**Purpose, objective: N-shot prompts**

**Prompt:**

A lake has formed over a glacier in the Alps. An inhabited 300 years old village sits on the valley.

The village maire evaluates the situation and needs to decide the best course of action:

Example 1: displace the population, and build new houses elsewhere for the people.

Example 2: wait for the water to evaporate, without further action

Example 3: start expensive long duration works to drain the water and hope it will not reoccur.

Advice on what choice is the best. Explain why.

A screenshot of a document

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

**Answer** :

In this scenario, the village faces a serious risk due to a lake forming over a glacier, which could potentially burst and flood the valley. Here's a breakdown of the three options and an evaluation of which might be best:

**Option 1: Displace the population and build new houses elsewhere**

**Pros:**

* **Maximizes safety**: Immediate removal of people from the danger zone eliminates the risk to human life.
* **Long-term solution**: If the glacier lake is unstable or likely to reform, relocation avoids repeated threats.
* **Preserves lives and reduces liability**.

**Cons:**

* **High social and emotional cost**: The village is 300 years old, likely with deep cultural and historical significance.
* **Expensive and logistically complex**: Building new infrastructure and relocating people is costly and disruptive.
* **Loss of heritage**: The village may be abandoned permanently.

**Option 2: Wait for the water to evaporate, without further action**

**Pros:**

* **No immediate cost**: Requires no financial investment or disruption.
* **Preserves the village**: No relocation or destruction of heritage.

**Cons:**

* **Extremely risky**: Glacier lakes can burst suddenly, especially with warming temperatures or seismic activity.
* **Unpredictable timeline**: Evaporation could take years or may not happen at all.
* **Negligence liability**: If disaster strikes, authorities could be held responsible for inaction.

**Option 3: Start expensive, long-duration works to drain the water and hope it will not reoccur**

**Pros:**

* **Risk mitigation**: Draining the lake reduces the immediate threat.
* **Preserves the village**: Allows residents to stay in place.
* **Demonstrates proactive governance**.

**Cons:**

* **High cost and uncertainty**: Engineering works in alpine environments are complex and may not be permanent.
* **Time-consuming**: The threat may materialize before the works are completed.
* **May need to be repeated**: If the lake reforms, the problem recurs.

**✅ Recommended Course of Action: A Hybrid Approach**

**Primary Recommendation: Combine Options 1 and 3.**

1. **Immediate partial evacuation** of the most vulnerable residents (elderly, children).
2. **Begin engineering works** to drain or stabilize the lake (Option 3).
3. **Develop a long-term relocation plan** for the entire village if the threat persists or worsens (Option 1).

This approach balances **safety**, **heritage preservation**, and **pragmatism**. It avoids the recklessness of inaction while not rushing into irreversible displacement.

Would you like help drafting a risk communication plan or a visual risk assessment for the village?

**Observation**: Very good and complete answer. However low level of details. Good reasoning, very pertinent guidance for the user. MISSING: references and links !!!! this is key in this context for the user to continue the search and next steps…..! It is NOT sufficient that the tool knows it all, the info is for the user to progress!!
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