



RESEARCH WHITE PAPER

FROM MELTING ICE TO GOVERNED RESILIENCE

An Evidence-Based Stress Test of the L-ARC™ Environmental Climate Governance Framework

Hindu Kush Himalayan evidence from South Lhonak–Sikkim (2023), Nepal (2024), Thame Valley (2024), and the Bhote Koshi–Trishuli disaster (2026)

Core proposition

Environmental resilience depends not only on detecting risk, but on converting early environmental signals into timely, explainable, accountable and sustainably financed action.

Dr. Surajit Lahiri

Independent Researcher · Melbourne, Australia

Research-use note

This white paper is a research and policy synthesis. It is not an operational hazard-warning system and does not claim that L-ARC™ has yet been prospectively validated as a causal disaster-reduction intervention. The evidence assessment tests real-world relevance, construct validity and operational plausibility using public data and recent events.

Executive Summary

The Hindu Kush Himalaya is moving into a period in which cryospheric change, infrastructure concentration and institutional exposure are increasingly interacting. The most recent evidence is stark. ICIMOD’s 2026 regional assessment reports a 12% reduction in glacier area across the Hindu Kush Himalaya between 1990 and 2020, while ice-loss rates have doubled since 2000 and long-term monitoring indicates losses of up to 27 metres of ice thickness since 1975 [1]. This is not only a glacier-science problem. It is a governance problem because the consequences propagate into water security, ecosystems, settlements, transport corridors, hydropower systems, emergency management and public finance.

This white paper develops and stress-tests the L-ARC™ logic first articulated in the companion perspective, From Melting Ice to Ecological Risk. L-ARC™ connects three requirements that are frequently separated in climate-risk practice: Anticipatory Intelligence, Governance Legitimacy and Capital Sustainability. The framework is operationalised through six functions — Detect, Interpret, Prioritise, Govern, Adapt and Monitor — and through indicator families covering glacier retreat, river-flow variability, biodiversity stress, livelihood exposure, community resilience and governance response readiness.

The purpose here is not to relabel recent disasters after the fact. It is to ask a stricter question: do recent Himalayan events repeatedly expose the same failure points that L-ARC™ is designed to address? Four event-based tests were used: the 2023 South Lhonak GLOF in Sikkim; the 2024 Thame Valley GLOF in Nepal; the September 2024 Nepal floods as a forecast-to-action governance test; and the 26 August 2026 Bhote Koshi–Trishuli disaster as a current, still-evolving high-mountain hazard cascade. Evidence was drawn primarily from government agencies, the United Nations, WMO, ICIMOD, ISRO/NRSC, IOM, UNOSAT and peer-reviewed literature.

12% HKH glacier-area reduction, 1990–2020 <i>ICIMOD 2026</i>	~50m m³ Water released from South Lhonak <i>Science / ICIMOD</i>	459,000 m³ Water released in the Thame cascade <i>ICIMOD 2025</i>	93% Forecast accuracy in Nepal’s Sept 2024 flood case <i>WMO</i>
246 Deaths in Nepal’s Sept 2024 floods <i>UN Nepal</i>	1,377 Bodies recovered after Bhote Koshi floods, as of 10 Sep 2026 <i>Govt. of Nepal</i>	5,130 People still reported missing, as of 10 Sep 2026 <i>Govt. of Nepal</i>	\$49.6m UN flash appeal for 2026 Nepal response <i>UN Nepal</i>

Bottom line

The cases provide strong convergent support for the framework’s central thesis: technical detection is necessary but insufficient. The decisive vulnerability repeatedly lies in the translation from environmental signal to assigned responsibility, trusted action, last-mile communication and sustained investment. That is strong evidence of construct validity and policy relevance. It is not yet statistical proof that deploying L-ARC™ will reduce losses; that requires a prospective pilot with pre-registered indicators and outcome measures.

1. Why this white paper

The companion manuscript frames Himalayan glacier retreat as an ecological and governance-intelligence challenge rather than a cryospheric variable alone. In that formulation, governance intelligence is the institutional ability to detect early environmental signals, interpret their consequences, prioritise vulnerable systems, assign responsibility, mobilise adaptation and monitor outcomes over time. AI is treated as an enabling intelligence layer rather than as decision authority. Human judgement, local knowledge, field validation, explainability and institutional accountability remain central.

