



This form should be used for all taxonomic proposals. Please complete all those modules that are applicable (and then delete the unwanted sections). For guidance, see the notes written in blue and the separate document "Help with completing a taxonomic proposal"

Please try to keep related proposals within a single document; you can copy the modules to create more than one genus within a new family, for example.

MODULE 1: **TITLE, AUTHORS, etc**

<b>Code assigned:</b>	<b>2020.001aG</b>	(to be completed by ICTV officers)
<b>Short title:</b> Unique taxonomy names (e.g. 6 new species in the genus <i>Zetavirus</i> )		
<b>Modules attached</b> (modules 1 and 9 are required)	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Author(s) with e-mail address(es) of the proposer:**

NCBI:

J. Rodney Brister jamesbr@ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

**List the ICTV study group(s) that have seen this proposal:**

A list of study groups and contacts is provided at <http://www.ictvonline.org/subcommittees.asp> . If in doubt, contact the appropriate subcommittee chair (fungal, invertebrate, plant, prokaryote or vertebrate viruses)

**ICTV-EC or Study Group comments and response of the proposer:**

---

---

Date first submitted to ICTV:

Date of this revision (if different to above):

---

MODULE 8: **NON-STANDARD**

Template for any proposal not covered by modules 2-7. This includes proposals to change the name of existing taxa (but note that stability of nomenclature is encouraged wherever possible).

non-standard proposal

Code	<b>2010.001aG</b>	(assigned by ICTV officers)
<b>Title of proposal:</b> Unique taxonomy names		

**Text of proposal:**

The official ICTV viral taxonomy scheme currently supports identical species and isolate names. This practice creates confusion within oral, written and database contexts because one cannot determine what object is being referenced, the species or the isolate of the same name. To address this issue, we propose that the ICTV should no longer use duplicate names within the taxonomy scheme and that isolate and species names should be unique.

For example, currently within Papillomaviridae there is community-wide serotype numbering Scheme, wherein official species names are derived directly from the serotype names. This is reflected in the ICTV Report 'isolate' list for the species, e.g.:

Human papillomavirus 4 (species)

- Human papillomavirus 4 (isolate)
- Human papillomavirus 65 (isolate)
- Human papillomavirus 95 (isolate)

This naming scheme leads to inevitable confusion as to whether the name "Human papillomavirus 4" refers to the species or the serotype. In other groups using alphanumeric naming schemes the species nomenclature is clearly distinct from the underlying serotype nomenclature, e.g.:

Human rhinovirus A (species)

- Human rhinovirus 10 (isolate)
- Human rhinovirus 100 (isolate)
- Human rhinovirus 11 (isolate)

Redundant names are not restricted to Papillomaviridae. Indeed, the same conceptual problem exists on a grander scale in the prokaryotic viruses, where many of the species names are derived directly from isolate names, e.g. "Enterobacteria phage T7" is listed as one of several isolates belonging to the species Enterobacteria phage T7.

Though less common, there are also examples of redundant naming schemes in eukaryotic viruses, e.g. the isolate "Human coronavirus 229E," which belongs to the species Human coronavirus 229E.

To prevent confusion, we propose that study groups be discouraged from approving species names that are derived directly from pre-existing serotype, strain or isolate names. Instead the strain and species names should be unique, as in the case of "California encephalitis virus - BFS-283," which is an isolate of the species California encephalitis virus.

We believe that this proposal agrees in principle with existing ICTV rules:

3.24 "A species name must provide an appropriately unambiguous identification of the species."

3.25 "A name such as '22' or 'A7' is not acceptable" [unless they are part of an existing species-level nomenclatural series].

MODULE 9: **APPENDIX**: supporting material

additional material in support of this proposal

**References:**

--

**Annex:**

Include as much information as necessary to support the proposal, including diagrams comparing the old and new taxonomic orders. The use of Figures and Tables is strongly recommended but direct pasting of content from publications will require permission from the copyright holder together with appropriate acknowledgement as this proposal will be placed on a public web site. For phylogenetic analysis, try to provide a tree where branch length is related to genetic distance.

