

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2018-032

Name of bird form: Black-bellied Whistling-Duck

Committee member name: Fraker

Date of review: 9/30/18

Circulation number: 1st

Vote: A-S

Comments:

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2018-032

Name of bird form: Black-bellied Whistling-Duck

Committee member name: Walter Marcisz

Date of review: 10-19-18

Circulation number: 1st

Vote: U-I

Comments:

The description sounds fairly good (and this is a very distinctive species) but I would prefer a more thorough description, especially since the observer seems somewhat inexperienced and may not be aware of the various domestic ducks that are sometimes found in the Palos area. Also, it seems odd that the observer reported the bird from Henry de Tonty Woods, but then went on to say it was at Tomahawk Slough, which is a rather different location. I vote to reject, at least for this pass.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2018-032

Name of bird form: Black-bellied Whistling-Duck

Committee member name: McMullen

Date of review: 10-19-18

Circulation number: 1st

Vote: A-S

Comments:

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2018-032

Name of bird form: Black-bellied Whistling-Duck

Committee member name: Adam Sell

Date of review: 31 October 2018

Circulation number: 1st

Vote: U-I

Comments:

Not enough of a description for me.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2018-032

Name of bird form: Black-bellied Whistling-Duck

Committee member name: Douglas Stotz

Date of review: 3 November 2018

Circulation number: 1st

Vote: U-I

Comments: The description is pretty marginal. The only real descriptive part is red bill and black belly. It could be a Muscovy duck from that description. The documentation indicates that he took photos. Even if they are poor, I would like to see them.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2018-032

Name of bird form: Black-bellied Whistling-Duck

Committee member name: Paul Sweet

Date of review: 10/28/18

Circulation number: 1st

Vote: U-I

Comments: Given that the observer states he did get photos, I'd like to see them. The description is nearly sufficient.

The vote U-I and the following comment were added 10 Jan 2019 by G.A. Williamson on the basis of an email communication from Paul Sweet:

[In the absence of photographs,] I'm afraid I have to vote U-I. I suspect that the observer really did see BBWD, but the description simply isn't sufficient to establish the ID.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2018-032

Name of bird form: Black-bellied Whistling-Duck

Committee member name:

Date of review: Geoffrey A. Williamson

Circulation number: 1st

Vote: A-S(1)

Comments:

This species is no longer a review list species. However, in this documentation, the description lacks clear detail. The features that were noted were

- The red bill.
- Dark brown stripe down the top of the head.
- That there was a “black portion of the belly.”

These are consistent with Black-bellied Whistling-Duck and as done in the documentation the red bill alone eliminates Fulvous Whistling-Duck. Is this barely enough? I am not sure, and I am wavering between accept and not accept. I think a nonspecific statement such as “The shape of the duck made it clear it was a whistling-duck” would put me clearly into the accept camp were that statement to have appeared in the documentation, even if what exactly it was about the shape that did that was not described. However, we have only a lesser version of such a statement that is only implicit: that Fulvous Whistling-Duck is considered as the similar species.

Because Black-bellied Whistling-Duck is so distinctive, I am going to vote in favor, but if this goes to a second round I may very well change my mind.