The original framework was deliberately presented as a conceptual and governance-design model rather than an operationally validated tool. That distinction matters. A credible research programme should not convert a conceptual framework into a claim of proven efficacy merely by citing disasters that appear compatible with it. This white paper therefore uses a retrospective stress-test approach. It asks whether independent, real-world evidence reveals recurring patterns that are predicted by the logic of the framework —

especially the gap between knowing and acting — and whether those patterns appear across different hazard types, places and institutional settings.

The resulting claim is deliberately calibrated. The evidence supports the relevance and construct validity of L-ARC™: its three pillars and six functions correspond closely to recurrent failure points in recent Himalayan disasters. The evidence also supports operational plausibility: several elements of the framework already exist separately in practice, such as satellite monitoring, flood forecasting, anticipatory action, community warning and disaster finance. What has not yet been proven is causal efficacy: whether a jurisdiction using an integrated L-ARC™ implementation would experience fewer deaths, lower economic loss or faster recovery than a comparable jurisdiction without it. Section 9 proposes a testable pathway for that next stage.

2. The risk baseline has shifted

The physical baseline against which Himalayan policy was designed is changing. ICIMOD's 2026 glacier assessment reports a 12% reduction in glacier area across the Hindu Kush Himalaya between 1990 and 2020 and describes glacier ice-loss rates as having doubled since 2000 [1]. ICIMOD's earlier HI-WISE assessment found that regional glacier mass loss accelerated by 65% between the 2000s and 2010s, and warned that the Hindu Kush Himalayan cryosphere is undergoing changes that are unprecedented and largely irreversible over human timescales [2].

These changes matter because the region's hazards are coupled. Glacier retreat can create or enlarge lakes; permafrost degradation can destabilise slopes; avalanches and rockfalls can enter lakes or rivers; outburst floods can entrain sediment and transform into debris-rich flows; and downstream exposure is increasingly concentrated in roads, hydropower, settlements and tourism infrastructure. ICIMOD has mapped more than 25,000 glacial lakes across the Hindu Kush Himalaya, while its HI-WISE assessment identifies around 200 lakes as dangerous and anticipates a substantial increase in GLOF risk this century [2,3].

The governance implication is straightforward: historical hazard categories are no longer sufficient when risks cascade across sectors. A glacier-monitoring system can be technically excellent while a downstream hydropower project remains exposed. A flood forecast can be accurate while warning-to-action protocols remain slow. A community may receive an alert but lack an evacuation route. A government can mobilise large recovery funding after disaster while preventive finance remains fragmented. The systemic risk lies in the interfaces.

3. The L-ARCTM Environmental Climate Governance logic

ANTICIPATORY INTELLIGENCE Recognise and interpret early environmental signals before visible crisis.	GOVERNANCE LEGITIMACY Translate risk intelligence into explainable, accountable and trusted decisions.	CAPITAL SUSTAINABILITY Sustain resilience through durable finance, institutions and long-term investment.
Detect → Interpret	Prioritise → Govern	Adapt → Monitor

<i>Signals & foresight</i>	<i>Authority & trust</i>	<i>Investment & learning</i>
--------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------

L-ARCTM is built around three linked questions. Anticipatory Intelligence asks whether the system can recognise and interpret risk early enough. Governance Legitimacy asks whether decisions are explainable, accountable, trusted and connected to clear authority. Capital Sustainability asks whether resilience actions are financially and institutionally durable enough to continue beyond short projects or emergency cycles. The logic is intentionally broader than hazard prediction: it focuses on whether intelligence becomes governed action.

3.1 Six operational functions

Function	Purpose
Detect	Identify physical, ecological and social signals before they become unmanaged crises.
Interpret	Translate detected change into ecological, social and institutional meaning.
Prioritise	Rank locations and interventions using hazard, exposure, sensitivity and response capacity.
Govern	Assign authority, responsibility, accountability, decision rights and communication pathways.
Adapt	Implement locally appropriate structural, ecological, community and policy interventions.
Monitor	Track environmental change, intervention performance, unintended effects and institutional learning.

