

the Code. To be recognised as published work, journals publishing primarily electronically (including open access journals) must contain a statement printed at least once in each issue that printed copies on durable paper of every issue are deposited in a minimum of 30 major libraries which are identified by name in the volume itself. The issues must be deposited and obtainable in these libraries.'

The proposed new Article 8.6 should not be included.

Article 9 should not be modified as proposed, except 9.9 which could be modified as proposed under Article 9.10.

Article 9.8 should be modified:

'9.8. information issued and distributed by means of electronic signals'

The proposed new Article 10.8 should not be included.

To promote stability of a widely used and well-known name established on CD-ROM or DVD after 1999, the Commission has the right to make available such a name from the next occasion when the name was published on paper after the CD-ROM was issued and where the explicit statement that this was a new species (violation of Article 16.1) is lacking.

The proposed new Article 10.9 should not be included.

The proposed new Article 21.8.3 should not be included.

The proposed new Article 21.9 should not be included.

The proposed new Article 78.2.4 should not be included.

Lots of Copies still need the focal function of libraries

Daphne G. Fautin

*KU Natural History Museum and Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, 1200 Sunnyside Drive Lawrence, KS 66045, U.S.A.
(e-mail: fautin@ku.edu)*

'Lots of Copies keeps stuff safe' has been the argument in principle and suggested specific mechanism (www.LOCKSS.org) for archiving electronic-only publications.

Libraries have served the archival role and journals the multiple identical copies so well for so long that they have been taken for granted. Electronic publications are clearly elbowing out print journals, but their longevity and unchangeability are not so certain (notwithstanding the opinions of some active contributors to the ICZN online discussions; despite requests, the archiving industry has yet to comment on this lively discussion). The framers of the 4th edition of the Code, seeing change on the horizon, allowed for publication of nomenclatural acts on CDs, while prohibiting them online. This was probably seen as a sort of link with print and likely permanency in that there was a physical object. We now know that CDs are less permanent than had been thought, and so part of the amendment currently being considered is to prohibit them henceforth as a medium for nomenclatural acts. Of at least as great concern is archiving. This is also relevant to the use of CDs because many libraries have no provision for archiving one-off CDs in the way ICZN4 stipulates. As for electronic products in general, it may be true, as many contributors to the ICZN online discussions have argued, that with so many copies out there, continued existence of electronic publications is not at issue, and so libraries need no

longer be a consideration. But one of my concerns is how a scientist new to a field can find the publications.

Presumably that person has to know who holds the most complete library of electronic copies (disregarding whether they are PDFs, Word documents, or in some other format). There is a precise analogy in the print world – many of us have extensive personal reprint collections, which have never been proposed as replacements for libraries. Libraries are gathering places, central points for finding information. The electronic world is dispersed, and we have all heard stories about what large proportion of relevant information search engines miss, so the focal function of libraries is another piece of the nomenclatural puzzle (and a reason a central register for names is being considered). We are in early days, and there is as yet no obvious equivalent for many of the multiple roles libraries have performed that were so much taken for granted they were not even mentioned in the Code! Now we have to recognise explicitly what we need and how to go about organising our science and information in this new world.

Open access publications and archiving

David E. Hill

Greenville County, SC, U.S.A. (e-mail: platycryptus@yahoo.com)

In the area in which I work (biology of salticid spiders), the major taxonomic references are already online (Platnick AMNH, Prószyński, see <http://www.peckhamia.com> for links).

Increasingly, documentation by photographs rather than only preserved specimens is becoming important, and we have open questions about this. Jerzy Prószyński (<http://www.gsd-salt.miiz.waw.pl/salticidae.php>) has taken the lead in this area, and he and I have been trying to resolve related questions. What we really want to be able to do is serialise (collection; serial number) these photographs for standard reference. We have issues to work out. I think we need a standard repository for serialised photographs, and I think that all accepted photographs need to be placed in the public domain at the time that they are posted, so that they can be freely referenced and incorporated into future work. It's that simple.

If you review some of the earlier taxonomic work (as I have recently, in considerable detail), you find that all descriptions and drawings carried a significant measure of ambiguity (e.g. what is really meant by 'testaceous' or 'rufous?') that is resolved in photographs. Photography is now generally available and highly affordable (major change). Preserved specimens also lose many details (posture, coloration) as they are 'rubbed,' and are more difficult to link to field work than are photographs of living specimens. We also have the ability, with photography and computers, to produce almost unlimited depth of field in photographs of specimens. Peer review does not have to take place before posting or 'publication'. It is an ongoing process in science, as more information becomes available. We have no problem with the dynamic process here. Even the taxonomic work of 'highly authoritative experts' gets reversed as more knowledge becomes available. That is fine. In the trade-off, we want more interest and participation in field zoology, not