U.S. CLIVAR was organized around the three panels to establish a structure in which the way in which we work, including process studies in the field, modeling, and analysis of phenomena and modes of variability, supported the mission of understanding and prediction of climate variability and change.

Can we further strengthen the work of U.S. CLIVAR by stimulating interaction between the panels?
Questions:

- Do POS and PPAI see that work by PSMI has supported or guided their own efforts?
- Does PSMI ask POS and PPAI for inputs on what processes need to be researched and improved upon in models?
- Does PPAI identify processes and parameterizations that are poorly understood and/or sources of model error and inform PSMI?
- Does POS ever interact with PSMI in the sense of saying, let's leave some of those observing resources in place after the process study to gain from what you learned?
- Would you change/refine the Panel, Working Group, and CPT structure and approach?