

## Taxonomic Recommendations

**Important: species texts have been attributed to the TCs by the chairman. TCs have not taken responsibility for the texts, unless the texts are followed by the name of an author. Texts, which are not followed by the name of an author, however, have been circulated up to fourteen times among all TCs, providing ample opportunity to react to those willing to contribute in a constructive way. The Recommendations have been compiled by Gunter De Smet.**

### Part one: non-passeriformes

#### **Egyptian Goose** *Alopochen aegyptiaca*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2000b).

**Common Teal** *Anas crecca* to be treated as two species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a):

- Common Teal *Anas crecca* (polytypic: *A. c. crecca*; extralimital: *A. c. nimia*)
- Green-winged Teal *Anas carolinensis* (monotypic)

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

#### **Willow Ptarmigan** *Lagopus lagopus*

Notice the correct spelling of *Lagopus lagopus scotica* (incl. *hibernica*), *Lagopus lagopus variegata* and *Lagopus lagopus rossica* (David & Gosselin 2002b).

#### **Rock Ptarmigan** *Lagopus muta*

Notice the correct spelling of *Lagopus muta pyrenaica*, *Lagopus muta helvetica*, *Lagopus muta muta* (incl. *alpina*, *scandinavica*), *Lagopus muta hyperborea* (incl. *hemileucura*) and *Lagopus muta pleskei* (incl. *transbaicalica*) (David & Gosselin 2002b).

**Red-throated Diver** *Gavia stellata* (monotypic, incl. *G. s. 'squamata'*) remains as is.

CSNA Red-throated Diver is treated as monotypic by De Korte (1972) because greyish edges to mantle feathers supposedly typical of *G. s. 'squamata'* in summer plumage (Svalbard and Franz Josefland) are variable and do not warrant subspecific recognition (see Cramp & Simmons 1977, Sangster et al. 1997). The BOURC TSC (e.g. Knox 1992) regards Red-throated Diver as polytypic. When TCs have different opinions on subspecies, the AERC TAC follows the choice of BWP as status quo.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A	A		A

**Black-throated Diver** *Gavia arctica* to be treated as two species:

- Black-throated Diver *Gavia arctica* (polytypic: *G. a. arctica*; extralimital: *G. a. viridigularis*)
- Pacific Diver *Gavia pacifica* (monotypic)

CAF There are no records of *G. pacifica* in the Western Palearctic. All committees and individual taxonomists who stated an opinion are in favour of the split; mind that the BOURC TSC still keeps this decision pending. [Pacific Diver is already treated as a separate species in the Swedish Holarctic checklist (SOF 1995), which serves as a base for considerations by the STC.] On that basis, it is accepted by the AERC TAC. *G. pacifica* is widely sympatric with *G. a. viridigularis* in E Siberia, with sometimes pairs of both breeding on the same pond (Kistchinski 1978, pp 24–27, Portenko 1981, Stepanyan 1975, p 9, Il'icev & Flint 1985, pp 224–225). Both species have also been reported breeding sympatrically in W Alaska (Bailey 1943, Douglas & Sowl 1993, Gabrielson & Lincoln 1959). Bailey (1943) and Storer (1978) reported specimens suggesting hybridisation between the two species, but the occasional hybridisation between Black-throated Diver and Great Northern Diver *G. immer* is also documented (Hunter & Dennis 1972, Robertson & Fraker 1974). Both species differ in structural, postural and plumage characters. Differences in vocalisations between *G. arctica* and *G. pacifica* are mentioned by Il'icev & Flint (1985), p 224, and can be heard on sound recordings (e.g. Vepintsev 1982). We are not aware of any molecular studies on *G. pacifica*.

Treated as a full species by the AOU. We would like to thank O. van Rootselaar for updating and kindly allowing to use his summary of the taxonomic history of black-throated divers on the internet (<http://www.birder.com/science/taxonomychat/0434.html>) and to J. Van Impe for providing additional comments.

ID: Birch & Lee (1995), Evanich (1977/8), Jonsson (1996), Kaufman (1990), McCaskie et al. (1990), Roberson (1989), Schulenberg (1989) and Walsh (1988).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as 'semi- or allospecies'.

**Black-browed Albatross** *Diomedea melanophris* to be renamed *Thalassarche melanophris* (polytypic; *T. m. melanophris*; extralimital Campbell Islands Albatross *T. m. impavida*)

**BOURC TSC** *Diomedea melanophris* becomes *Thalassarche melanophris* (Nunn et al. 1996, Sangster et al. 2002b). Cramp & Simmons (1977) treated Black-browed Albatross as a polytypic species (nominate and *T. m. impavida*) but (erroneously?) treated as monotypic by Knox (1992). These two taxa may be considered as 'allospecies'. Sympatric breeding, however, has been recorded on the Campbell Islands, where less than 30 pairs of *melanophris* breed among 26,000 pairs of *impavida*. 'Occasional interbreeding with Campbell Islands Albatross occurs, but with little success. This perhaps indicates that the "allospecies" may be a "biological species" and it is possible that further study will improve this assumption' (Russ & Shirihai 2000; see Shirihai & Jarrett 2002 for a considerably more detailed discussion). Phenotypically, adult Campbell Islands Albatross is well differentiated from nominate *melanophris* by (1) honey-coloured iris, (2) heavier black eyebrow (particularly in front of the eye), (3) usually more extensively dark underwing. Some seabirds have been split on account of less obvious phenotypical differences than these two taxa. As this issue has not yet been actively discussed within the AERC TAC, however, both taxa are provisionally retained in *T. melanophris* here. Additional comments on albatross genera are announced (Penhallurick & Wink in press). Relationships amongst the *melanophris* – *impavida* – *chrysostrama* complex have been studied by Burg & Croxall (2001) using mtDNA and microsatellites. Their genetic analyses support the classification of *T. impavida* as being distinct from *T. melanophris*, but would also suggest splitting *T. melanophris* into two groups: Falkland Islands, and Diego Ramirez/South Georgia/Kerguelen.

ID: For a recent treatment of the identification of Blackbrowed Albatross, cf. Jiguet (2000).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A*	A*	A*	A*	A*

(\*) Systematic position of (sub)species remains to be studied.

**Yellow-nosed Albatross** *Diomedea chlororhynchos* to be renamed *Thalassarche chlororhynchos* (polytypic; *T. c. chlororhynchos*; extralimital: *T. c. carteri*)

**BOURC TSC** See Nunn et al. 1996 and Sangster et al. 2002b for arguments supporting this generic change. Robertson & Nunn (1998) proposed to recognise Atlantic Yellow-nosed *chlororhynchos* and Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross *carteri* as species. See Shirihai & Jarret (2002) for some discussion concerning the names *bassi* and *carteri*, which both appear to be available for the Indian Ocean form. According to Robertson (2002), who examined the type specimens of *carteri* Rothschild 1903 and *bassi* Mathews 1912, these two represent the same taxon. Hence *carteri* has priority and *bassi* should be dropped as a junior synonym. The AERC TAC has not yet discussed whether Yellow-nosed Albatross should remain a single species or be split into two species.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A*	A*	A*	A*	A*

(\*) Systematic position of (sub)species remains to be studied.

**Shy Albatross** *Diomedea cauta* to be renamed *Thalassarche cauta* (polytypic; *T. c. cauta*; extralimital: *T. c. steadi* (?), *salvini*, *eremita*)

**BOURC TSC** See Nunn et al. (1996) and Sangster et al. (2002b) for the change in generic name. Robertson & Nunn (1998) proposed to split Shy Albatross into a number of species (without providing scientific data in support of their rearrangement). Russ & Shirihai (2000) regarded these as 'allospecies' and named these Shy Mollymawk *T. [c.] cauta*, White-capped Mollymawk *T. [c.] steadi*, Salvin's Mollymawk *T. [c.] salvini* and Chatham Islands Mollymawk *T. [c.] eremita*. S. Bartle, curator of birds in the Te Papa National Museum,

New Zealand, maintains that the Tasmanian form *steadi* cannot be reliably identified in museum collections and no convincing evidence on its separation has yet been published. According to a molecular study by Abbott & Double (2003a) the taxonomic separation of Shy (*cauta*) and White-capped (*steadi*) Albatrosses from Salvin's (*salvini*) and Chatham (*eremita*) Albatrosses is clearly justified, whereas the taxonomic classification within Shy and White-capped albatrosses remains unresolved. This implies that two species are justified within *T. cauta* s.l.: *T. cauta* (including *T. c. cauta* and *T. c. steadi* for the time being) and *T. salvini* (provisionally including *T. s. salvini* and *T. s. eremita*). Abbott & Double (2003b) further investigated genetic structure within the *cauta* / *steadi* complex using microsatellites. Although they argue for specific status of these forms, their data show low very level of divergence between *cauta* and *steadi* (typical of populations within species) and indicate that *cauta* was recently founded by colonisation from *steadi*. Their result are in fact consistent with a recent divergence of *cauta* and *steadi* and a lack/low-level of contemporary gene flow as a result of geographic isolation, a situation typical of intraspecific population structure rather than speciation. These taxa are thus better treated as conspecific. As the AERC TAC has not yet actively addressed this issue, all four taxa are provisionally combined in *T. cauta* here.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A*	A*	A*	A*	A*

(\*) Systematic position of (sub)species remains to be studied.

**Soft-plumaged Petrel** *Pterodroma mollis* complex to be treated as three species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a):

- Soft-plumaged Petrel *Pterodroma mollis* (monotypic; extralimital)
- Fea's Petrel *Pterodroma feae* (monotypic, incl. '*deserta*')
- Zino's Petrel *Pterodroma madeira* (monotypic)

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Black-capped Petrel** *Pterodroma hasitata* to be treated as two species:

- Bermuda Petrel *Pterodroma cahow* (monotypic)
- Black-capped Petrel *Pterodroma hasitata* (monotypic)

STC Voous (1973) treated Bermuda Petrel (locally known as Cahow) as a subspecies of Black-capped Petrel *P. hasitata*. Bermuda Petrel, however, appears to be more closely related to Fea's Petrel *P. feae* than to *P. hasitata* (e.g. Nunn & Stanley 1998) and is now widely recognised as a distinct species. In the Western Palearctic, Bermuda Petrel has been recorded once (*Birding World* 16: 22, 2003) and Black-capped Petrel four times (Howell 2002). The BOURC TSC has not considered this split.

ID: The identification of Bermuda Petrel is treated by Wingate et al. (1998).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A		A	A

**Manx Shearwater** *Puffinus puffinus* to be treated as six species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a):

- Manx Shearwater *Puffinus puffinus* (monotypic)
- Yelkouan Shearwater *Puffinus yelkouan* (monotypic)
- Balearic Shearwater *Puffinus mauretanicus* (monotypic)
- Black-vented Shearwater *Puffinus opisthomelas* (monotypic; extralimital)
- Fluttering Shearwater *Puffinus gavia* (monotypic; extralimital)
- Hutton's Shearwater *Puffinus huttoni* (monotypic; extralimital)

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Northern Gannet** *Sula bassana* becomes *Morus bassanus* (monotypic)

**Cape Gannet** *Sula capensis* becomes *Morus capensis* (monotypic)

CAF Some arguments have been put forward recently to recognise several genera in the family Sulidae. From BOURC (1991): 'An osteological study of the boobies *Sula* and the gannets *Morus* has revealed differences between the two groups sufficient to warrant generic separation (van Tets et al. 1988; see also Olson & Warheit 1988)'. Sangster et al. (1997) presents additional reasons. HBW, on the other hand, advocates keeping one genus only for all Sulidae. A recent phylogenetic study by Friesen & Anderson

(1997), based on mtDNA sequencing, produced a strongly supported, and thus probably reliable, phylogenetic tree. Three main lineages were recovered: the gannets (*bassana*, *capensis*, and *serrator*), the boobies (*dactylatra*, *leucogaster*, *nebouxii*, *sula*, and *variegata*) and the Abbott's booby (*abbotti*), which is clearly more closely related to the gannets than the true boobies. These three lineages correspond to the three genera advocated by BOURC (1991). Approximate dating of the speciation events in Sulidae by Friesen & Anderson (1997) suggest that the current species within gannets and boobies originated within the last 3 million years, whereas the three main lineages diverged between 14 million years ago (*abbotti* from the gannets) and 23 million years ago (gannets + *abbotti* from boobies). These three lineages are thus well-supported monophyletic groups that diverged a long time ago. Three nomenclatural options are possible for the family Sulidae: (a) to retain all species in one genus (*Sula*), (b) to recognise three genera: *Sula* for the true boobies (including *granti*, recently elevated to species rank), *Morus* for the gannets and *Papasula* for *abbotti* or (c) a two-genera treatment (i.e., with *Morus abbotti*). All options are in agreement with the evolution of the group and are thus valid on scientific grounds. Based on the fact that the three main lineages within Sulidae diverged a long time ago, we recommend adopting the 'three genera' option. Keeping all Sulidae species in the genus *Sula* does not recognise the ecological, behavioural and morphological diversification of the Sulidae. Furthermore, the age of these lineages is more compatible with a treatment as different genera, since keeping in the same genus some species that diverged more than 20 million years ago would be unusual based on current treatment of other avian groups. Furthermore, since many authorities have accepted *Morus* as a full genus (including AOU) it might be best to follow for the sake of homogeneity. Notice that the AOU has accepted *Sula* (in 1886, 1895 and 1910), next *Morus* Leach 1816 (in 1931), then *Morus Vieillot* 1816 (in 1957), again *Sula* in 1983 and eventually *Morus* once more in 1998. (P.-A. Crochet)

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	R	A

**Pygmy Cormorant** *Phalacrocorax pygmeus* (monotypic) remains as is

**Shag** *Phalacrocorax aristotelis* (polytypic: *P. a. aristotelis*, *desmarestii*, *riggenbacchi*) remains as is

No changes in cormorant genera.

