

[2025-D-1: Establish English names for three species of \*Gygis\*](#)

[2025-D-2: Treat \*Formicarius destructus\* as a separate species from \*F. nigricapillus\*](#)

[2025-D-3: Treat Eurasian Hoopoe \*Upupa epops\* as more than one species](#)

[2025-D-4: Add three species to the Checklist and six species to the U.S. list](#)

## **2025-D-1**

### **Establish English names for three species of *Gygis***

**NO.** 2 without comment.

**NO.** I was initially strongly in favor of Fairy-Tern for these birds, both during the process of writing the proposal and during my initial comments here. However, after reading comments from other committee members and some of those on the concurrent SACC proposal, I am changing my vote to “White-Tern”. Although I still think that “Fairy-Tern” is the best choice, and is evocative, widely used, and appropriate for these ethereal species, I acknowledge that the potential confusion with *Sternula nereis* could significantly negatively affect conservation action for that species. That is the last thing I want, no matter how good a name Fairy-Tern is for *Gygis*. Therefore, I am changing my vote to a strong NO to “Fairy-Tern” and a strong YES to “White-Tern”. There is no doubt, of course, that *Gygis* are extremely white, and “White-Tern” is an accurate name for the group. For species names, Atlantic and Little are straightforward choices. I lean towards Blue-billed for *candida*, mainly because it highlights a distinctive species-level morphological feature, and I prefer descriptive morphological names over geographic ones when possible. However, I acknowledge that *candida* is the most common and widespread of the *Gygis*, so Common White-Tern is an acceptable option.

**NO.** I originally favored Fairy-Tern for reasons given in the original proposal, but I was swayed to go with White-Tern because of possible confusion with the Fairy Tern *Sternula nereis* and for consistency with SACC. I like Blue-billed for *candida* because it is a distinctive characteristic of that species. Therefore my votes are Atlantic White-Tern for *G. alba*, Little White-Tern for *G. microrhyncha*, and Blue-billed White-Tern for *G. candida*.

**NO.** Sadly, because I really like the name Fairy-Tern! However, it is and has long been taken by *Sterna nereis*, albeit as Australian Fairy Tern. Given the overlap in the ranges of *candida* and *nereis* in Australia, northern New Zealand, and New Caledonia, I think using essentially the same name (however it is hyphenated, run-together, or not) for these two distantly related taxa is simply asking for confusion (and I have personally experienced such confusion in the region). “White-Tern” as a group name is perfectly adequate and familiar through long use, and will not cause unnecessary confusion.

I see that Howard and Moore use “Atoll Tern” as an alternative name for *Gygis*. I’m not sure how widely that has been used, and Google AI says it can also refer to the Sooty Tern. But it might be worth looking into and thinking a bit more about this.

NZ Birds Online also lists Love Tern and Angel Tern as alternatives. The second of these I gather was originally proposed by the IOC long ago and didn’t stick, but might also be worth further consideration. (Note that this is far from a new problem.)

Lastly, there is of course the option of reusing Noddy for *Gygis*, advocated by Howell et al. I don’t think adopting a name that reinforces false, past assumptions about relationships is a good idea, but at least it shouldn’t result in mass confusion.

Anyway, at this time I vote for Atlantic White-Tern, Blue-billed White-Tern, and Little White-Tern.

**NO.** I think we should adopt the general name White-Tern for the three species, the name Fairy-Tern could cause confusion with the Fairy Tern *Sternula nereis*. Atlantic White-Tern for *G. alba* and Little White-Tern for *G. microrhyncha* are easy choices; for *G. candida*, I prefer Blue-billed White-Tern as it describes a particular morphological trait in that species.

**NO.** This is an interesting case, and while part of me really does like Fairy Tern, as it does feel like a fun, evocative name for *Gygis*, I think adopting “White-Tern” for the group is a better approach (and is still a very, and perhaps more, appropriate name). I like the options Atlantic, Little, and Blue-billed White-Tern for the three species. My alternate choice for *candida* would be “Common White-Tern,” but there are already a lot of issues and negative feelings toward the use of “Common” as a name for species.

**NO.** I initially voted for and prefer Fairy-Tern, but to avoid confusion with Australian Fairy Tern, I suppose we need to use White-Tern.

**NO.** I similarly like Fairy-Tern, but understand why White-Tern is the better option.

**NO.** Atlantic White-Tern and Little White-Tern make sense. Blue-billed White-Tern is descriptive and an important mark to see when resolving Atlantic records AWAY from the South Atlantic islands they are known to be resident on. Thus far, all records well away from those islands have been of birds from the Indo-Pacific, Blue-billed White-Terns, as far away as the UK! As evidenced from Committee deliberations and other analysts, the thick blue-based bill is the most reliable way to tell *candida*.

