

## Ibis Species

Rejected 1 vote For, 1 vote for Hypothetical, 5 Against

This report was discussed at length at the annual meeting. This somewhat unique report spurred action to have all reports made available, in a redacted nature when necessary, to the public. No committee member doubted that report was in fact a *Plegadis* species as submitted. However, WV already has accepted records for Glossy and White-faced Ibis. Furthermore, the possibility of a wild Puna Ibis in WV is essentially zero. Therefore, there did not seem to be an appropriate place on the State List to record such an individual. However, the report itself seems by all measure correct and therefore deserves acknowledgement and historical recognition. The rejection on this case was more a procedural matter than anything else. The committee still encourages and appreciates reports of this sort to be submitted for historical recording.

### Committee Member Comments:

CM1: I have no reason to doubt this sighting. The identification at the generic level seems appropriate and the observer has shown sufficient details to that end. But given that both *Plegadis* Ibis species that we could expect in WV have already been sufficiently documented in WV as to be placed on the main list, I see no reason to vote for a generic level entry despite not questioning the identification at that level.

CM2: The observer has appropriately documented this species. This being such a difficult identification I feel it is appropriate to be included as *Plegadic* sp.

CM3: Keep for records on hypothetical list

CM4: Birds not ID'd to species or subspecies are of limited value when compiling an official state list.

CM5: The submitter did not actually seek to identify the bird to species, and the video does not help me distinguish between a potential glossy ibis vs. white-faced ibis. The report also mentions a "photo" but I do not see one in the submission. I do agree it is an ibis, but I do not think that the Committee receives reports or accepts identification which is not to species. Best case for the evidence is that it supports two possible species identification. So I would have to reject the submission as inadequate to determine actual species. The bird was apparently in the area for at least 7 days. If other observers of the bird have additional details and evidence to submit, we would welcome it.

CM6: Agree that we should be voting for a specific species, not Ibis sp.

CM7: Rejected without comment