CAF Siegel-Causey (1988) proposed to recognise nine genera of cormorants and shags based on a phylogenetic analysis of morphological characters. Kennedy et al. (2000), based on mtDNA sequencing, re-evaluated the evolutionary hypotheses of Siegel-Causey and found them to be mostly unsupported. They have a limited species sampling, however, and many of the basal relationships they found are not well supported. The evolutionary relationships among cormorants and shags are thus at present poorly understood, but the classification of Siegel-Causey is clearly unreliable. The genus *Stictocarbo* in particular is clearly polyphyletic as defined by Siegel-Causey. Furthermore, the level of sequence divergence among cormorants and shags is not unusual for intra-generic divergence in birds. Even if several genera can be recognised among cormorants and shags, it is recommended not to propose any generic splitting until a reliable picture of the evolution of the group is available. This is why Kennedy et al. state: 'Given the lack of resolution and the levels of sequence divergence we favour a conservative approach [...]. Until a more robust and complete phylogeny is available the use of the single genus *Phalacrocorax* appears sensible [...].' We recommend following this treatment for the time being. The AOU has always maintained all North American cormorant species in *Phalacrocorax*. (P.-A. Crochet)

Note: next to *Ph. pygmeus*, used by Voous (1973, 1977c), the spelling *Ph. pygmaeus* is often encountered. M. Gosselin commented: 'A difficult case, since *pygmeus* could be considered a lapsus calami for *pygmaeus* (but since *pygmaeus* is a Latin word, *pygmeus* is not an incorrect transliteration or latinisation) [...] but I don't think it would be a good idea. On the other hand, if *pygmeus* is not considered a lapsus calami, the only reason why the emended *pygmaeus* would be correct would be if it were in prevailing usage, which is probably not the case.' See also <http://www.zoonomen.net/>, where *pygmaeus* is considered an unjustified emendation. We thus retain the original spelling here, *Pelecanus pygmeus* (Pallas 1773).

(M. Gosselin; *this remark is not the responsibility of CAF or P.-A. Crochet, as none of us has the competence to comment on this purely nomenclatural problem*).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
	A	R	A	A

**Dwarf Bittern** *Ardeirallus sturmii* becomes *Ixobrychus sturmii*

CSNA Dwarf Bittern is currently placed in the monotypic genus *Ardeirallus* based on reduced sexual dimorphism compared to species placed in *Ixobrychus* and behavioural and ecological differences with species generally placed in *Ixobrychus* (Verheyen 1959, Curry-Lindahl 1971). However, the validity of these reasons has been questioned (Payne & Risley 1976). Cladistic analysis of osteological characters (Payne & Risley 1976), and re-analysis of this data set (McCracken & Sheldon 1998), indicate that Dwarf Bittern appears to be nested within the *Ixobrychus* clade. Therefore, Dwarf Bittern is placed in *Ixobrychus* and becomes *Ixobrychus sturmii*. (George Sangster; see full account in appendix 3)

Vernacular name: Sturm's Bittern may be a better name than Dwarf Bittern, as *I. sturmii* is not the smallest species of bittern (not even in Africa).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
Ø	A	A	A	A

**Striated Heron** *Butorides striata* to be treated as two species:

- Striated Heron *Butorides striata* (polytypic: *B. s. striata*, *brevipes*; extralimital – in alphabetical order: *B. s. actophila*, *albolimbata*, *amurensis*, *atricapilla*, *chloriceps*, *crawfordi*, *degens*, *idenburgi*, *javanica*, *macrorhyncha*, *moluccarum*, *papuensis*, *patruelis*, *rhizophorae*, *rutenbergi*, *solomonensis*, *spodiogaster*, *stagnatilis*)
- Green Heron *Butorides virescens* (polytypic: *B. v. virescens*; extralimital: *B. v. anthonyi*, *frazari*, *maculata*)

STC *Butorides* Blyth, 1852, was first established in combination with the feminine adjective *javanica*, and is thus feminine. In order to comply with the gender agreement rules to avian species-group names, the adjective *striatus*, *-a*, *-um* must have the feminine ending *-a* in this case (David & Gosselin 2002b). The split of *B. striata* and *B. virescens* was already accepted by Voous (1973) – the starting point of the AERC TAC list – and is accepted unanimously by the AERC TAC. Furthermore, it is already treated as a separate species in the Swedish Holarctic checklist (SOF 1995). Hartert (1920) took the view that *virescens* and *striata* should be regarded as conspecific. In North America, Monroe and Browning (1992) reanalysed the taxonomy of *Butorides* and concluded that *B. striata* and *B. virescens* were separate species; AOU (1993) adopted this change. Previously, Payne (1974) had lumped *striata* and *virescens*, and North American populations were regarded as Green-Backed Heron *B. striata*. Hayes (2002) reanalysed Payne's data and found an increased variability and intermediacy in the contact zone implying extensive hybridisation. However, the presence of apparently pure *B. virescens* and *B. striata* phenotypes within the contact zone suggests that assortative mating does occur, supporting the treatment of the two forms as distinct species. Lava Heron *B. sundevalli* is also considered a distinct species by Hayes (2002): the persistence of pure *B. sundevalli* in a potential hybrid zone on the Galápagos Islands supports its treatment as a distinct species. Dowsett & Dowsett-Lemaire (1980) pp 152–153 recognised *Butorides* as distinct from *Ardeola* but DNA-DNA hybridisation data are inconclusive (Sibley & Monroe 1990). A review of all the taxa is lacking. The number of recognised subspecies within the *Butorides* complex varies from source to source, e.g. 37 in Howard & Moore (1980), 30 according to Payne (1979), adopted by Hancock & Kushlan (1984), and 25 in Dickinson (2003) – which is the latest version of the *Howard & Moore Checklist* (the most recent source is followed here for convenience; mind, however, that the AERC TAC did not examine the subspecific limits within the entire complex). A record of *B. s. amurensis* in Norway was placed in category D and is therefore not included in the Western Palearctic list.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as 'semi- or allospecies'.

**Little Blue Heron** *Hydranassa caerulea* becomes *Egretta caerulea*

**Black Heron** *Hydranassa ardesiaca* becomes *Egretta ardesiaca*

**Tricoloured Heron** *Hydranassa tricolor* becomes *Egretta tricolor*

CSNA Throughout history, names of heron genera have often changed. In the checklists of the American Ornithologists' Union, Little Blue Heron was named *Ardea coerulea* in 1886, *Ardea caerulea* in 1895, *Florida caerulea* in 1910 and *Egretta caerulea* in 1983; Tricoloured Heron was named *Ardea tricolor* in 1886, *Hydranassa tricolor* in 1910 and *Egretta tricolor* in 1983. (Source: <http://members.aol.com/darwinpage/zoo/AOUa.htm>). Bock (1956) very tentatively placed Black Heron in *Hydranassa*, and Irwin (1975) supported this treatment. Dickerman & Parkes (1968) considered that the

characters used to separate *Hydranassa* (breeding plumes) were highly adaptive. Recent authors have merged *Hydranassa* in *Egretta* (e.g. Dowsett & Dowsett-Lemaire 1980). Although Black Heron was not covered in the phylogenetic study of Ardeidae by Sheldon (1987b), it may be preferable to merge *Hydranassa* with *Egretta* to reduce the number of genera but genus size is still largely a matter of taste. For heron systematics see Curry-Lindahl (1971) and Payne & Risley (1976). Sheldon (1987b) supplied DNA-DNA hybridisation data, which support the inclusion of the genus *Hydranassa* in *Egretta* (e.g. the close relationship between *E. caerulea* and *E. thula*) (see also Sheldon 1987a and Sheldon et al. 2000). Bolman et al. (submitted) may be particularly interesting, as they provide ‘a highly resolved and biologically sensible tree’ in which *thula* is sister to *caerulea*, and *tricolor* is basal to both ((*Egretta thula*, *E. caerulea*), *E. tricolor*). Hence, a taxon regrouping *caerulea* and *tricolor* but excluding *thula* would be paraphyletic, and this would be strong evidence against the validity of *Hydranassa* sensu Voous. For a hybrid between Little Blue Heron and Snowy Egret *E. thula*, see Sprunt (1982). Without gene flow, hybridisation has no influence on the specific status of birds under the BSC. Even when hybrids are fertile and when they mate with one or both of the parent species, they can be biological species if the fitness (reproductive success) is much less than in the parent species.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
∅	A		A	A

**White Stork** *Ciconia ciconia* to be treated as two species:

- White Stork *Ciconia ciconia* (polytypic; *C. c. ciconia*; extralimital: *C. c. asiatica*)
- Oriental White Stork *Ciconia boyciana* (monotypic; extralimital)

In the Palearctic, three forms of white storks are generally accepted, being

1. *ciconia* (Linnaeus) 1758 (Europe and N Africa)
2. *asiatica* Severtzov 1873 [Vaurie gives: 1872] (C Asia in Afghanistan and Turkestan)
3. *boyciana* Swinhoe 1873 (NE Asia and Japan)

The latter honours Robert Henry Boyce (1834–1909), civil servant in Shanghai, China. The taxonomic status of Oriental White Stork *C. boyciana* has been a matter of debate for a long time [see Vaurie (1965, p 85), Kahl 1972a, b, King 1981, Neufeldt & Wunderlich 1982, Creutz (1988, p 18), Hancock et al. (1992, pp 107–108)]. Howard & Moore (1980) included *boyciana* in *ciconia*, based on Peters (1931), Kahl (1971, 1972b) and Kahl & Schüz (1972, *Vogelwarte* 26). Walters (1981) also included *boyciana* in *ciconia*, but with the remark that ‘*Ciconia boyciana* Swinhoe, of Amurland, Korea and Japan, is sometimes separated’. Howard & Moore (1991, p 17) separated *boyciana* as Oriental White Stork, referring to note ‘23.2’ (p xvi): ‘Hancock, J. 1989. pers. comm.’. Subsequently, Beaman (1994, p 65: Taxonomic notes) only commented ‘Now frequently treated as specifically distinct [e.g. Sibley & Monroe (1990, p 317), Stepanyan (1990, pp 41–42)] due to significant morphological differences (including black bill colouration)’. White Stork and Oriental White Stork are allopatric, but so closely related that they could be considered a ‘superspecies’ (Amadon 1966). There are, however, significant morphological (e.g. body size, culmen and tarsus length, bare parts colouration – both in adults and nestlings – and plumage) and behavioural differences, e.g. up-down and threat up-down displays (King 1988, Archibald & Schmitt 1991). On account of these differences, the white storks are now widely treated as two species. (Text by O. van Rootselaar.)

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A		A*	A

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Greater Flamingo** *Phoenicopterus ruber* to be treated as three species:

- Caribbean Flamingo *Phoenicopterus ruber* (monotypic)
- Greater Flamingo *Phoenicopterus roseus* (monotypic)
- Chilean Flamingo *Phoenicopterus chilensis* (monotypic)

**BOURC TSC** Greater Flamingo *Ph. roseus*, Caribbean Flamingo *Ph. ruber* and Chilean Flamingo *Ph. chilensis* are well-marked taxa, which are best treated as separate species (cf. Hazevoet 1995, Sangster 1997, Sangster et al. 1999) based on (1) distinct morphological differences, (2) qualitative differences in plumage and bill pattern, colouration of legs (e.g., van den Berg 1987b, Treep 1994, Sangster 1997a), (3) different displays and (4) vocalisations (Studer-Thiersch 1964, 1974 and 1975). This split is accepted unanimously by the AERC TAC.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC



<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>
----------	----------	----------	-----------	----------

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Honey Buzzard** *Pernis apivorus* to be treated as two species:

- European Honey Buzzard *Pernis apivorus* (monotypic)
- Crested Honey Buzzard *Pernis ptilorhyncus* (polytypic: *P. p. orientalis*; extralimital: *P. p. ruficollis, torquatus, ptilorhyncus, palawanensis, philippensis*)

**A.J. Helbig** The AERC TAC did not discuss this split as it is already accepted by Voous (1973). Crested Honey Buzzard is also treated as a separate species in the Swedish Holarctic checklist (SOF 1995). Although the two are alleged occasionally to interbreed west of the Yenisey, they differ constantly in wing shape and emargination, foot size, crest development, and wing and tail markings (Ferguson-Lees & Christie 2001). Reports of intermediate birds are few and could in many cases refer to individual variation rather than hybrids. The variation within *P. ptilorhyncus* requires further study. It is sometimes proposed that there should perhaps be a further division between the Japanese/Siberian *orientalis* and the variably crested *ptilorhyncus* forms of SE Asia. Incidentally, the variable crests are thought to be adaptations for mimicking the local hawk eagles *Spizaetus* (van Balen et al. 1999; Edelstam & King in Ferguson-Lees & Christie 2001). The variation among the mainly sedentary taxa is also insufficiently studied. The molecular phylogeny of *Pernis* is currently being investigated by Haring & Gamauf (in prep.) of the Research Group of Molecular Systematics, Museum of Natural History Vienna. Helbig (unpublished) also sequenced mtDNA of *P. ptilorhyncus orientalis* and found an important divergence from *P. apivorus*. Within the *P. ptilorhyncus* complex, genetic diversity is highest in the south-east (M. Riesing in litt.).

