

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2023-099

Name of bird form: White-faced Ibis

Committee member name: Nathan Goldberg

Date of review: August 14, 2024

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: U-ID

Comments: [required as this is a 4th circulation]

Continuing with my same line of thought from prior circulations of this record, the observer does not mention anything about eye *color*, only facial skin. In order to accept these birds as White-faced Ibis, I'd like to have no doubt about the color of their eyes.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2023-099

Name of bird form: White-faced Ibis

Committee member name: Steve Huggins

Date of review: 8/19/24

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: U-ID

Comments: My stance on this record remains steadfast as unidentifiable to species and should remain 'plegdadis' species. Immature dark Ibis are notoriously difficult to ID and I do not see enough to convince me that the bird is a White-faced and not a Glossy or even a hybrid.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2023-099

Name of bird form: White-faced Ibis

Committee member name: Davida Kalina

Date of review: 1 August 2024

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: U-ID

Comments: [required as this is a 4th circulation]

In discussions with other committee members, the suggestion has been made that the reddish-tint I have noted in the left eye of the target bird in Macaulay Library asset ML611447530 could be due to an artifact of my computer display. I cannot adequately refute this suggestion, and am changing my vote to reject this immature Plegadis individual as White-faced Ibis.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2023-099

Name of bird form: White-faced Ibis

Committee member name: Terry Walsh

Date of review: 8/8/24

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: U-ID

Comments: [required as this is a 4th circulation]

I reiterate my previous comments: "The hints of red around the eye and in the eye may just about be discernible in this bird, but the photos are dark and heavily tinted. Given the difficulty in assigning immature fall ibis to species and the problems with hybrids, I continue to consider this record not proven."

I believe pixel-peeping for red irises in photos that are not top quality is sub-optimal for assigning a confident species ID, especially as they were not commented on by the original observer/photographer.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2023-099

Name of bird form: White-faced Ibis

Committee member name: Kyle Wiktor

Date of review: 8/7/2024

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: A-PE

Comments: [required as this is a 4th circulation]

Eyes still look red to me.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2023-099

Name of bird form: White-faced Ibis

Committee member name: Dan Williams

Date of review: 7/26/24

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: U-ID

Comments: [required as this is a 4th circulation]

In the earlier rounds, I believed that I could see red in the iris on two of the photos. Other members of the committee could not. The observer did not note that he saw a red iris, which has taken on greater import in my deliberation of this record. In the end, I do not feel confident that the individual in the submitted photographs is sufficiently established as to species to be added to the permanent record. I am no longer willing to accept the record.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2023-099

Name of bird form: White-faced Ibis

Committee member name: Geoffrey A. Williamson

Date of review: 26 July 2024

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: U-ID

Comments: [required as this is a 4th circulation]

I am changing my vote after hearing several other IORC members distinguish between the import of red around/near the eyes and actual reddish irises. A close re-examination of the photos convinces me that I cannot see a red iris in the photographs, and the observer is silent about iris color specifically in the eBird checklist comments.

I agree with other members' position that a record like this is best left unaccepted.