3.2 Indicator families

Indicator family	Illustrative variables
Glacier Retreat Risk	Glacier area/length change, snow-cover change, lake proximity and expansion, downstream exposure.
River-Flow Variability	Seasonal flow shifts, peak-flow timing, low-flow stress and hydrological anomalies.
Biodiversity Stress	Habitat change, vegetation shift, wetland stress, fragmentation and species movement.
Livelihood Exposure	Water, agriculture, grazing, tourism, hydropower, transport and income dependence.
Community Resilience	Warning access, local leadership, social networks, preparedness, evacuation readiness and local knowledge.
Governance Response Readiness	Monitoring capacity, inter-agency coordination, funding, legal authority, data sharing, emergency preparedness and accountability.

The distinctive move

Most hazard systems ask: “Where is the hazard?” L-ARCTM adds a second question: “Where can hazard become avoidable harm because institutions are not ready to act?” The Governance Response Readiness dimension is therefore as important as physical exposure.

4. How the real-world stress test was conducted

The stress test uses evidence triangulation rather than a retrospective numerical score. A weighted index would create false precision because each event has different data availability, hazard mechanisms and institutional contexts. Instead, the analysis tests eight recurring propositions across four cases:

- Observable environmental or hydrological signals existed before or during the event.
- Downstream exposure and cascading consequences could be represented using multiple data sources.
- Technical monitoring, forecasting or remote sensing could materially support situational awareness.
- The conversion from technical signal to actionable warning or decision was a critical vulnerability.
- Institutional coordination and clear assignment of responsibility materially affected response capacity.
- Critical infrastructure and public/private capital were significant components of exposure.
- Community knowledge, warning reach or last-mile behaviour materially affected outcomes.
- Post-event learning, monitoring and sustained investment are required to reduce recurrence.

The evidence hierarchy gives priority to official government and United Nations sources for current impact figures; peer-reviewed papers and ICIMOD technical reports for hazard reconstruction; and WMO, ISRO/NRSC, IOM and UNOSAT products for forecasting, satellite and response evidence. For the 2026 Bhote Koshi–Trishuli event, impact figures are explicitly time-stamped because search, verification and forensic attribution remain ongoing.

5. Case evidence

1

South Lhonak Lake, Sikkim — October 2023

A known high-risk system became a catastrophic multi-hazard cascade.

South Lhonak is unusually important for testing the L-ARC™ thesis because the hazard was not wholly unknown. A 2021 peer-reviewed study had already identified South Lhonak as one of Sikkim’s largest and fastest-growing proglacial lakes. Modelling showed the frontal moraine was susceptible to overtopping and estimated that a large future GLOF could produce flow depths of roughly 25–30 metres and velocities of 6–9 m/s at Chungthang, where major hydropower infrastructure was located [4]. This is unusually strong pre-event evidence: risk intelligence existed before the disaster.

On 3–4 October 2023, the warning materialised at catastrophic scale. The 2025 Science reconstruction found that approximately 14.7 million m³ of frozen lateral moraine collapsed into the lake, generating a tsunami-like wave of about 20 metres, breaching the moraine and releasing roughly 50 million m³ of water. The flood then eroded approximately 270 million m³ of sediment and propagated as a destructive multi-hazard cascade down the Teesta valley [5]. ISRO/NRSC satellite analysis immediately after the event found that about 105 hectares of lake area had drained between 28 September and 4 October [6].

Evidence	Observed fact
Pre-event hazard knowledge	2021 modelling identified overtopping susceptibility and severe downstream inundation potential at Chungthang [4].
Trigger / physical scale	~14.7 million m³ moraine collapse; ~20 m impact wave; ~50 million m³ water released [5].
Cascading process	~270 million m³ of sediment eroded and mobilised downstream [5].
Infrastructure exposure	The 1,200 MW Teesta-III hydropower dam was destroyed; multiple downstream assets were damaged [5,7].
Human exposure	A World Bank review reports about 88,400 people directly affected; peer-reviewed/post-event sources report dozens killed and missing [7].
Satellite confirmation	ISRO/NRSC observed ~105 hectares of lake-area drainage after the outburst [6].

L-ARC™ interpretation. The case provides strong evidence for Anticipatory Intelligence — the lake’s growth, instability and downstream exposure were already researchable and modelled. The failure was not simply an absence of data. It was a failure to ensure that risk knowledge was fully converted into infrastructure stress testing, operational thresholds, warning protocols, evacuation planning and durable mitigation. Governance Legitimacy is implicated because the existence of a technical warning has public value

only when authority, responsibilities and last-mile actions are clear. Capital Sustainability is implicated because a strategic 1,200 MW asset and associated infrastructure were exposed to a hazard that had been scientifically characterised years earlier.