Note: besides *ptilorhyncus*, the emended *ptilorhynchus* is also regularly encountered. *Ptilorhynchus* is clearly not an ‘incorrect original spelling’, as incorrect transliterations or latinisations are not to be considered inadvertent errors (ICZN Art. 32.5.1). Therefore, the only reason why the emended ‘*ptilorhynchus*’ would be correct would be if it were in ‘prevailing usage’ [=substantial majority of the most recent authors, cf. ICZN Glossary + Art. 33.3.1], which is probably not the case (M. Gosselin in litt.).

ID: The identification of Crested Honey Buzzard is treated by e.g. Forsman (1994), Porter et al. (1996) and Clark (1999); for Honey Buzzard, see e.g. Forsman & Shirihai (1997) and Forsman (1999).

<b>BOURC TSC</b>	<b>CAF</b>	<b>CSNA</b>	<b>A.J. Helbig</b>	<b>STC</b>
<b>P</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>

**Steppe Eagle** *Aquila rapax* to be treated as two species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a):

- Tawny Eagle *Aquila rapax* (polytypic: *A. r. belisarius*; extralimital: *A. r. vindhiana* and *rapax*)
- Steppe Eagle *Aquila nipalensis* (polytypic: *A. n. nipalensis* and *orientalis*)

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Imperial Eagle** *Aquila heliaca* to be treated as two species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a):

- Imperial Eagle *Aquila heliaca* (monotypic)
- Spanish Imperial Eagle *Aquila adalberti* (monotypic)

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Red-footed Falcon** *Falco vespertinus* to be treated as two species:

- Red-footed Falcon *Falco vespertinus* (monotypic)
- Amur Falcon *Falco amurensis* (monotypic)

**STC** This split was not discussed by the AERC TAC as it was already accepted by Voous (1973). Although Voous (1973) recognised *F. amurensis* as a species, he stated ‘sometimes treated as conspecific with *F. vespertinus* (author’s preference)’. Amur Falcon is treated as a separate species in the Swedish Holarctic checklist (SOF 1995). There is a wide consensus on the specific status of Amur Falcon among recent authors, e.g. Cramp et al. (1980), del Hoyo et al. (1994), Ferguson-Lees & Christie (2001). Amur Falcon differs significantly in plumage from Red-footed Falcon, while their breeding ranges are disjunct and their wintering ranges (in southern Africa) largely discrete. General papers on the phylogeny of Falconidae are Seibold et al. (1993) and Griffiths (1999).

ID: Identification of Red-footed Falcon is treated by Forsman (1995, 1999), Amur Falcon by Corso et al. (1998, 2000) and Corso & Catley (in prep.). Amur Falcon was recently added to the Western Palearctic list (Corso & Dennis 1998).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Small Buttonquail** *Turnix sylvaticus sylvaticus*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002b).

**Allen’s Gallinule** *Porphyryula alleni* suggested by Olson (1973) to become *Porphyrio alleni*

**Purple Gallinule** *Porphyryula martinica* suggested by Olson (1973) to become *Porphyrio martinica*

**A.J. Helbig** The generic change is based on Olson (1973) and is compatible with a molecular study (Trewick 1997; but note the limited taxon sampling), followed by Banks et al. (2002). Olson (1973), while advocating the lump, nevertheless stated that ‘because the three species of *Porphyryula* are more closely related to each other than to *Porphyrio* a case could be made for maintaining them as a subgenus’. He apparently accepted the validity of *Porphyryula* as a taxon, and an a priori notion of ‘what a genus should be’ is the only reason that led him to merge it with *Porphyrio*. Results in Trewick (1997) do not make this change mandatory (the only change to appear mandatory in their paper is that their ‘*Gallinula martinica*’ should be switched to another genus, but this genus could be *Porphyryula*, as well as *Porphyrio*). Incidentally, *Porphyryula* and *Porphyrio* are also both found to be reciprocally monophyletic by Livezey (1998), though some prefer to disregard this type of study. It seems that in this case, the most widely supported decision is based on a rather arbitrary decision (L. Raty in litt.).

Sibley and Monroe have accepted *Porphyrio martinicus* as a noun in apposition. N. David writes (on zoonomen.net) ‘that *Porphyrio* is masculine. The word martinicensis is definitely adjectival (masculine and feminine; neuter: martinicense) but *martinica* appears a noun in apposition (a place name), as the several African place names combined with *Cisticola*. *Porphyrio martinica* may be correct. The original name *martinica* and several others, e.g. *dominica*, *cajanea*, *guinea*, etc. are problematic. They must be studied together, and I plan to do that in the near future. Note, however, that the suffix -us, -a, -um is adjectival when added to a noun ending with a consonant (e.g., hainanus, -a, -um, from Hainan). Thus, *martinicus* could be viewed as a modified noun, not as an adjective. But I am not yet 100% sure.’ M. Gosselin commented that he believes that *Porphyrio martinica* is the correct name. ‘Where the author of a species-group name did not indicate whether he regarded it as a noun or as an adjective, and where it may be regarded as either and the evidence of usage is not decisive, it is to be treated as a noun in apposition to the name of its genus [ICZN 1999, Art. 31.2.2].’ There is no clear evidence of what Linnaeus intended when he created *Fulica martinica*, but he did use “Martinica” as a country name in his book. So, *martinica* can certainly be a noun [but also an adjective, i.e. “pertaining to Martin”]; the evidence of usage is not decisive [Ridgway quotes just as many *martinica* as *martinicus* in combination with *Porphyrio* and *Ionornis*], therefore it is to be treated as a noun in apposition.’ The AOU has accepted *Porphyrio martinica* (Banks et al. 2002). The AERC TAC accepts this generic change (accepted by at least three TCs and the AOU).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
	A		A	A

**Demoiselle Crane** *Anthropoides virgo* becomes *Grus virgo*

**CAF** Two studies using totally independent genetic data (cytochrome *b* sequences of mtDNA by Krajewski & Fetzner 1994, Krajewski & King 1996; DNA-DNA hybridisation of total nuclear DNA by Krajewski 1989, see also Ingold et al. 1989) address the question of phylogenetic relationships among cranes. Both studies fail to fully resolve the relationships among crane species groups, but in both studies the genus *Anthropoides* is included in the clade formed by species of cranes currently classified as *Grus*. In none of the recovered trees *Anthropoides* and *Grus* form reciprocally monophyletic clades. Given that these studies are based on independent data, this conclusion can be considered as very reliable. A classification as currently accepted, with *virgo* in one genus and *grus*, *canadensis*, and *leucogeranus* in another genus, thus does not reflect cranes evolution. The option favoured by the AERC TAC is thus to merge *Anthropoides* with *Grus* (as proposed by Krajewski 1989). The alternative choice to give genus rank to all species groups of cranes (a) would require to determine precisely the relationships of all species, (b) would require to find the genus



name available for every species group and (c) would result in many changes as only *Grus grus* would remain in the genus *Grus*. For the time being, this option is thus rejected.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
	A		A	A

**Houbara Bustard** *Chlamydotis undulata* to be treated as two species:

- Houbara Bustard *Chlamydotis undulata* (polytypic: *C. u. undulata* and *fuertaventurae*)
- Macqueen's Bustard *Chlamydotis macqueenii* (monotypic)

CSNA Gaucher et al. (1996) suggested splitting these taxa. Sangster (1996b) commented on the reasons supporting the split and Knox et al. (2002) summarised why the BOURC TSC accepted this split. General papers on bustard phylogeny include Pitra et al. (2002) and Broders et al. (2003). This split was accepted unanimously by the AERC TAC.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as 'semi- or allospecies'.

**Lesser Golden Plover** *Pluvialis fulva* to be treated as two species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a)

- American Golden Plover *Pluvialis dominica* (monotypic)
- Pacific Golden Plover *Pluvialis fulva* (monotypic)

Rationale: Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Sociable Lapwing** *Chettusia gregaria* becomes *Vanellus gregarius*

CSNA cf. BOURC (1996) and Sangster et al. (1997).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A	A

**White-tailed Lapwing** *Chettusia leucura* becomes *Vanellus leucurus*

CSNA cf. BOURC (1996) and Sangster et al. (1997)

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A	A

**Stilt Sandpiper** *Micropalama himantopus* suggested by Jehl (1968) to become *Calidris himantopus*.

**Andreas Helbig** Based on morphological, behavioural and molecular studies, Stilt Sandpiper is better placed in *Calidris* (Jehl 1968 *San Diego Soc. Nat. Hist. Memoir* No. 3; Jehl 1973; Borowik & Mc Lennan 1999). This generic change is supported by at least three TCs and the AOU, hence accepted by the AERC TAC. A.J. Helbig, however, commented: 'Inclusion of *Micropalama* into *Calidris* (as advocated by AOU 1998) is insufficiently supported by molecular data (see low bootstrap values). Plumage of downy young shows similarities to *Calidris*, but does not prove *Micropalama* to be nested within *Calidris*. I therefore retain *Micropalama* until better evidence for relationships within this group becomes available'. The majority of the AERC TAC prefers the alternative not to use *Micropalama* until there is strong evidence that it is NOT in *Calidris*. The genus *Calidris* clearly needs more research. Stilt Sandpiper is provisionally placed after Curlew Sandpiper *C. ferruginea*.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A		R	A

**Common Snipe** *Gallinago gallinago* suggested to be treated as seven species:

- Common Snipe *Gallinago gallinago* (polytypic: *G. g. gallinago*, *faeroeensis*)
- Wilson's Snipe *Gallinago delicata* (monotypic)
- African Snipe *Gallinago nigripennis* (polytypic; extralimital *G. n. nigripennis*, *angolensis*)
- Madagascar Snipe *Gallinago macrodactyla* (monotypic; extralimital)

- Paraguayan Snipe *Gallinago paraguaiiae* (monotypic; extralimital)
- Magellan Snipe *Gallinago magellanica* (monotypic; extralimital)
- Puna Snipe *Gallinago andina* (monotypic; extralimital)

**BOURC TSC** Wilson's Snipe is best treated as a separate species based on slight differences in morphology (Miller 1996) and clear differences in vocalisations (Thönen 1969). Genetic differences between *gallinago* and *delicata* are discussed by Zink et al. (1995). They found a single DNA restriction site difference and a very low *p*-value between U.S. and Russian haplotypes ( $p = 0.006$ ) Further sampling is required, however, to discern if there is a discrete mtDNA boundary between these taxa. The 'drumming' made by tail-feathers during display flight is clearly different between *gallinago* and *delicata*. The BOURC TSC is preparing a file on these taxa. Sangster et al. (1998) summarised the reasons for accepting this split: 'Common Snipe and Wilson's Snipe *G. delicata* are specifically distinct (cf. Olsson 1987, Gantlett et al. 1996) based on qualitative differences in morphology, vocalisations and drumming display (Thönen 1969, Cramp & Simmons 1983, Olsson 1987, Carey & Olsson 1995, Miller 1996a, 1996b, Gibson & Kessel 1997). Pending further analysis, *faeroeensis* and *gallinago* are provisionally retained as conspecific (cf. Miller 1996b). African Snipe *G. nigripennis*, Madagascar Snipe *G. macrodactyla*, Paraguayan Snipe *G. paraguaiiae*, Magellan Snipe *G. magellanica* and Puna Snipe *G. andina* are specifically distinct from Common Snipe based on qualitative differences in morphology, vocalisations, and drumming display (Tuck 1972, Sutton 1981, Hayman et al. 1986, Fjeldså & Krabbe 1990, del Hoyo et al. 1996). The AOU recognised Wilson's Snipe as a species in 2002 (Banks et al. 2002).

ID: The following papers or notes on field identification of Wilson's versus Common Snipe have been published in *Birding World*: Bland (1998), Bland (1999) and Leader (1999).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A*	A	A**	A*

(\*) Split of *gallinago* and *delicata* accepted, no opinion on the other taxa.

(\*\*) Accepted as 'semi- or allospecies'.

### Spotted Sandpiper *Actitis macularius*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002b).

### Red Phalarope *Phalaropus fulicarius*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2000; David & Gosselin 2002a; contra e.g. Parkes 1982, del Hoyo et al. 1996 and Sangster et al. 1997).

**Herring Gull *Larus argentatus*** proposed to be treated as six species by Yésou (2002):

- Herring Gull *Larus argentatus* (polytypic: *L. a. argenteus*, *argentatus*)
- American Herring Gull *Larus smithsonianus* (monotypic)
- East Siberian Gull *Larus vegae* (polytypic; extralimital: *L. v. vegae* and *mongolicus*)
- Caspian Gull *Larus cachinnans* (monotypic)
- Yellow-legged Gull *Larus michahellis* (polytypic: *L. m. atlantis*, *michahellis*)
- Armenian Gull *Larus armenicus* (monotypic)

**CAF** Yésou (2002) offers the most complete recent summary on the taxonomy of the *Larus argentatus* - *cachinnans* - *fuscus* complex. This complex has received a lot of attention by dedicated gull watchers and scientists alike; some of the unpublished results have been presented during lectures at the so-called International Gull Meetings (IGM). The AERC TAC follows P. Yésou's treatment of Caspian Gull *L. cachinnans*, Yellow-legged Gull *L. michahellis*, Armenian Gull *L. armenicus*, East Siberian Gull (*L. vegae*; extralimital; polytypic: *L. v. vegae* – incl. 'birulai' – and *L. v. mongolicus*) and American Herring Gull (*L. smithsonianus*). (Texts on *Larus argentatus* complex by P.-A. Crochet and P. Yésou.)

