The alliance *Gymnocarpio dryopteridis-Abietion lasiocarpace* Wali & Krajina, is supported by the association *Gymnocarpio dryopteridis-Abietetum lasiocarpace* Wali & Krajina, which has as its nomenclatural type (lectotypus in *Peinado & al., op. cit.*: 193) the relevé number 1 included in table 6 of the invalidly published name association –(art. 10 of the current issue of the Code of the Phytosociological Nomenclature, *Barkman & al., Vegetatio* 67: 145-195. 1986; CPN)–*Gymnocarpio (dryopteridis)-Oplopanaco (horridi)-Abieto (lasiocarpace)-Piceetum glaucae* Wali & Krajina 1973 (*Vegetatio* 26(4-6): 258). *Peinado & al. (l.c.)* publish no relevés belonging to the new association they validate, nor any relevés of their synonymized association, *Ptilio (cristae-castrensis)-Gymnocarpio (dryopteridis)-Abieto (lastiocarpace)-Piceetum glaucae* Wali & Krajina (*l.c.*). This situation makes it necessary to consider the selected relevé (number 1) as the obliged nomenclatural type and the protologue of the Wali & Krajina invalid association as the only diagnostic reference.
RIVAS-MARTÍNEZ, SÁNCHEZ-MATA & COSTA (Itinera Geobotanica 12: 56. 1999; 30.06.99) propose as nomen dubium (art. 37, 38), the name of the alliance Gymnocarpio dryopteridis-Abietion lasiocarpaceae Wali & Krajina ex Peinado & al. 1998 (art. 37 CPN) as the supported type-relevé, selected by Peinado & al. (l.c.), is incompatible with the Wali & Krajina protologue (l.c.). The reason is the abundance of the characteristic species of the secondary deciduous forests of the order Betulolopia betulifolia-Populetalia tremuloidis Rivas-Martínez, Sánchez-Mata & Costa 1999 such as Alnus viridis (Vill.) Lam. & DC. subsp. sinuata (Regel) A. & D. Lœve y Betula papyrifera Marsh., and also the absence of Oplopanax horridus Miq., which the Canadian authors (op. cit.: 259) point out in the protologue as the dominant characteristic species.

We have now also added the article 36 (CPN) in order to reject the Peinado & al. alliance name due to taxonomic corrections in the characteristic and dominant trees of this association. On the one hand, Peinado & al. (l.c.) assure that Wali & Krajina’s Picea glauca really belongs to the hybrid Picea glauca x engelmannii (Picea glauca var. albertiana sensu nobis); on the other hand, Spribille (Phytocoenologia 29(4): 569. 1999) when he refers to the genus Abies species (teste Hunt, Flora of North America 2: 359. 1993) assures that Wali & Krajina’s Abies lasiocarpa (op. cit.: table 6) really belongs to Abies bifolia, and in consequence (art. 43 CPN), he corrects the names of the association and alliance (Gymnocarpio-Abietetum bifolioe, Gymnocarpio-Abietion bifolioe). No decisions can be made based on the precise geographical location of the places where Wali & Krajina made their relevés, as the mapped and described territory is so vast (British Columbia: 54º-56ºN/122º-125ºW). It is therefore impossible to decide with certainty as to the taxonomic corrections on trees belonging to the genus Picea and Abies. We reported in the above-mentioned vast territory (approx. 42,000 square Km) the presence of Abies lasiocarpa (Hook.) Nutt., Abies bifolia A. Murray bis, Abies lasiocarpa x bifolia, Picea engelmannii Parry ex Engelm., Picea glauca (Moench) Voss and Picea engelmannii x glauca (Picea glauca var. albertiana (S. Br.) Sarg.). Finally, we would like to point out that the territory where Wali & Krajina worked belongs to the following biogeographical sectors: Canadian Rockies (Canadian Rockies and Omineca Mountains subsectors) and Fraser Interior Plateau (Nechako-Fraser Plateau subsector), according to our recent biogeographical proposals for the North American territories (Rivas-Martínez, Sánchez-Mata & Costa, op. cit.: 27). As a result, we hereby propose to the Commission of Phytosociological Nomenclature the application of article 36 (CPN), as the restoration of the original sense of the association will be a permanent source of confusion (nomen ambiguum propositus hoc loco).