What this case supports

South Lhonak is the clearest real-world example of the “knowing–acting gap” at the centre of L-ARC™. It does not prove that L-ARC™ would have prevented the GLOF. It does show that high-quality hazard intelligence, by itself, was insufficient to prevent catastrophic downstream loss.

2

Thame Valley, Nepal — August 2024

A two-lake cascade showing why monitoring must extend from lakes to communities and infrastructure.

On 16 August 2024, a complex glacial-lake cascade struck Thame in Nepal’s Everest region. ICIMOD and Nepal’s NDRRMA later reconstructed a sequence in which a rock avalanche entered the upper lake, generated a displacement wave, breached its moraine and then triggered failure of a lower lake. The 2025 technical report estimates a combined release of about 459,000 m³ of water — approximately 185 Olympic-sized swimming pools — and documents a hyper-concentrated debris flow extending more than 80 km downstream [8].

The physical hazard was significant, but the human outcome differed sharply from South Lhonak. ICIMOD reports that 25 homes were destroyed, 135 people were displaced and critical local assets — including a school, health post, bridge and hydropower facility — were damaged, yet no deaths occurred. The report attributes the absence of fatalities in part to the event occurring in daylight and the phased nature of the flood due to temporary ponding [8]. A 2026 peer-reviewed reconstruction estimated approximately 770,000 m³ of total water release from the two lakes using updated drone-derived methods, showing how event estimates can evolve as better data become available [9].

Evidence	Observed fact
Water release	ICIMOD 2025: ~459,000 m³ from two lakes; later 2026 analysis estimates ~770,000 m³ using updated methods [8,9].
Spatial reach	Debris transported >80 km downstream [8].
Local impacts	25 homes destroyed; 135 people displaced; school, health post, bridge and hydropower assets affected [8].
Fatalities	No loss of life reported; daylight timing and phased flood progression were important contextual factors [8].
Forward risk	Remaining lakes in the valley were classified as high/moderate risk and require monitoring and mitigation [8].

L-ARC™ interpretation. Thame shows that physical hazard magnitude alone does not determine human loss. Community location, event timing, warning opportunity, evacuation behaviour and institutional preparedness shape the final outcome. It also demonstrates why “Monitor” is not a postscript to adaptation: post-event geomorphic instability, remaining lakes and altered river channels can generate continuing risk. The Capital Sustainability pillar is relevant because real resilience requires long-term hydrometeorological stations, riverbank stabilisation, land-use controls and resilient infrastructure rather than a one-off emergency response.

3

Nepal floods — September 2024

A governance test in which forecast skill was high but forecast-to-action conversion remained incomplete.

The September 2024 Nepal floods are not primarily a glacier-outburst case, but they are extremely useful for testing the governance logic of L-ARC™. WMO’s Early Warnings for All review reports that Nepal’s Flash Flood Guidance System generated forecasts with 93% accuracy during the event. The system integrated rainfall, river observations, flash-flood indicators and numerical weather prediction, and its outputs supported situational awareness and partial pre-positioning of emergency teams. Yet WMO also identifies delays in converting forecasts into actionable alerts and weaknesses in last-mile dissemination as constraints on risk reduction [10].

The consequences were severe. The United Nations Nepal 2024 Results Report records 246 deaths, 2.9 million people affected and estimated damage of US\$345 million from the September 2024 floods and landslides [11]. This juxtaposition — high forecast accuracy

alongside major human and economic loss — is one of the strongest empirical illustrations of the L-ARC™ thesis. Detection and prediction do not automatically produce resilience.

Nepal’s anticipatory-action architecture also shows what an integrated model can look like. The 2024 OCHA framework links a forecasting trigger (“the model”), pre-agreed actions (“the delivery”) and pre-arranged financing (“the money”), with the objective of providing anticipatory assistance to up to 238,831 people across 15 flood-prone municipalities [12]. This is conceptually close to the L-ARC™ sequence: anticipatory intelligence must be connected to legitimate operational authority and to capital that is available before impact.