### Herring Gull *Larus argentatus*

There is a lot of geographical variation within *Larus argentatus* s.s. (*L. a. argenteus*, *argentatus*). We have a valid name for one end of the variation (*argenteus*), but the variation within the rest of the Herring Gulls s.s. is at least as wide: *argentatus* from e.g. N Norway are more different from the Baltic birds than the latter are from *argenteus*. There are very few analyses covering the whole *argentatus* range. Nothing much has been added since Berth (1968). Such a variation leaves room for speculation, and as there is one poorly defined

name ('*omissus*'), there is a temptation to use it in different ways by different authors. Until more research has been done, '*omissus*' should better be considered as a synonym of *argentatus*.

**American Herring Gull *L. smithsonianus***

American Herring Gull *smithsonianus* is clearly distinct in mtDNA from *argentatus* / *argenteus* (Crochet et al. 2002) and more closely related to *vegae* (A. Helbig in litt.). It is also distinct in all plumages, with differences being more pronounced in juvenile and immature plumages (e.g. Adriaens & Mactavish in press; Lonergan & Mullarney in press) and in vocalisations (Frings et al. 1958). The similarity of adult plumage between *smithsonianus* and *argentatus* / *argenteus* is probably a result of convergence and does not reflect true relationships. For identification of American Herring Gull, see e.g. Sibley (2000) and Jonsson & Mactavish (2001).

The geographical variation within *smithsonianus* still needs to be thoroughly described, but appears in some ways similar to the variation (*argentatus* / *argenteus*) in Europe (Jonsson & Mactavish 2001; Adriaens & Mactavish in press).

ID: Two important papers on the identification of American Herring Gull are submitted (Adriaens & Mactavish in press; Lonergan & Mullarney in press).

Is *Larus smithsonianus* a distinct species?

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A	A	A	P*

(\*) The STC believes that *smithsonianus* is separate from *argentatus* / *argenteus*, but is not clear about its relation to *vegae* and/or *mongolicus*, hence its hesitation to split further.

**Caspian Gull *Larus cachinnans***

**Yellow-legged Gull *Larus michahellis***

**Armenian Gull *Larus armenicus***

See Liebers et al. (2001) and Yésou (2002) for reasons to treat these three taxa as non-conspecific. Reasons to treat *michahellis* as distinct from *argentatus* are summarised in Crochet et al. (2002) and Yésou (2002).

The key point in the context of the AERC TAC is whether the southeastern end of *argentatus* variation has something to do with *cachinnans* or not. Some authors believe in clinal variation between *argentatus* and *cachinnans* (e.g. Voipio 1954, Panov & Monzиков 1999), whereas others do not (e.g. Stegmann 1934). The latter opinion is part of some kind of consensus among western European gull-watchers and taxonomists.

Unpublished genetic results (Pons & Crochet, Liebers, Helbig, et al.) indicate that *argentatus* and *cachinnans* are not more closely related than other large gull species. On the basis of phylogenetic relationships, they should thus be treated as different species. The current uncertainties originate from reports of hybridisation between *argentatus* and *cachinnans* in E Europe. It is certain that hybridisation occurs quite extensively at least in some colonies, but the extent of intergradation remains unknown. The current situation (in Poland at least) corresponds to a recent secondary contact with mainly pure phenotypes of *argentatus* and *cachinnans* and a significant proportion of hybrids (Neubauer, Zagalska, Gay et al. in prep). Studies of the amount of pre- and post-zygotic isolation and the genetic consequences of hybridisation (in term of intergradation) are under way.

Panov & Monzиков (1999) claim that the pattern of variation from *argentatus* to *cachinnans* corresponds to a broad zone of intergradation. There is however little support in their data for this interpretation. Results based on morphometry and colouration are based on populations, not individuals: there is thus no way to interpret their results as intergradation (homogeneous populations of intermediate specimens) or sympatric occurrence of various proportion of *argentatus* and *cachinnans*. Results based on DNA (RAPD markers) are difficult to understand and, as for morphology, mix all individual within populations: they are thus unable to demonstrate intergradation. More convincing evidence of the existence of hybrid individuals comes from the study of vocalisations: a significant proportion of specimens from Rybinsk Reservoir are really intermediate in vocalisations between *argentatus* (Gulf of Finland, Barents, Sea, White Sea) and *cachinnans* (S Caspian Sea). Their data on vocalisations, however, clearly show two clusters of points (*cachinnans* and *argentatus*) with no overlap and a small number of intermediate birds. Their findings are thus in agreement with the observations on the Polish colonies that hybrids between *argentatus* and *cachinnans* occur frequently but that variation is not continuous. There is thus no indication of extensive intergradation between both taxa, and based on amount of divergence in behaviour, vocalisations, morphology, and on their phylogenetic relationships, *argentatus* and *cachinnans* are best treated as valid species.

Is *Larus cachinnans* a distinct species?

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC

<b>P</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

**Atlantic Yellow-legged Gull *L. m. atlantis***

**‘Cantábrican’ (or Galician) Yellow-legged Gull *L. m. ssp. (lusitanius?)***

Yésou (2002) postulated that ‘it is wise to restrict the name of *atlantis* to the birds breeding in the Azores, as Dwight originally did, pending the results of further research on the phenotypic and genetic variations within *michahellis*.’ Dubois (2001b) stated that ‘the form *atlantis* was first described from the Azores (Dwight 1922),...’ Thereby, both misquoted Dwight (1922): in the original description of *atlantis*, he included two specimens from the Canaries.

There seems to be some variation among gulls breeding in the Azores and the Canary Islands and Madeira (Dubois 2001). Pending further studies, it is best to keep all these populations in *atlantis*. The range of *atlantis* is sometimes extended to the Iberian Atlantic coasts (de Knijff et al. 2001, Liebers et al. 2001). Although birds from Atlantic Iberia are distinct from Mediterranean birds (Pons et al., submitted), they have not been compared to birds from the Atlantic Islands yet. It is possible that birds from the N Atlantic Iberian coasts constitute another subspecies. In that case, this subspecies should probably be named *lusitanius* Joiris, 1978. This name is based on a very poor description of birds seen in the harbour of Peniche (close to the Berlengas Islands). As the name is available, however, it may be recommended to designate a neotype collected on the Berlengas Islands (A. Dubois pers. comm.). If birds from the Berlengas belong to *atlantis* or to *michahellis*, *lusitanius* would become a synonym of one of these names. If not, the name *lusitanius* would be the valid name of the Atlantic Iberian subspecies.

Is *L. michahellis* (incl. *L. m. michahellis* and *atlantis*) a distinct species?

<b>BOURC TSC</b>	<b>CAF</b>	<b>CSNA</b>	<b>A.J. Helbig</b>	<b>STC</b>
	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>

(\* Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Armenian Gull *Larus armenicus***

See Liebers & Helbig (1999), Liebers et al. (2001) and Yésou (2002) for a review of the reasons to elevate Armenian Gull to species rank.

<b>BOURC TSC</b>	<b>CAF</b>	<b>CSNA</b>	<b>A.J. Helbig</b>	<b>STC</b>
	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>

(\* Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**When combining all votes on the six-fold split (see 2.13), the following result is obtained:**

<b>BOURC TSC</b>	<b>CAF</b>	<b>CSNA</b>	<b>A.J. Helbig</b>	<b>STC</b>
<b>P</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>

**Gull-billed Tern *Gelochelidon nilotica* becomes *Sterna nilotica***

**STC** cf. BOURC (1996). See Sangster et al. (1999) for reasons for maintaining *Gelochelidon*. The majority of the AERC TAC believes, however, that it would not be logical to maintain *Gelochelidon* for *Sterna nilotica* while species as distinct as Little Tern *S. albifrons* and Caspian Tern *S. caspia* are all kept in *Sterna* (*Sterna* would then probably become paraphyletic). If *Gelochelidon* is recognised at genus level, it would then seem logical to elevate other subgenera to genus rank as well (e.g. *Thalasseus*, *Sternula*). Note, however, that keeping a distinct *Chlidonias* while merging all other terns in *Sterna* might not be a valid option either. A revision of all Sternini is urgently required. This generic change is accepted by four TCs and the AOU, and is therefore accepted by the AERC TAC.

<b>BOURC TSC</b>	<b>CAF</b>	<b>CSNA</b>	<b>A.J. Helbig</b>	<b>STC</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>

**Whiskered Tern *Chlidonias hybrida hybrida***

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002a,b).

**Marbled Murrelet *Brachyramphus marmoratus* to be treated as two species:**

- Marbled Murrelet *Brachyramphus marmoratus* (monotypic; extralimital)
- Long-billed Murrelet *Brachyramphus perdix* (monotypic; one record in the Western Palearctic)

CSNA Molecular data from Zink et al. (1995) show that the degree of differentiation between *B. perdix* and *B. marmoratus* is comparable to that between well-differentiated species. Friesen et al. (1996) provided evidence from cytochrome *b* sequences and allozymes to recognise *B. perdix* as a distinct species, a conclusion fully supported by sequences of nuclear genes showing long-term reproductive isolation of both taxa (Friesen et al. 1997). Marbled and Long-billed Murrelets also differ in plumage and in size. Long-billed Murrelet occurs through the Sea of Okhotsk and the Kamchatka Peninsula. The split was accepted by the American Ornithologists' Union in 1998 (AOU 1998). Long-billed Murrelet has been recorded once in the Western Palearctic: a first-winter was found dead in a fishing net in Lake Zurich, Switzerland, between 15th and 18th December 1997 (Maumary & Knaus 2000). Its occurrence in North America is discussed by Sealy et al. (1982).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
∅	A	A	A*	A

(\* ) Accepted as 'semi- or allospecies'.

**Parakeet Auklet** *Cyclorhynchus psittacula* becomes *Aethia psittacula* (cf. Strauch 1985)

STC This treatment has been suggested on the base of morphological and ecological characters by Strauch (1985), and based on mtDNA sequences by Moum et al. (1994). Molecular evidence presented by Friesen et al. (1996) shows that Parakeet Auklet should be included in the genus *Aethia* (but the authors did not make this suggestion themselves).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
∅	A		A	A

**Pin-tailed Sandgrouse** *Pterocles alchata caudacutus*

Notice the correct spelling. *Alchata* is a Latin transliteration of the Arabic name of the sandgrouse (cf. Jobling 1991), and is thus invariable. Del Hoyo (1997) has it right: *P. alchata caudacutus* (M. Gosselin in litt.).

**Brown Fish Owl** *Ketupa zeylonensis* becomes *Bubo zeylonensis* (Wink & Heidrich 1999)

**Snowy Owl** *Nyctea scandiaca* becomes *Bubo scandiacus* (Wink & Heidrich 1999)

A.J. Helbig Both Brown Fish Owl and Snowy Owl are derived within *Bubo* (Wink & Heidrich 1999; Wink & Heidrich 2000), thus subsumed in that genus. Furthermore, osteology does not support the separation of *Nyctea* from *Bubo* (Ford 1967). Some differences between *Nyctea* and *Bubo* are believed to be adaptations to the Arctic environment. The generic change of Snowy Owl is also supported by the AOU (Banks et al. *Auk* 120 (3): 922-931, 2003). Chewing lice (Phthiraptera) of the species *Strigiphilus ketupae* occur in Brown Fish Owl, Philippine Eagle-Owl *B. philippensis* and Barred Eagle-Owl *B. sumatranus*; furthermore, Brown Fish Owl and Barred Eagle-Owl are both hosts to *Colpocephalum turbinatum*, possibly supporting a close relationship between these owls (Dalglish 2003). The bare legs of fish owls are conspicuous, and this feature is usually correlated with their fish-catching habits; but certainly other owls that are not known to catch fish present much the same character.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A		A	P

**Chimney Swift** *Chaetura pelagica* treat as monotypic (BOURC 1991)

The only reason to include this species is that is not included in BWP IV, so a starting point is needed for the subspecific treatment. This is not a problem, as the species is universally regarded as monotypic (including the AOU).

**Pied Kingfisher** *Ceryle rudis syriacus*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002b). Re. *syriacus*, Kasperek (1996) placed a good rationale not to accept this taxon. G. Kirwan will be considering *syriacus* as a synonym in his forthcoming book on Turkish birds.

