Fiamma Straneo opened the conversation and asked Mike Patterson and Cathy Stephens to introduce US CLIVAR program and its goals. Mike briefly described its structure, pointing out that it has been established 15 years ago, and had major reorganization 6 years ago, when a structure of working groups was developed. Main overarching event is an annual summit meeting with (1) predictability, (2) process studies, and (3) observations as overarching schemes. Mike pointed out that last year's CLIVAR annual summit had a focus on polar science (Arctic environmental changes, Antarctic climate system, climate variability of the Southern Ocean). The expectation of bringing together various communities working in high latitudes was a strong motivation for this (Greenland/Ocean interaction) WG. US CLIVAR is a project office funded jointly by NASA, NOAA and NSF, but which does not fund any research activities. Solicitations for proposals are issued by NASA/NOAA/NSF independently, but coordinated through and with advice from CLIVAR at times. Some of such solicitations are in response to CLIVAR working group activities.

Cathy Stephens added that CLIVAR is a project of World Climate Research Project. This year two new working groups were created - one is this working group, the other one is on hurricanes. US CLIVAR operates independently. WG's have a limited life time of two years. Existing and previously active working groups have either assessed the state of knowledge in their field, coordinated modeling studies, or proposed coordinated field programs. For instance, a WG on droughts designed a set of experiments for climate models, and the Salinity WG has provided assessment of the problem and designed an observation program. Some working groups that began as US CLIVAR WG have evolved into international activities after their two year term. The WGOMD and the Drought WG are currently operating under international CLIVAR. Evaluating the potential for rapid climate change is perceived by US CLIVAR as an important theme which this WG could tackle.

The second item on agenda was deliverables. Fiamma asked Mike and Cathy to provide examples. According to Cathy, WG's have frequently held a workshop open to the relevant science community at the end of year two. Other groups have produced several peer-reviewed publications and reports. For instance, the working groups on droughts and western boundary currents have produced special issues of the Journal of Climate.

Fiamma pointed out that the idea of the working group came up during a summer school on ice sheet-ocean interactions in Norway in 2010. It was clear that a closer interaction and collaboration among existing groups was needed to make a progress. The goal of the WG is not to address a problem itself, but bring communities together and facilitate their interaction. Its goal would be to raise visibility for funding agencies and scientific communities as well.

David Bromwich raised the question of whether focusing only on Greenland is a limitation. Fiamma, Olga and Patrick argued that the ice/ocean interaction problem was much more developed in Antarctica where campaigns are better coordinated. In this sense Greenland had been neglected and lagged behind in terms of coordination. Adrian Jenkins, who is a chair of FRISP lend support to this view and to focusing on Greenland. There is a strong focus on Antarctica in communities (oceanographic and glaciological) and similar focus needs to be developed in Greenland. He also pointed out that FRISP has emerged from SCAR activities.
As deliverables Fiamma suggested several options - a generic WG report, a white paper targeted for EOS, or a peer-reviewed article. Their goal would be to address scientific communities and funding agencies. A white paper would be a review of the state of the field. An advantage of such a review would be to provide different perspectives from different disciplines and lay out options on how to proceed. Cecilia Bitz pointed out that a review document should be focused rather than too broad. A focused approach had the best prospect to enthrall interest within the WG and in the scientific community at large. Fiamma suggested that such a document might be used to identify scientific questions. Considering diverse expertise of the group it might be useful to identify what is needed from the different communities.

A summary of the discussion on possible meetings and workshops identified a two-tier approach:

1. take advantage of the upcoming IGS meeting on ice/ocean interaction at Scripps in early June by holding a WG meeting would meet on Saturday June 11th; by that time a draft of a preliminary report or white paper should be available for discussion and subsequent submission to EOS or BAMS. The meeting would start discussion on how to achieve the goals outlined in the report. In addition, the meeting would prepare the workshop to be held in winter/spring 2012.

2. organize a dedicated, by-invitation only international 2-3 day workshop during winter/spring 2012 with 30-50(?) participants to be identified. Participants would be mainly PIs who could initiate an interaction between disciplines and fields. This workshop would target communities such as US and Northern European oceanographers who have been doing field observations in the North Atlantic for a long time; fjord dynamicists, sea ice and atmosphere experts, glaciologist studying outlet glaciers and hydrologists. Fiamma pointed out that the upcoming IGS meeting on ice/ocean interaction at Scripps hardly will attract new people who not already in the field. Cecilia noted that IGS would be primarily focused on the Southern Ocean.

Regarding (1), a first report or white paper might address the interdisciplinary aspect of the problem, e.g., what quantities measured by a specific community would advance other communities and vise versa; what outstanding issues needed to be addressed. Fiamma suggested that a document is a priority, and key questions and major themes need to be identified soon.

Thinking about deliverables, Adrian suggested that the group should think beyond the two-year horizon, and whether it can develop a legacy contribution. For example, the two years could be used to shape up a comprehensive coordinated long-term monitoring program for Greenland’s major outlet glaciers and fjords. This would be of tremendous value, and which can only be achieved by an inter-disciplinary, inter-agency and international group. Developing such a system could be the theme of the workshop (2). Mike suggested a Climate Process Team (CPT) as another important outcome and potential follow-up. Fiamma brought up similarities to ASOF and FRISP. She re-emphasized the need (shared by all) that the group needed to reach international collaborators.

The last topic on agenda was a website. Fiamma pointed out that due to limited lifetime of the WG it should be more geared towards activities of the WG, i.e. minutes from meetings and reports should be posted there. Also, links to existing websites and data sources should be created. Possibly, a list of the funded projects in Greenland should be posted there as well. Mike expressed support in getting such information from the agencies involved. Cathy suggested that each member of a group could write a paragraph about their interests and relevance to this WG with links to other resources.