Evidence	Observed fact
Forecast skill	WMO reports 93% forecast accuracy in the September 2024 event [10].
Governance gap	WMO identifies delays in forecast-to-alert conversion and last-mile dissemination [10].
Human impact	246 deaths; 2.9 million people affected [11].
Economic damage	Estimated US\$345 million [11].
Anticipatory capacity	OCHA framework designed to reach up to 238,831 people with pre-agreed actions and pre-arranged finance [12].

The strongest governance finding

A 93% technically accurate forecast did not translate into 93% protection. This is precisely why L-ARC™ treats governance legitimacy, assigned action and last-mile communication as co-equal with prediction.

4

Bhote Koshi–Trishuli, Nepal — 26 August 2026

A current glacier-related rock–ice avalanche and flood cascade with large human and infrastructure consequences.

The 26 August 2026 disaster provides the most recent stress test, but it must be handled with care because scientific attribution and damage assessment are still evolving. Government of Nepal reporting describes a severe Bhote Koshi River flood that caused widespread loss of life, displacement and damage to houses, roads, bridges, hydropower facilities and other critical infrastructure. Health-sector reporting links the event to an ice-and-rock avalanche and temporary damming of the Lhende Khola upstream [13,14].

As of 14:00 NPT on 10 September 2026, Nepal’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs reported 1,377 bodies recovered, 5,130 people still missing and 13,656 people rescued, including more than 300 foreigners. The same update confirms continuing operations at multiple hydropower projects and requests for specialised international support including high-capacity drones, LiDAR systems, Bailey bridges, underwater drones, surge pumps, DNA kits and tunnel-rescue equipment [13]. These numbers remain subject to revision as search and identification continue.

UN reporting estimated that approximately 84,270 people had been affected and launched a US\$49.6 million flash appeal for emergency support [15,16]. IOM’s early displacement snapshot found 4,288 households affected, of which 2,886 — about 67% — were displaced in the assessed sites during 27–31 August [17]. UNOSAT’s initial satellite assessment mapped approximately 30 km² of flood, mudflow and rockflow impact within about 330 km² analysed across Rasuwa and Nuwakot — roughly 9% of the analysed footprint, not an estimate of total regional impact [18].

Evidence	Observed fact
Government impact figures	1,377 bodies recovered; 5,130 missing; 13,656 rescued as of 10 Sep 2026 [13].
Population affected	UN estimate: ~84,270 people affected [15].
Displacement	IOM: 4,288 households affected; 2,886 displaced (~67%) in early assessed sites [17].
Mapped physical footprint	UNOSAT: ~30 km² affected within ~330 km² analysed in Rasuwa and Nuwakot [18].
Emergency finance	UN flash appeal: US\$49.6 million [16].
Infrastructure / capability stress	Government response includes multiple hydropower sites and requests for drones, LiDAR, bridges and specialised tunnel-rescue systems [13].

L-ARC™ interpretation. The event reinforces the need to treat high-mountain risk as a cascade rather than a single hazard label. Anticipatory Intelligence must integrate cryosphere, slope, river and infrastructure signals. Governance Legitimacy must address transboundary coordination, evacuation, rescue authority, data sharing and communication under uncertainty. Capital Sustainability is visible both in the concentration of hydropower and transport assets in exposed corridors and in the large post-impact mobilisation of public and international resources. Because the forensic assessment is still underway, this case should be treated as emerging evidence rather than as a completed validation case.

6. Cross-case findings: what the evidence actually says

Test	South Lhonak 2023	Thame 2024	Nepal floods 2024	Bhote Koshi–Trishuli 2026
Early signals / monitoring	Strong: hazard had been modelled before event.	Strong: changing lakes visible in satellite record.	Strong: 93% forecast accuracy.	Emerging: source and downstream impacts rapidly mapped; pre-event signal chain under investigation.
Cascading risk	Strong: lake → flood → sediment → hydropower/settlements.	Strong: upper lake → lower lake → debris flow → village/infrastructure.	Strong: rainfall → river/urban flooding → landslides/transport disruption.	Strong: rock–ice avalanche → temporary blockage/flood → hydropower/transport/health impacts.
Warning-to-action translation	Gap: scientific foresight did not eliminate catastrophic loss.	Partial: no deaths, but major property loss and continuing risk.	Gap: WMO identifies alert-conversion and last-mile weaknesses.	Under investigation; large rescue mobilisation occurred after impact.
Institutional coordination	Critical across water, disaster, infrastructure and local systems.	Critical for monitoring, evacuation and land-use recovery.	Explicitly central to WMO/CERF anticipatory action.	Critical and international, involving multiple agencies and countries.
Capital exposure / finance	Very high: 1,200 MW dam and corridor infrastructure.	Material: homes, tourism, bridge, hydropower and public services.	US\$345m estimated damage; anticipatory finance architecture exists.	Large infrastructure exposure; US\$49.6m humanitarian appeal while PDNA/RDNA continue.
Community / last mile	Important for evacuation and risk communication.	Outcome illustrates importance of timing, local awareness and mobility.	WMO explicitly identifies last-mile dissemination as a constraint.	Displacement, inaccessible communities and complex rescue demonstrate last-mile criticality.