**Blue-cheeked Bee-eater** *Merops superciliosus* to be treated as three species:

- Blue-cheeked Bee-eater *Merops persicus* (polytypic: *M. p. chrysocercus*, *persicus*; range: N Africa and Middle East to NW India)

- Olive Bee-eater *Merops superciliosus* (polytypic; extralimital: *M. s. superciliosus* and *alternans* – according to Fry in del Hoyo et al. 2001; different treatments have been proposed; range: southern Africa, E Africa, Madagascar and Comoro Islands)
- Blue-tailed Bee-eater *Merops philippinus* (polytypic; extralimital: *M. ph. philippinus*, *celebensis* and *salvadorii*; range: N Pakistan, SW Asia to New Guinea and New Britain)

CSNA Considered as distinct species, based on well-established plumage characters by e.g. Fry in Snow (1978), Glutz von Blotzheim & Bauer (1980), Fry (1984), van den Berg (1987a), CINFO (1993), Clements (4th and 5th edition), Sibley & Monroe (1993, 1996) and Sangster et al. (1997). Although Blue-cheeked Bee-eater (*M. persicus*; polytypic: *M. p. chrysocercus*, *persicus*) is widely accepted by recent authors, Olive (or Madagascar) Bee-eater *M. superciliosus* has been treated in various ways. Fry et al. (1992) combined Madagascar Bee-eater and Blue-tailed Bee-eater in a single species *M. superciliosus* (polytypic; extralimital; *M. s. philippinus*, *superciliosus* and *alternans*) and considered that Blue-tailed and Blue-cheeked Bee-eaters are distinct species, because they do not hybridise where they meet in breeding grounds in NW India. Voous (1977c), the starting point for the AERC TAC, did not mention *M. philippinus* in his Holarctic list and included *persicus* in *M. superciliosus*. Fry in del Hoyo et al. (2001), however, recognised a polytypic Olive Bee-eater *M. superciliosus* (no longer named Madagascar Bee-eater, because it is also breeding elsewhere; *M. s. superciliosus* and *alternans*) and a monotypic Blue-tailed Bee-eater (*M. philippinus*). This split is recognised by all TCs.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A*	A**	A

(\*) Formally accepted by CSNA based on qualitative morphological differences by Sangster et al. (1997), p 24.

(\*\*) Accepted as *Merops [superciliosus] persicus* under the superspecies concept.

**Green Woodpecker *Picus viridis* complex to be treated as two species:**

- European Green Woodpecker *Picus viridis* (polytypic: *P. v. viridis*, *karelini*, *sharpei*; extralimital: *P. v. innominatus*)
- Levaillant's Green Woodpecker *Picus vaillantii* (monotypic)

CAF The split of *viridis* and *vaillantii* was not discussed as it was already accepted by Voous (1973). Levaillant's Green Woodpecker is already treated as a separate species in the Swedish Holarctic checklist (SOF 1995) as well.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A	A

Remark: Recently (31 July 2003), a threefold split was proposed to the AERC TAC. The AERC TAC has, however, not yet examined this option: 'Iberian Green Woodpecker *P. sharpei*, is best treated as a separate species based on differences in plumage, morphology and vocalisation with limited intergradation (Winkler et al. 1995). A study of museum specimens in the contact area between *sharpei* and *viridis* in S France (Beuzart 1997) analysed 13 plumage characters in 21 male specimens from Spain, S France and C/N France. Specimens from Hérault department (n=2) do not differ from pure *viridis* from N and C France, whereas specimens from Aude department (next to the South) (n = 3) are not separable from pure *sharpei* from Barcelona area. Two specimens from E Pyrenees are outside the variation of *sharpei* and show characters of *viridis*: they are certainly hybrids or intergrades. This pattern of variation (more pure phenotypes than intergrades, abrupt passage from pure *sharpei* to pure *viridis* over a narrow zone without geographical barrier) is typical of (incomplete) reproductive isolation and indicates that the best treatment for *sharpei* is to split it from *viridis*.' Sound recordings of *vaillantii*, *sharpei* and *viridis* can all be found on Schulze (2003) (P.-A. Crochet).

## Part two: Passeriformes

[Chestnut-headed Sparrow-Lark *Eremopterix signatus harrisoni*]



Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002b). This species was considered as most likely erroneously recorded in the Western Palearctic by Beaman & Madge (1998), p 849. The single observer record in Israel is, however, still accepted by the IRDC (see Shirihai 1999; G. Kirwan in litt.).

**Bar-tailed Lark** *Ammomanes cinctura*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002b).

**Common House Martin** *Delichon urbicum urbicum*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002b).

**Richard's Pipit** *Anthus novaeseelandiae* to be treated as four species:

- **Richard's Pipit** *Anthus richardi* (monotypic – according to Alström & Mild 2003)
- **Grassland Pipit** *Anthus cinnamomeus* (polytypic; extralimital: *A. c. cameroonensis*, *lynesi*, *stabilis*, *cinnamomeus*, *annae*, *eximius*, *lacuum*, *spurium*, *itombwensis*, *lichenya* incl. 'katangae', *rufuloides*, *bocagei* and *grotei* – according to Clancey (1986); many different treatments have been proposed)
- **Paddyfield Pipit** *Anthus rufulus* (polytypic; extralimital: *A. r. rufulus*, *malayensis* – according to Alström & Mild 2003; see also Mayr & Greenway 1960)
- **Australian/New Zealand Pipit** *Anthus novaeseelandiae* (polytypic; extralimital: *australis* group: *A. n. exiguus*, *rogersi*, *subaustralis*, *bilbali*, *australis*, *bistriatus*; *novaeseelandiae* group: *A. n. reischeki*, *novaeseelandiae*, *chathamensis*, *aucklandicus*, *steindachneri*)

**STC** At least the above four taxa are specifically distinct, based on qualitative differences in plumage and vocalisations (cf. Devillers 1980, p 138, Glutz von Blotzheim & Bauer 1985 and references cited therein, Sangster et al. 1997, Schodde & Mason 1999). A number of taxa have been proposed to be split further, e.g. Grassland Pipit *A. cinnamomeus* and Cameroon Pipit *A. cameroonensis* (Clancey 1978), including four montane forms, one of which, Mountain Pipit *A. hoeschi* was later shown to be a distinct species. Initially, Jackson's Pipit *A. latistriatus* was also believed by some authors to be part of the Grassland Pipit complex, but was later accepted as a distinct species (Prigogine 1981, Clancey 1984). Clancey (1986) recognised no less than 13 subspecies of *A. cinnamomeus*; the taxonomic relationships within Grassland Pipit need more research. More research is also needed in Paddyfield Pipit *A. rufulus* (particularly the island populations) and in the Australasian taxa (*australis* / *novaeseelandiae*). Richard's Pipit *A. richardi* was considered as a distinct species by Dement'ev & Gladkov (1954), Stresemann (1959), Stresemann & Stresemann (1968), Kozlova (1975), Devillers (1980) and most subsequent authors. Voelker's phylogeny (1999) based on mtDNA sequence data indicated three independent origins for this complex. Alström & Mild (2003), however, believe that this complex is monophyletic, and that it consists of at least four separate lineages (the *cinnamomeus* group, the *richardi* group, the *rufulus* group and the *australis* / *novaeseelandiae* group) which they provisionally treat as four separate species (a treatment first proposed by Kozlova 1975). Alström and Mild (2003) describe geographic variation within *A. richardi*, which is, however, in their opinion insufficient to recognise several subspecies.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A	A	A	A

**Water Pipit** *Anthus spinoletta* to be treated as three species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a)

- **Water Pipit** *Anthus spinoletta* (polytypic: *A. s. spinoletta*, *coutellii*; extralimital: *A. s. blakistoni*)
- **Rock Pipit** *Anthus petrosus* (polytypic: *A. p. petrosus* incl. 'meinertzhageni' and 'kleinschmidti' and *A. p. littoralis*)
- **Buff-bellied Pipit** *Anthus rubescens* (polytypic: *A. r. rubescens* and *japonicus*; extralimital: *A. r. geophilus*, *alticola*, *pacificus*)

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Güldenstädt's Redstart** *Phoenicurus erythrogastrus*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002a).

### **Eversmann's Redstart** *Phoenicurus erythronotus*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002b).

### **Common Stonechat** *Saxicola torquatus*

Notice the correct spelling of *torquatus*, *variegatus*, *armenicus* and *maurus* (David & Gosselin 2002b).

### **Black-eared Wheatear** *Oenanthe hispanica* complex to be treated as three species:

- Black-eared Wheatear *Oenanthe hispanica* (polytypic: *Oe. h. hispanica* and *melanoleuca*)
- Pied Wheatear *Oenanthe pleschanka* (monotypic)
- Cyprus Wheatear *Oenanthe cypriaca* (monotypic)

### **Black-eared Wheatear** *Oenanthe hispanica*

The STC pointed out that the forms *Oe. h. melanoleuca* and *Oe. h. hispanica* seem to be connected by a wide zone of intermediates in e.g. S Bulgaria and the N Balkans. The CSNA commented that the intergradation zone of *Oe. hispanica* and *Oe. pleschanka* is 1000 km wide (Haffer 1977) and there is no evidence of reproductive isolation (Panov et al. 1994). The existence of a wide zone of intermediates should not be cited as the basis for lumping *melanoleuca*, but ignored in the case of *Oe. hispanica* and *Oe. pleschanka* (G. Sangster in litt.). L. Svensson agrees, and specifies that the intergradation zones between *Oe. pleschanka* and *Oe. hispanica* have been extensively studied, whereas that of *Oe. h. hispanica* and *Oe. h. melanoleuca* not. Hence, he advocates pending due to this.

### **Pied Wheatear** *Oenanthe pleschanka*

Pied Wheatear is already treated as separate species in the Swedish Holarctic checklist (SOF 1995). The BOURC commented on the taxonomic status of Pied and Black-eared Wheatears in its 13th report (BOURC 1988): Haffer (1977) presented detailed information on the hybridisation of these two species in Iran. Recent work by Panov (1986, 1999) on the W coast of the Caspian Sea has emphasised the extent to which these taxa interbreed and the variety of plumages found in the resulting hybrids. However, *Oe. pleschanka* and *Oe. hispanica* are largely parapatric with limited areas of contact.' G. Sangster added 'but where they meet, they show introgressive hybridisation without evidence for reproductive isolation.' Pied and Black-eared Wheatears are poorly differentiated acoustically; in playback experiments, they react to each other's songs. G. Sangster then asked: 'Why still consider them as species if this is the case?' whereupon L. Svensson replied: 'I agree that same or extremely similar song should make us very cautious before we split. However, taxonomy (or speciation) is complex, and in a few cases the song does not seem to be as important for upholding largely distinct species, as witnessed by Yellowhammer *Emberiza citrinella* and Pine Bunting *E. leucocephalos*, Red-headed *E. bruniceps* and Black-headed Buntings *E. melanocephala*, Willow *Parus montanus* and Songar Tits *P. songarus*, and others. Habitat choice, altitude, breeding season, mating behaviour etc. can sometimes be enough, while selection has apparently not (yet) developed distinct songs.'

Further reading:

Panov, N. & Ivanitzky, V.V. (1975) Evolutionary and taxonomic relations between *Oenanthe hispanica* and *Oe. pleschanka*. *Zool. Zhurn.* 54: 1860-1873.

### **Cyprus Wheatear** *Oenanthe cypriaca*

Christensen (1974) and Sluys & van den Berg (1982), who examined plumages, behaviour, food, moult and biometry, split it from Pied Wheatear on these criteria, a view followed by Svensson (1992). Cyprus Wheatear is treated as separate species in the Swedish Holarctic checklist (SOF 1995). Cramp et al. (1988) and Keith et al. (1992), however, treated it as a subspecies, with the latter stating that the differences in biometrics, plumage and song between Pied Wheatear and Cyprus Wheatear are no greater than those sometimes shown by races of other species. The songs of Cyprus Wheatear and Pied Wheatear, however, are very different. Cyprus Wheatear has a very distinct cicada- or grasshopper-like, monotonous buzzing song, whereas the song of Pied Wheatear is a more varied, partly musical, more often dry twittering, often with mimicry interwoven, although it may rarely begin with a *cypriaca*-like 'bizz... bizz...' (Cramp 1988, Svensson et al. 1999).

ID: For identification of wheatears in general, see Clement & Harris (1987a, b). Following useful identification papers on the *Oenanthe hispanica* complex, listed by topic, were published in *Dutch Birding*: (1) *Oenanthe h. hispanica* and *Oe. h. melanoleuca* (Ullman 2003); (2) *Oenanthe pleschanka* (Small 1994; Ullman 1994) and (3) *Oenanthe cypriaca* (Small 1994; Flint 1995 *Brit. Birds* 88: 230-241).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A*	A**	A

(\*) Both the CSNA and (\*\*) A.J. Helbig split *Oenanthe hispanica* further into *melanoleuca* and *hispanica* (regarded as ‘allospecies’ by Helbig, however); Helbig (in litt.) includes the taxa *hispanica*, *melanoleuca*, *pleschanka* and *cypriaca* in the ‘superspecies’ *Oenanthe [hispanica]*.