---

#### 2025-D-2

**Treat *Formicarius destructus* as a separate species from *F. nigricapillus***

**POSTPONED**

---

#### 2025-D-3

**Treat Eurasian Hoopoe *Upupa epops* as more than one species: (a) split *africana***

**NO.** 1 without comment.

**NO.** I’m against this for all the reasons stated in the proposal, especially the clinal differences in morphology.

**NO.** I don’t support this given the lack of vocal distinctiveness and apparently clinal plumage variation.

**NO.** My vote is mostly due to the lack of vocal differences, as well as the variable plumage across the range of the species.

**NO.** Vocal and plumage evidence do not support the split of *africana* from *epops*.

**NO.** There is clinal variation.

**NO.** Reasons are given in the proposal.

**NO.** Clinal differences.

**NO.** A split of *africana* from *epops* is not supported in my opinion.

**Treat Eurasian Hoopoe *Upupa epops* as more than one species: (b) split *marginata***

**YES.** Distinctive morphology and very distinct vocalizations point to species status. This also brings us in line with global lists for an extralimital species. I am strongly in favor of adopting Common Hoopoe for *epops*. "Eurasian" is wholly inappropriate for a species that is also widespread in Africa. I agree with adopting Madagascar Hoopoe for *marginata*.

**YES.** I support this split as *marginata* simply cannot be conspecific with *epops* given its strikingly different song. I am in favor of changing the English name from Eurasian Hoopoe to Common Hoopoe, and adopting the name Madagascar Hoopoe for *U. marginata* (for reasons stated in the proposal).

**YES.** Again, my vote is mostly due to the very clear vocal differences, and at least some evidence that *epops* mostly does not respond to playback of *marginata*. I agree with adopting Common Hoopoe for *epops* and Madagascar Hoopoe for *marginata*.

**YES.** Vocal differences support the split of *marginata* from *epops*. Common Hoopoe is a better English name for *U. epops* than Eurasian Hoopoe, considering the species also inhabits Africa. For reasons in the proposal, adopt the English name Madagascar Hoopoe for *U. marginata*.

**YES.** There is enough evidence to split *marginata* from *U. epops*. Common Hoopoe is better than Eurasian Hoopoe. I agree with the proposal for the common English name Madagascar Hoopoe for *U. marginata*.

**YES.** I am in favor of splitting *marginata* from *U. epops* due to song differences and some evidence that *upops* does not usually respond to the song of *marginata*. I agree with changing the name from Eurasian Hoopoe to Common Hoopoe, and with adopting the name Madagascar Hoopoe for *U. marginata*.

**YES.** Vocal differences. Common Hoopoe for clarity.

**YES.** This split is better supported. I agree with Common Hoopoe and Madagascar Hoopoe.

**YES.** I vote in favor based mainly on vocal differences. Common Hoopoe is a more accurate name geographically. Clinal differences and lack of vocal differences make splitting African birds as their own species unacceptable. I learned that from the St. Helena monograph (BOU Monograph No. 16) that there was an extinct endemic Hoopoe there (*Upupa antaios*, St. Helena Hoopoe). Fossil deposits were obtained at Prosperous Bay and older deposits at Dry Gut. It is suggested that it was a relatively large and poor flyer. It is also suggested that the introduction of mammals, specifically domestic cats, caused its extinction. The holotype (an incomplete skeleton) is at the USNM (No. 175936); other paratypes are there as well.

---

**2025-D-4**

**Add three species to the Checklist and six species to the U.S. list**

**YES.** 6 without comment.

**YES.** For *Monticola solitarius*, *Anarhynchus alexandrinus*, and *Accipiter nisus*, the identification is established (albeit a tough identification for the latter two), and I have no concerns regarding origin. Note that there is a second accepted record of *Anarhynchus alexandrinus* from Connecticut. Following the 2016 record that the ABA CLC reconsidered and ultimately accepted, there is an additional record of two birds on Adak in winter 2024-2025 that are unequivocally *A. nisus*.

Regarding the species new to the United States, *Leucophaeus modestus* is relatively straightforward. *Hydrobates cheimomnestes* is acceptable to me based on the tracking data. It clearly occurs in the United States, even if we're unable to identify it with confidence in the field. *Carduelis carduelis* is clearly established and the population is spreading, so it is acceptable to add to the USA list. *Vanellus chilensis*, *Milvago chimachima*, and *Volatinia jacarina* all have concerns regarding origin, but none showed obvious signs of captivity, and are either prone to vagrancy (the former two) or were in wild areas with appropriate habitat (the *Volatinia*). The burden of proof falls on these being captive birds. I've heard some concerns regarding the lapwing, but these are spreading north, and lapwings in general wander widely, especially in the Old World, so I don't see why we shouldn't expect the same of *chilensis*. For the caracara, there is now a spate of records in areas where one would expect the species to occur if headed north from their native range, including Texas, Florida, and Jamaica. This also mirrors the pattern of vagrancy shown by Crested Caracara when they first expanded northward on the Pacific coast of the United States.

I note that we need to change the genus of the caracara, as *Milvago* is embedded within *Daptrius*.

**YES.** These records are all accepted by the ABA CLC.

**YES.** These records have been accepted by ABA CLC and seem robust.

**YES.** All records acceptable and accepted by ABA CLC.