

Main focus from group 1 (Observationalists):

- 1) Were enough measurements taken to constrain the processes? No, the campaign started late and measurements earlier in the season may provide more samples.
- 2) What they learned from SeaState that was unexpected was the episodic growth/retreat of the ice.
- 3) Also it was unexpected that the ice growth was so sensitive to the ocean mixing.
- 4) Events that came through would be good test cases for model studies: Distinct wind vs wave driven events. For example, off-ice and on-ice wind events.
- 5) Question: how regionally depend are the SeaState measurements? The balance of processes will be different in different parts of the Arctic.
- 6) Concern with validating current models with point measurements.
- 7) Spatial and temporal scales for user needs vary and impact forecasts time and space scales.
- 8) Must make data available to all. Can benefit from crowd-sourcing.

Main focus from group 2 (Modelers):

- 1) How can sea ice models simulate ice flow distribution in the MIZ. Critical for simulating these processes.
- 2) All groups brought up coupling issues. We all work on individual components. The SeaState measurements highlight the coupled nature of the MIZ and require a coupled system.
- 3) Specific diagnostics for comparison.
- 4) Model intercomparison can be done for specific events.

Main focus for group 3 (operational modelers and users):

- 1) How representative are the SeaState observations?
- 2) How can these small-scale processes observed during these events be parameterized and included in the models?
- 3) Where to start improving the models given the coupled nature of the MIZ?
- 4) A balance between operational need and process understanding. Do we need to go back to simple models to study feedbacks?