**Red-tailed Wheatear** *Oenanthe xanthopyrmyna* to be treated as two species:

- Kurdish Wheatear *Oenanthe xanthopyrmyna* (monotypic)
- Red-tailed Wheatear *Oenanthe chrysopygia* (monotypic)

**A.J. Helbig** According to the STC, Red-tailed Wheatear is best treated as a separate species based on marked differences in morphology, incl. absence of sexual dimorphism. Kurdish Wheatear was found breeding in the 1980s in SE Turkey (Helbig 1984, Kumerlovee et al. 1984, Kasperek 1986, and Roselaar 1995); the distinctive male has a dark chestnut rump, white sides to the tail-base and a dark throat, whereas Red-tailed Wheatear from Transcaucasia lacks white on tail and dark throat. Some intergradation is said to occur and measurements and structure are similar, hence Vaurie (1949) *Amer. Mus. Novitat.* 1425 and C.S. Roselaar in Cramp et al. (1988) included these taxa in a single polytypic species. Dubois (2000) observed an ‘intermediate’ male on 5 March 2000 in the Hilleh area, Iran. This individual had the black throat of *Oe. xanthopyrmyna*, but the ‘red-cornered’ tail of *chrysopygia*. Such birds are sometimes separated as ‘*cummingsi*’ (Withaker 1899) and are stated to occur in the overlap zone, but a rufous tail may be normal for some pure *Oe. xanthopyrmyna* (Roselaar in Cramp et al. 1988), so the tail observed by Dubois has limited weight as an argument (L. Svensson pers. comm.). Although they are said to interbreed, the supposed characters of the hybrid are also found in some first year birds of *Oe. xanthopyrmyna* (Bates 1935, Helbig 1984, Roselaar 1995). Ivanov (1941) already advocated splitting the species. See also Stepanyan (1971). Panov (1999) considered them to form a superspecies. L. Svensson commented: ‘In my opinion, based on the examination of fairly long series of skins, and of seeing a few of both taxa in the field, these two are much more distinct than the various forms of *Oe. lugens*, and I maintain that such distinct taxa with so few positively known intermediates should easily qualify as separate species. Due to the fact that some *xanthopyrmyna*, notably females and some immature males, have reddish tail base, it is quite possible that the incidence of hybrids or intermediates has been exaggerated in the past. I think one needs now to take a critical new look at all claimed intergrades.’ As to the English names, alternatively, ‘Persian Wheatear’ could be used for *chrysopygia* (more in line with ‘Kurdish Wheatear’) (L. Svensson pers. comm.).

ID: Clement & Harris (1987a,b)

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
∅	A	P	A*	A*

(\*) Accepted as ‘allospecies’.

**Grey-cheeked Thrush** *Catharus minimus* to be split in two species:

- Grey-cheeked Thrush *Catharus minimus* (polytypic: *C. m. minimus*, *aliciae*)
- Bicknell’s Thrush *Catharus bicknelli* (monotypic; extralimital)

**CAF** cf. BOURC (1996). Grey-cheeked Thrush is (erroneously) considered monotypic by Dubois et al. (2000), an official reference for the CAF.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A		A*	A

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Zitting Cisticola** *Cisticola juncidis neuroticus*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002b).

**Paddyfield Warbler** *Acrocephalus agricola* to be treated as two species:

- Paddyfield Warbler *Acrocephalus agricola* (polytypic: *A. a. septimus*, *capistratus*; extralimital *A. a. agricola*)
- Manchurian Reed Warbler *Acrocephalus tangorum* (monotypic; extralimital)

**STC** Manchurian Reed Warbler *A. tangorum* is specifically distinct based on divergence in mtDNA (Leisler et al. 1997, Helbig & Seibold 1999) and qualitative differences in plumage (described by Alström et al. 1991, Lekagul & Round 1991 and Round 1994, but still treated as a subspecies of Paddyfield Warbler *A. agricola* in these publications). In fact DNA phylogeny not only shows that it is a good species, but that its closest relative is Blunt-winged Warbler *A. concinens*, not Paddyfield Warbler *A. agricola* as previously thought (Leisler et al. 1997). The genetic distance between *A. tangorum* and *A. agricola* (cytochrome *b*) is 7.7–7.9% (compare this to 7–8% between *A. palustris* and the *scirpaceus* group but only 1.6–2.5% between *fuscus* and *scirpaceus*) (Helbig & Seibold 1999). Note that Alström et al. (1991) did not actually propose a split, although all three authors are now in favour of this (Alström in litt.; Round 2000).

Sangster et al. (1997) accepted the split of *tangorum*, but did not consider *septimus* and *capistratus* as valid races of *A. agricola*. *A. a. agricola* from Kazakhstan and *septimus* from Crimea, Ukraine, are phenotypically highly similar, but their mtDNA sequences are divergent by as much as 4.5%; *septimus* might therefore be considered as a cryptic species but this needs independent confirmation (Leisler et al. 1997; Sangster 1997b). Pending further research, Paddyfield Warbler is therefore still considered a polytypic species here. Lars Svensson commented: ‘I have not been able to recognise more than one subspecies of *agricola* on morphology. Thus, I apparently agree with Sangster (1997).’

ID: Alström et al. (1991), Lekagul & Round (1991), Round (1994).

Should *A. agricola* be treated as monotypic?

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
		<b>A</b>		<b>A</b>

Does your TC accept the split of *A. agricola* and *A. tangorum*?

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Great Reed Warbler** *Acrocephalus arundinaceus* to be treated as three species:

- Basra Reed Warbler *Acrocephalus griseldis* (monotypic)
- Great Reed Warbler *Acrocephalus arundinaceus* (polytypic: *A. a. arundinaceus* and *zarudnyi*)
- Oriental Reed Warbler *Acrocephalus orientalis* (monotypic)

**A.J. Helbig** Basra Reed Warbler is already considered a separate species in the Swedish Holarctic checklist (SOF 1995). Pearson & Backhurst (1988) first clarified the characters and taxonomic position of Basra Reed Warbler. Leisler et al. (1997) discuss molecular data confirming the species status of *A. griseldis* and its basal position among the large reed warblers. The species Great Reed Warbler was suggested by Helbig & Seibold (1999) not to be monophyletic (see also Helbig 2000). *A. a. arundinaceus* and the poorly differentiated *A. a. zarudnyi* are more closely related to the different forms of Clamorous Reed Warbler *A. stentoreus* than to Basra Reed Warbler *A. griseldis*. Oriental Reed Warbler is best treated as a separate species based on differences in morphology, including juvenile plumage. Leisler et al. (1997) showed that it is genetically more closely related to Clamorous Reed Warbler *A. stentoreus* than to Great Reed Warbler *A. arundinaceus*. It is treated as a full species by e.g. Sibley & Monroe (1990), Howard & Moore (1991). For additional reading on the taxonomy of the complex of large reed warblers, see Salomonsen (1929), Stresemann & Arnold (1949), Cramp (1992) and Shirihai (1995). Ezaki (1984), Svensson (1992) and King (1996) described the moult of Oriental Reed Warbler.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Olivaceous Warbler** *Hippolais pallida* to be treated as two species:

- Eastern Olivaceous Warbler *Hippolais pallida* (polytypic: *H. p. reiseri*, *pallida*, *laeneni* and *elaeica*)
- Western Olivaceous Warbler *Hippolais opaca* (monotypic)

**STC** Olivaceous Warbler is best treated as two separate species based on clear differences in morphology, vocalisation, behaviour (Svensson 2001a) and genetic data (Helbig & Seibold 1999, Ottosson et al., in prep.). In spite of parapatric ranges in NW Africa, intermediates are unknown (Roselaar, in Cramp et al. 1992,

Svensson 2001). All taxa of the Eastern Olivaceous Warbler have a cyclic, scratchy-voiced song, and they all dip their tail down frequently. The Western Olivaceous Warbler has a more pleasing and varied song, like a slower version of *H. polyglotta*, and it does not dip its tail downwards. Bill-shape and some other biometric differences make it possible to distinguish all individuals in the hand. Recent DNA data (Ottosson et al., in prep.) show that all four subspecies of *pallida* have very similar genetic composition, whereas *opaca* differs markedly. – Sangster (1997b) proposed to include the small *Hippolais* warblers in the genus *Acrocephalus*. Helbig (2001) contradicted this as the classification based on cytochrome *b* sequences in Leisler et al. (1997) and Helbig & Seibold (1999) is only supported by poor bootstrapping (58%). This implies a possible error margin of over 40%. It is therefore not clear whether the small *Hippolais* are more closely related to *Acrocephalus* than to *Hippolais* but this may well be the case. [L. Svensson: ‘It seems unwise to move them to *Acrocephalus*, since this is not a perfect arrangement either. You gain some things but lose others. Square tail with whitish sides, a broad bill base, these are traits, which unite the *Hippolais*. For stability, the present order is better kept. Michael Walters (pers. comm.) has pointed at the egg patterns, which are similar for all the present *Hippolais*, but apparently slightly different for the *Acrocephalus*.’] (L. Svensson)

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Booted Warbler *Hippolais caligata*** to be treated as two species:

- Booted Warbler *Hippolais caligata* (monotypic)
- Sykes’s Warbler *Hippolais rama* (monotypic)

STC Sykes’s Warbler is best treated as a separate species based on differences in morphology, song, ecology, genetic data and partly sympatric breeding ranges (Svensson 2001a). Although both species are morphologically at times extremely similar (however separable in the hand to 99%), they differ in song and can invariably be separated on that. They are true cryptic species which are best told on vocalisation and habitat choice, *caligata* breeding in low scrub on steppe or steppe-like habitats, *rama* in sand or clay deserts with dense *Saxaul* or *Tamarix* vegetation. They have recently (Svensson 2001a) been found to apparently breed sympatrically in a part of the range (S Kazakhstan). Also in this year (May 2003) were *rama* found to sing north of Lake Balkhash, and *caligata* south of it. – The CSNA split this species in 1998 based on PSC (Sangster et al. 1998), and BOURC did so in 2002 (Knox et al. 2002). This split was accepted unanimously by the AERC TAC. Previously, Sykes’s Warbler was regarded as a separate species, mainly based on morphology, by Sykes (1832), Hartert (1910), Stepanyan (1978 & 1983), Haffer in Glutz & Bauer (1991), Sibley & Monroe (1993), and Clements (2000). (Lars Svensson)

ID: Svensson (2001a); Small (2002) commented on a difference in bill shape between *rama* and *caligata*.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Marmora’s Warbler *Sylvia sarda***

suggested by Shirihai et al. (2001) to be treated as two species:

- Marmora’s Warbler *Sylvia sarda* (monotypic)
- Balearic Warbler *Sylvia balearica* (monotypic)

CAF *Sylvia sarda* and *S. balearica* have distinct songs and calls. Play back experiments suggest that *balearica* does not react to song of *sarda*. These two taxa are genetically distinct, and the level of genetic divergence is compatible with species status. This level of divergence in spite of the geographical proximity of *balearica* and *sarda* and the migratory behaviour of *sarda* is a further support for the existence of intrinsic mechanisms of reproductive isolation. Morphology is also diagnostically distinct (diagnosable taxa). The AERC TAC thus recommends treating *balearica* as a valid species. Unfortunately, there is no original data to assess sample sizes of genetic analyses or bioacoustical studies (unpublished information by G. Gargallo; see Shirihai et al. 2001 for details). Legrand & De Smet (2002) published additional sonograms of contact calls of *sarda*, *balearica* and *undata* as well as a summary of the occurrence as a vagrant of *sarda* in AERC countries. More accurate information on the Italian breeding and wintering ranges can be found in *British Birds* 95: 198–199 (N. Baccetti & G. Fracasso in litt.). (P.-A. Crochet)

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Desert Warbler** *Sylvia nana* suggested to be treated as two species by Shirihai et al. (2001):

- Asian Desert Warbler *Sylvia nana* (monotypic)
- African Desert Warbler *Sylvia deserti* (monotypic)

**BOURC TSC** African Desert Warbler is best treated as a separate species based on differences in morphology and song; there are, however, no published genetic data (Shirihai et al. 2001). BWP VI recognises the extralimital *S. n. theresae*; this poorly differentiated taxon, however, is best treated as a synonym of *S. nana* (Shirihai et al. 2001). For recordings of the song of *nana*, readers are referred to Schubert (1982. *Stimmen der Vögel Zentralasiens*); recordings of *deserti* were published by Strömberg (no date. *Moroccan bird songs and calls*), Roché & Chevereau (1998. *Birds of North-West Africa*) and Chappuis (2000. *African bird sounds 1. West and Central Africa*). Sonograms of *nana* were published by Mauersberger et al. (1982. *Mitt. Zool. Mus. Berlin* 58: 11–74). Asian Desert Warbler *S. nana* occurs north and east of the Caspian Sea and from E Iran eastward through S/C Kazakhstan, N Afghanistan, Turkmenia, Uzbekistan to N and W China: Xinjiang, N Qinghai, N Gansu, W Inner Mongolia and SW Mongolia. African Desert Warbler *S. deserti* occurs in SE Morocco, E Western Sahara, N Mauritania, N Mali, Algeria south of the Atlas mountains, S Tunisia and W Libya. In winter it disperses into adjacent desert areas, incl. N Mali and N Niger.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Orphean Warbler** *Sylvia hortensis* suggested to be treated as two species by Shirihai et al. (2001):

- Western Orphean Warbler *Sylvia hortensis* (monotypic)
- Eastern Orphean Warbler *Sylvia crassirostris* (polytypic: *S. c. crassirostris*, and perhaps migrating through West Palearctic also *jerdoni*)

**CSNA** Eastern Orphean Warbler is best treated as a separate species based on slight but consistent differences in morphology, marked differences in song and genetic data (Shirihai et al. 2001). More research is needed on the potential contact zone of orphean warbler(s), especially in Italy, where the breeding birds have not been studied by Shirihai et al. (2001). N. Baccetti commented: ‘Both taxa might be breeding in Italy, *crassirostris* in the Trieste area (still reasonably common), and *hortensis* in the prealpine belt and peninsular Italy (very much decreasing). There is some gap between the two. Nobody, however, has recently checked any specimens as far as I know. Belonging of peninsular birds to *hortensis* is suggested by a recent (2003) recovery of an adult breeding in Marche (eastern C Italy), that was controlled in Mauritania (C. Sebastianelli and Italian Ringing Scheme, pers. comm.).’

