Cherax cainii* as the neotype for *C. tenuimanus* (i.e. a different specimen than that nominated in the Case), and to take no further action. This would preserve current usage of *C. tenuimanus* but *C. cainii* would be an objective junior synonym of *C. tenuimanus* and disappear. Grygier suggested that a new name could be devised for the isolated Margaret River population.

On 1 March 2008 the members of the Commission were invited to vote again on the proposals published in BZN **63**: 233. At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2008 the votes were as follows

Affirmative votes – 9: Bouchet, Fautin, Halliday, Kottelat, Lamas, Mawatari, Papp, van Tol and Zhang.

Negative votes – 8: Bogutskaya, Brothers, Grygier, Krell, Kullander, Pape, Rosenberg and Štys.

No vote was received from Lim.

Alonso-Zarazaga, Minelli, Ng, Patterson and Pyle were on leave of absence.

Voting against the proposals in the second round, Brothers commented that if, as seemed likely from the case, the 'holotype' of *Cherax tenuimanus* Smith, 1912 had been incorrectly identified and no unambiguous syntype material could be found, then the possibility remained for designation of a suitable neotype. Grygier, voting against the proposals, said his reasoning was unchanged from the previous round of voting. Kullander, voting against the proposals, said that this was a case that could be solved to the satisfaction of the authors without reference to the Commission. Štys, voting against the proposals, said he could not support this application on formal grounds alone. He pointed out that we did not learn the original type locality of *Cherax tenuimanus* Smith, 1912, nor were we told where the proposed neotype of this nominal species labelled WAM C 37199 came from. The same was true for the proposed neotype of *Cherax cainii* Austin, 2002, labelled WAM C 37197. He commented that the Commission should not blindly vote for non-specified symbols.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

tenuimanus, Cherax, Smith, 1912, *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, **1912**: 166.
cainii, *Cherax*, Austin in Austin & Ryan, 2002, *Invertebrate Systematics*, **16**: 360.