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as ‘semi- or allospecies’.

**Greenish Warbler** *Phylloscopus trochiloides*

proposed by BOURC TSC (Collinson et al. 2003) to be treated as one species:

- Greenish Warbler *Phylloscopus trochiloides* (polytypic: *Ph. t. viridanus*, ‘Green Warbler’ *Ph. t. nitidus*, ‘Two-barred Greenish Warbler’ *Ph. t. plumbeitarsus*; extralimital: *Ph. t. ludlowi*, *obscuratus* and *trochiloides*)

**BOURC TSC** The taxa within the Greenish Warbler complex are best treated as conspecific, based on application of the *Guidelines* (Collinson et al. 2003). Four of the five taxa form an interrupted ring *viridanus–ludlowi–trochiloides–obscuratus–plumbeitarsus*. There is distributional overlap between the two ends *viridanus* and *plumbeitarsus*. All published morphological and vocal characters vary clinally along the chain *viridanus–ludlowi–trochiloides–obscuratus–plumbeitarsus* and there is no evidence of species-level differences across the distributional gap between *obscuratus* and *plumbeitarsus*. Under the guidelines, taxa that are linked by a broad cline are retained within a single species. For *nitidus*, a treatment as a separate species could be defended considering its allopatric range, genetic differentiation (by 2.5–3.1% for cytochrome *b* mtDNA) and apparently distinct morphology, but it has not yet been shown that *nitidus* fulfils



diagnosability requirements under the guidelines. *Nitidus* is therefore, for now, retained within *Ph. trochiloides*. Based on sound-recordings, M. Schubert showed that some vocalisations of *Ph. t. plumbeitarsus* are very similar to those of *viridanus* [Schubert M. (1982) *Mitt. zool. Mus. Berlin* 58 (1): 109–128.]. Van der Vliet et al. (2003) showed that *plumbeitarsus* and *nitidus* have rather similar sparrow *Passer*-like contact calls with slightly different patterns; the contact calls of *viridanus* differ in showing a rising first part and a descending final part. For additional reading on the Greenish Warbler complex, see Ticehurst (1938), Vaurie (1959), Williamson (1967), Helbig et al. (1995), Irwin (2000, 2002), Irwin et al. (2001b) and Collinson (2001).

P.-A. Crochet commented: ‘A difficult case obviously, since ring speciation is a continuous process which is difficult to interpret in terms of classification. But in this case, *plumbeitarsus* and *viridanus* clearly behave as valid biological species. There is also a gap in distribution between *plumbeitarsus* and the *trochiloides* complex (*obscuratus*) which allows drawing a line between a set of intergrading populations (*Ph. trochiloides*) and the isolated *Ph. plumbeitarsus*. No treatment is perfect, but I firmly believe that a split of *plumbeitarsus* is the best option. After all, this can be considered speciation and if we lump them, we do not acknowledge that. The issue of paraphyly of *trochiloides* should not be a major obstacle. Even if the mitochondrial tree is the real taxon tree (which has to be tested yet), paraphyletic species are not “forbidden” when there is strong evidence of speciation from other sources. For *nitidus*, it should be easier: distinctive mtDNA, distinctive song.’

L. Svensson commented: ‘I agree with P.-A. Crochet’s initial remark, but in contrast to him, I believe that with ring species, the drawback with an arbitrary division of the ring exceeds the advantage of “acknowledging that speciation has taken place”. I think it is far better to keep such a complex and plastic species together as one whole, not least for a better understanding of evolution and speciation, rather than splitting and naming down to smallest possible fraction of a whole. Splitting can be beneficial, but only up to a point. Possibly, however, Collinson et al. (2003) exaggerated the difficulties of discriminating *nitidus* on morphology. In my experience this taxon can invariably be separated on morphology. In the future, therefore, at least *nitidus* might be regarded as a separate species. It is more of an appendix and not a part of the ring, where the problems arise.’

Whether ring species are one or more species is also a matter of scale... And scale does not enter the taxonomic model. Hence, clearly, taxonomy cannot represent this situation properly. This not due to the case being particularly difficult, nor to any ‘paradox’ – explaining what a ring-species is with words is rather easy; this is simply a patent failure of the taxonomic model. Whether you lump or split, you will always be ‘wrong’ at some scale. Actually, the only ‘taxonomic treatment’ that might reflect the reality of a ring species accurately would be an open and never-ending disagreement among taxonomists.

The extremes of a ring species are sympatrically allopecific and allopatrically conspecific... Hence the *Guidelines*, because they propose distinct criteria in allo- and sympatry, can be of no help at all. They will inevitably provide two distinct answers according to the scale at which you look at the problem. Knox et al. (2002) wrote: ‘Where *viridanus* and *plumbeitarsus* meet in C Siberia they behave as separate species. This group of taxa appears to comprise a ring species. The (almost) continuous distribution and clinal variation along the chain prevents the constituent taxa being treated as anything other than a single species.’ The counterpart to this affirmation would be something like: ‘The (almost) continuous distribution and clinal variation along the chain linking *viridanus* and *plumbeitarsus* might be interpreted as them being conspecific. This group of taxa appears to comprise a ring species. The fact that where *viridanus* and *plumbeitarsus* meet in C Siberia they behave as separate species prevents these two constituent taxa being treated as anything other than two species.’ Knox’s treatment would be at the cost that true relationships in the contact zone would be lost to taxonomy. The opposite treatment would be at the cost that intermediate populations would not be unambiguously attributable to one of the two species. Either decision is arbitrary. It is difficult, however, to both adopt the *Guidelines for assigning species rank* and not follow what the authors of those *Guidelines* decided regarding Greenish Warbler. This is the major reason to treat the complex as a single species for the time being.

ID: Ticehurst (1938), Alström & Olsson (1987, 1989), Leader (1993) and van der Vliet et al.(2001).  
Greenish Warbler complex lumped as one species:

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A				A*

(\*) STC is not able to come to a consensus treatment in this case, so will vote Pending and keep the group lumped (as in *Holarctis fāglar*, which serves as a baseline for the Swedish list).

**Yellow-browed Warbler** *Phylloscopus inornatus* to be treated as two species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a):

- Yellow-browed Warbler *Phylloscopus inornatus* (monotypic)
- Hume's Leaf Warbler *Phylloscopus humei* (polytypic: *Ph. h. humei*; extralimital: *Ph. h. mandellii*)

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Pallas's Warbler** *Phylloscopus proregulus* to be treated as three species:

- Pallas's Leaf Warbler *Ph. proregulus* (monotypic)
- Lemon-rumped Warbler *Ph. chloronotus* (polytypic; extralimital: *Ph. c. chloronotus*, *simlaensis*)
- Gansu Leaf Warbler *Ph. kansuensis* (monotypic; extralimital)

STC Pallas's Leaf Warbler *Ph. proregulus* used to be considered a wide-ranging polytypic species, breeding in Siberia, N Mongolia and NE China (*proregulus*); C China and the Himalayas west to C Nepal (*chloronotus*); and W Himalayas (*simlaensis*). A fourth taxon, *kansuensis*, from NC China, was treated as a synonym of either *proregulus* or *chloronotus*. Alström & Olsson (1990) proposed that *proregulus* and *chloronotus* / *simlaensis* should be treated as two separate species based on pronounced differences in vocalisations and lack of response of playback to each other's songs. Alström & Olsson (1995) pointed out that also *kansuensis* differed much in vocalisations from the others, and did not respond to playback of song of these, and concluded that it ought to be treated as a separate species. (Martens & Eck 1995; Alström et al. 1997; Alström 2001, Alström & Olsson submitted).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as 'semi- or allospecies'.

**Bonelli's Warbler** *Phylloscopus bonelli* to be treated as two species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a):

- Bonelli's Warbler *Phylloscopus bonelli* (monotypic)
- Balkan Warbler *Phylloscopus orientalis* (monotypic)

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Chiffchaff** *Phylloscopus collybita* complex to be treated as four species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a):

- Common Chiffchaff *Phylloscopus collybita* (polytypic: *Ph. c. collybita*, *abietinus* and *tristis*)
- Canary Island Chiffchaff *Phylloscopus canariensis* (polytypic: *Ph. c. canariensis* and – recently extinct – *exsul*)
- Iberian Chiffchaff *Phylloscopus ibericus* (monotypic; the recently described *Ph. i. biscayensis* is not recognised here)
- Mountain Chiffchaff *Phylloscopus sindianus* (polytypic: *Ph. s. lorenzii*; extralimital *Ph. s. sindianus*)

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Firecrest** *Regulus ignicapilla* to be treated as two species:

- Firecrest *Regulus ignicapilla*
- Madeira Firecrest *Regulus madeirensis*

CSNA Notice the correct spelling of *Regulus ignicapilla* (David & Gosselin 2002a). The split of the taxon *madeirensis* is accepted by a 4/5 majority of the AERC TAC members, due to significant differences in call, structure, morphology and genetical divergence (e.g. Päckert et al. 2003).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
P	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Considered by A.J. Helbig to be part of the 'superspecies' *Regulus [ignicapilla]*.

**Common Babbler** *Turdoides caudata salvadorii*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002b).

**Fulvous Babbler** *Turdoides fulva*

Notice the correct spelling of *Turdoides fulva maroccana* and *Turdoides fulva fulva* (David & Gosselin 2002b).

**Brown Flycatcher** *Muscicapa latirostris dauurica* becomes *Muscicapa dauurica dauurica*

We follow the views given by Watson (1986) i.e. Pallas's *Muscicapa dauurica* described in 1811, was in wide use in the Russian literature and precedes *Muscicapa latirostris* Raffles, 1822.

**Red-breasted Flycatcher** *Ficedula parva* to be treated as two species:

- Red-breasted Flycatcher *Ficedula parva* (monotypic)
- Taiga Flycatcher *Ficedula albicilla* (monotypic)

**BOURC TSC** Taiga Flycatcher is best treated as a separate species based on consistent differences in morphology (incl. female-like winter plumage of adult males, and absence of immature-like first-summer plumage of males), marked differences in vocalisation, genetic data and presumed sympatric breeding ranges (Cederroth et al. 1999). Jännes (1996) treated the identification of *albicilla* and provided some useful comments on its taxonomy. The recent record of 'Taiga' or 'Red-throated' Flycatcher in Sweden (Cederroth et al. 1999) has led to a re-appraisal of the taxonomic status of this form. Hitherto, it has been treated as subspecies *albicilla* of *F. parva*. However, the songs are diagnosably distinct (see BWP Vol. VII p. 36 Figs III and IV). Furthermore, Jännes (2003) described the distinct call notes of these two flycatchers. Svensson (1992) drew attention to the near all-dark underside of the bill in *albicilla*, whereas *parva* has a pale brown or pinkish base to the lower mandible. Adult male *parva* has a more extensive red breast meeting the white of the lower breast and belly; in *albicilla* the reddish breast patch is encircled by grey and restricted to the centre of the throat. One year-old male *albicilla* attain adult plumage, whereas *parva* are more female-like. Finally, the upper tail coverts of *albicilla* are jet black, even blacker than the uppertail, compared with *parva*, which has these brown or black-brown, never darker than the uppertail. Both breast and upper tail coverts seem to be diagnostic. Taiga Flycatcher has now also been recorded in Great Britain (Lassey 2003; Chapman 2003), with recent records in Denmark and France pending.

DNA analyses have not yet been published. Urban Olsson reports that cytochrome *b* differs by c. 6.9% between *parva* and *albicilla*. This is larger than for many similar species, and clearly would support a split. Following the *Guidelines for assigning species rank*, these taxa seem to be parapatric, overlapping slightly in the Ural mountains. They are diagnosably distinct on song, bill colour, upper-tail coverts (apparently in all plumages), and adult male breast pattern. The case for splitting is further strengthened by the difference in one year-old males and the (unpublished) mtDNA data. Thus, *Ficedula albicilla* Taiga Flycatcher should be recognised as a separate species. It is a pity, however, that no information is available from the presumed contact zone. (Martin Collinson)

ID: Jännes (1996), Cederroth et al. (1999)

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as 'semi- or allospecies'.

**Pied Flycatcher** *Ficedula hypoleuca* to be treated as two species:

- Atlas Flycatcher *Ficedula speculigera* (monotypic)
- Pied Flycatcher *Ficedula hypoleuca* (polytypic: *F. h. iberiae*, *hypoleuca*, *sibirica*)

**BOURC TSC** The Eurasian black and white flycatchers have been treated as three separate species: Pied *Ficedula hypoleuca*, Collared *F. albicollis* and Semi-collared *F. semitorquata*. Adult males are diagnosably distinct on the basis of rump colour, size of forehead patch, extent of white on secondaries and tertials, and extent of white on outer tail feathers. Females can also be separated with care, but there is more overlap. Populations of *hypoleuca* from Iberian and NW Africa are allopatric. The Spanish form (*iberiae*) has a larger white forehead than the nominate race, and there is more white in the wings than in populations from further north; adult males of both *iberiae* and *hypoleuca* usually have an all black tail. Birds from the Atlas mountains (*speculigera*) have the greater coverts completely white, but with much less white in the outer tail feathers than in *hypoleuca*. The white forehead is more extensive in *speculigera* than in any other forms of *hypoleuca*. *Speculigera* is probably diagnosably distinct from *iberiae* on size of forehead patch. In many

ways, *speculigera* is closer to *albicollis*, apart from complete neck collar in latter. DNA sequence data published by Saetre et al. (2001a, *Ibis* 143: 494–497) suggest that Pied and Collared Flycatchers form a monophyletic group, with *speculigera* as their sister group, although the bootstrap support for Pied/Collared relationship is not that strong. *Speculigera* is thus more distant from *hypoleuca* than *hypoleuca* is from *albicollis*. Semi-collared is most distinct. Nuclear DNA sequences (Saetre et al., 2001b, *Mol. Ecol.* 10: 727–749) support these findings. The mitochondrial genetic distances between Pied (*hypoleuca* NW Europe), Collared, Semi-collared, *speculigera* and *iberiae* are all of the order of 3–4%, apart from *hypoleuca* and *iberiae*. These are c. 0.5%, which is closer to the intra-taxon differences of 0.12–0.39%. The evidence suggests that *hypoleuca*, *albicollis*, *semitorquata* and *speculigera* are diagnosably distinct, and with genetic divergences (from both nuclear and mtDNA) that are supportive of full species status. The Iberian form seems to be intermediate between *speculigera* and *hypoleuca* in morphology, though closer to the latter. The DNA data also suggest that its affinities lie with *hypoleuca*. The song of *speculigera* is somewhat different from the song of *hypoleuca*; it is perhaps more variable, at times a little reminiscent of *semitorquata*. (P.-A. Crochet and L. Svensson, pers. comm.) It is proposed that the Iberian form retains its subspecific status as *F. hypoleuca iberiae*. (Martin Collinson)

ID: Mild, K. (1994) Field identification of Pied, Collared and Semicollared Flycatchers. *Birding World* 7: 139–151; 231–240; 325–334. Etherington, G. & Small, B. (2003) Taxonomy and identification of Atlas Flycatcher – a potential British vagrant. *Birding World* 16 (6): 252-256.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Accepted as allospecies.

**Blue Tit** *Parus caeruleus* proposed by Martin (1988) to be treated as two species:

- African Blue Tit *Parus teneriffae* (polytypic: *P. c. palmensis*, *teneriffae*, *ombriosus*, *degener*, *ultramarinus*, *cyrenaicae*)
- Blue Tit *Parus caeruleus* (polytypic: *P. c. caeruleus*, *obscurus*, *ogliastrae*, *balearicus*, *calamensis*, *satunini*, *persicus*, *orientalis*, *raddei*)

CAF Martin (1988) suggested a division of Blue Tit into two species based on comparative morphological and acoustic data. Sangster (1996a) proposed six species based on differences in plumage, song, various calls and habitat, and strongly reduced reaction to playback in these forms. This proposal was based on BSC and has been adopted by Sibley (1996). Salzburger et al. (2002) and reference therein presented convincing evidence that the Blue Tit represents a paraphyletic assemblage. The analyses of mtDNA of seven subspecies from Eurasia and North Africa revealed a European/Middle Asian clade (that is the sister group to the Azure Tit *P. cyanus*) and a North African clade *P. teneriffae*. However, their data do not support assigning species rank to *P. cyanus flavipectus* as suggested by several authors on morphological grounds. The (mainly) North African clade is thus more distant from the European *caeruleus* clade than *caeruleus* is from *cyanus*. Since *caeruleus* and *cyanus* are good biological species, *caeruleus* and *teneriffae* are best treated as distinct species also. N. Baccetti and G. Fracasso pointed out that *ultramarinus* is also breeding on the (European) island of Pantelleria (Moltoni 1971). L. Svensson commented: ‘It is impossible not to be impressed by the call of *teneriffae*, sounding like a Crested Tit, and nothing like Blue Tit. The song is variable, but one common variant sounds more like Great Tit than Blue Tit. Certainly a good candidate for species status.’ Eduardo de Juana commented that Eduardo García del Rey (C/. Malaquita, 5 E-38005 Santa Cruz de Tenerife) is currently conducting a PhD thesis on *teneriffae*. (P.-A. Crochet)

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
	A	A	A*	A

(\*) Considers *caeruleus*, *cyanus* and *teneriffae* as part of the ‘superspecies’ *P. [c.] caeruleus*.

**Black-crowned Tchagra** *Tchagra senegalus cucullatus*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002b).

**Isabelline Shrike** *Lanius isabellinus* (polytypic: *L. i. phoenicuroides*, *isabellinus* and extralimital *arenarius*)

- *Lanius isabellinus phoenicuroides* remains as is (range: breeds from Iran north and east to far NW Xinjiang, through Turkmenistan, Afghanistan, W Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Tadjikistan and S

Kazakhstan; winters mostly in S Arabia and E Africa (Somalia to Tanzania) although a few are apparently found in NW India. Worfolk 2000)

- *Lanius isabellinus speculigerus* becomes *Lanius isabellinus isabellinus* (range: breeds from the Russian Altai through N China and Mongolia approximately as far east as the Upper Amur river; winters from S Arabia to E and C Africa, generally to the north and the west of *phoenicuroides* although there is undoubtedly much overlap; W African records of Isabelline Shrikes probably refer to *isabellinus*; scarce but regular in Israel in autumn and winter. Worfolk 2000).
- *Lanius isabellinus isabellinus* becomes *Lanius isabellinus arenarius* (range: breeds only in W Xinjiang (Tarim basin), south of the range of *isabellinus*; winters mainly from Iran through Pakistan to NW India. Worfolk 2000)

**BOURC TSC** These nomenclatural changes were proposed by Pearson (2000) and supported by D. Schodde and W. Bock of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature ('Does holotype priority always serve nomenclature?' *British Birds* 95: 593–596.) *L. i. phoenicuroides*, *arenarius* and *isabellinus* may be treated as phylogenetic species (Sangster et al. 1999), whereas recent Russian authors have tended to split *phoenicuroides* as a monotypic species and to lump the other taxa (Kryukov 1995). The situation in the contact zones within the '*cristatus* group' of shrikes is extremely complicated and open to differing interpretations (e.g. review of hybrids in Worfolk 2000, pp 333–335); this group consists of red-backed, isabelline and brown shrikes. More research is needed before they can be split under the species concept that has been adopted by the AERC TAC. L. Svensson commented: 'During a recent field trip in May around Lake Balkhash (with E. Gavrilov, O. Belyalov, A. Lassey, A. Grieve and P. Alström), local *phoenicuroides* (of two occurring forms, morphs or perhaps two valid geographical subspecies, *karelini* in W and N, *phoenicuroides* in E and S) and migrant *isabellinus* were trapped and studied in the field. It became painfully evident that not only were females at times extremely difficult to identify reliably, males too were sometimes appearing as confusing intergrades between the *phoenicuroides* group and *isabellinus*. Clearly a lot more field work and DNA studies remain before we understand the best taxonomic treatment of this group.'

ID: Worfolk (2000) offers a useful review of the identification of red-backed, isabelline and brown shrikes

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A	A	A	A

**Great Grey Shrike** *Lanius excubitor* to be treated as two species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a):

- Great Grey Shrike *Lanius excubitor* (polytypic: *excubitor* incl. '*galliae*' and '*melanopterus*', *homeyeri*, *przewalskii*, *sibiricus*; extralimital: *mollis* incl. *funereus*, *bianchii*, *invictus*, *borealis*)
- Southern Grey Shrike *Lanius meridionalis* (polytypic: *L. m. meridionalis*, *koenigi*, *algeriensis*, *elegans*, *aucheri* incl. *theresae*, *pallidirostris*; extralimital: *lahtora*, *buryi*, *uncinatus*, *leucopygos*)

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Red-billed Chough** *Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax erythroramphos*

Notice the correct spelling of the subspecies (David & Gosselin 2000a), erroneously *eythroramphus* in Cramp & Perrins (1994).

**Citril Finch** *Serinus citrinella* to be treated as two species (accepted by the AERC TAC in Sangster et al. 2002a):

- Citril Finch *Serinus citrinella* (monotypic)
- Corsican Finch *Serinus corsicanus* (monotypic) – notice the correct spelling!

Rationale: see Sangster et al. (2002a) and appendix 1.

**Crimson-winged Finch** *Rhodopechys sanguineus*

Notice the correct spelling of *Rhodopechys sanguineus alienus* and *Rhodopechys sanguineus sanguineus* (David & Gosselin 2002b).

**Ovenbird** *Seiurus aurocapilla aurocapilla*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002a).

**Rufous-sided Towhee** *Pipilo erythrophthalmus* to be treated as two species:

- Eastern Towhee *Pipilo erythrophthalmus* (polytypic: *P. e. erythrophthalmus*; extralimital: *P. e. rileyi*, *alleni*, *canaster*)
- Spotted Towhee *Pipilo maculatus* (polytypic; extralimital: *P. m. arcticus*, *montanus*, *gaigei*, *curtatus*, *oregonus*, *falcifer*, *megalonyx*, *falcinellus*, *clementae*, *umbraticola*, *magnirostris*, *consobrinus*, *socorroensis*, *griseipygius*, *orientalis*, *maculatus*, *macronyx*, *vulcanorum*, *oaxacae*, *chiapensis*, *repetens*)

BOURC TSC cf. BOURC (1996).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A		A*	A

(\*) Accepted as ‘allospecies’ by A.J. Helbig.

**Savannah Sparrow** *Ammodramus sandwichensis* becomes *Passerculus sandwichensis*

BOURC TSC cf. BOURC (1996).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A		A	A

**Fox Sparrow** *Zonotrichia iliaca* becomes *Passerella iliaca*

BOURC TSC cf. BOURC (1996).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A		A	A

**Song Sparrow** *Zonotrichia melodia* becomes *Melospiza melodia*

BOURC TSC cf. BOURC (1996). These changes were accepted by the BOURC in 1996 to conform to treatments adopted by the AOU almost a century earlier: *Melospiza fasciata* was adopted for Song Sparrow by the AOU in 1886, and changed into *M. melodia* in 1910; *Passerella iliaca* has been used by the AOU for Fox Sparrow since 1895, *Passerculus sandwichensis* for Savannah Sparrow since 1910. They have not been confronted to modern evidence. Recent work (e.g. Carson & Spicer 2003) could well shake the tree.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A		A	A

**Pine Bunting** *Emberiza leucocephalos leucocephalos*

Notice the correct spelling (David & Gosselin 2002a).

**Cirl Bunting** *Emberiza cirlus* suggested to be treated as monotypic by Svensson (1992)

BOURC TSC Two recent reviews (Svensson 1992, Cramp & Perrins 1994, p 182) have suggested that the Sardo-corsican form *nigrostriata* is not recognisable. The BOURC follows this view (Knox et al. 2002).

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
A	A			A

**House Bunting** *Emberiza striolata* to be treated as two species:

- Mountain Bunting *Emberiza striolata* (polytypic: *E. s. striolata*; extralimital: *E. s. jebelmarrae* and *saturator*)
- House Bunting *Emberiza sahari* (polytypic: *E. s. sahari*; extralimital: *E. s. theresae* and *sanghae*)

STC House Bunting is best treated as a separate species based on clear differences in morphology and vocalisation (Kirwan & Shirihai in prep.). This consideration refers only to the Palearctic forms *E. s. striolata* and *E. s. sahari*; the Sub-Saharan forms *jebelmarrae*, *saturator*, *theresae* and *sanghae* need further research.

BOURC TSC	CAF	CSNA	A.J. Helbig	STC
	P	A	A	A



**Corn Bunting** *Miliaria calandra* suggested to be renamed *Emberiza calandra* (polytypic: *E. c. calandra*, *clanceyi* and *buturlini*) according to Grapputo et al. (2001) and Lee et al. (2001)

**CSNA** There are two genetic studies confirming that Corn Bunting is an *Emberiza* (Grapputo et al. 2001 and Lee et al. 2001). Grapputo et al. (2001) show that '*Miliaria*' *calandra* is nested within the genus *Emberiza*, thus subsumed under that genus. In such a case, the AERC TAC must follow. Generally, it is only useful to maintain separate genera (e.g. *Miliaria*) if there is sufficient evidence to do so. If not, it is recommended to limit the number of genera.

<b>BOURC TSC</b>	<b>CAF</b>	<b>CSNA</b>	<b>A.J. Helbig</b>	<b>STC</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>

**Northern Oriole** *Icterus galbula* to be treated as three species

- Baltimore Oriole *Icterus galbula* (monotypic)
- Black-backed Oriole *Icterus abeillei* (extralimital)
- Bullock's Oriole *Icterus bullockii* (extralimital)

**CSNA** The English name of *Icterus galbula* s.s. becomes Baltimore Oriole and the species is monotypic. cf. BOURC (1996).

<b>BOURC TSC</b>	<b>CAF</b>	<b>CSNA</b>	<b>A.J. Helbig</b>	<b>STC</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			<b>A</b>