Across the cases, the physical hazard mechanisms differ, but the institutional pattern is remarkably consistent. First, early signals or technically useful information often exist. Second, damage is amplified when hazards interact with infrastructure, settlement and ecosystem exposure. Third, warning systems are only as strong as the institutional pathway that converts a signal into a decision. Fourth, finance is usually easiest to mobilise after visible loss even though the greatest resilience value often lies in funding monitoring, preparedness and risk reduction beforehand. These are the exact interfaces that L-ARC™ is designed to connect.

7. What can — and cannot — be claimed as “validation”

7.1 Claims supported by the evidence

- The framework has strong construct validity: its core dimensions correspond to independently observed determinants of disaster outcomes.
- The “knowing–acting gap” is empirically supported. South Lhonak shows pre-existing hazard knowledge; Nepal 2024 shows high forecast accuracy with incomplete forecast-to-action conversion.
- Governance readiness is not a secondary variable. Authority, coordination, last-mile communication and community engagement repeatedly influence whether technical intelligence becomes protective action.
- Capital sustainability is central rather than peripheral. Hydropower, roads, public services, tourism and recovery finance are repeatedly part of the hazard chain.
- The framework is transferable across glacier-outburst, debris-flow and extreme-rainfall contexts because it governs the information-to-action chain rather than assuming one hazard mechanism.

7.2 Claims that would be scientifically premature

- That L-ARC™ has been statistically proven to predict Himalayan disasters.
- That use of L-ARC™ would have prevented any specific historical disaster or produced a quantifiable number of lives saved.
- That the proposed indicator families already have validated weights or universal thresholds.

- That AI can replace field observations, expert judgement, community knowledge or accountable public authority.
- That evidence from four cases is sufficient to establish causal superiority over other resilience frameworks.

Defensible formulation for governments and research institutes

“Recent Himalayan disasters provide strong real-world evidence that the L-ARC™ dimensions are operationally relevant and that the framework captures recurrent weaknesses in the conversion of environmental intelligence into governed and sustained resilience action. Prospective field validation is the next required step.”

8. Turning L-ARC™ into an operational environmental-intelligence system

The next stage is not to add complexity to the framework but to make each function measurable. A practical implementation should operate as a decision architecture layered over existing observation, forecasting and governance systems. It should not require a government to replace its hydrometeorological, disaster-management or remote-sensing platforms. Instead, it should connect them through common risk objects, thresholds, decision owners and audit trails.

8.1 Illustrative measurable indicators

Function	Examples of measurable variables
Detect	Lake-area growth (%/year); glacier-front retreat (m/year); InSAR deformation (mm/year); rainfall anomaly; river-stage anomaly; sensor uptime.
Interpret	Hazard-chain confidence; uncertainty bounds; affected ecosystem classes; exposed population/assets; community observations corroborated.
Prioritise	Number of people/assets above action threshold; critical-infrastructure exposure; ecological sensitivity; governance-readiness deficit.
Govern	Signal-to-alert time; alert-to-decision-owner time; % agencies acknowledging alert; decision rationale recorded; uncertainty disclosed.
Adapt	Evacuation readiness; land-use controls; lake/riverside mitigation; ecosystem restoration; infrastructure redesign; contingency resources deployed.
Monitor	Post-event learning completed; warning reach; false/missed alert rates; recovery time; intervention effectiveness; indicators recalibrated.

8.2 AI’s appropriate role

AI can materially improve the “Detect–Interpret–Prioritise” side of the framework by accelerating change detection in satellite imagery, classifying snow/ice/water boundaries, identifying anomalous lake growth, analysing InSAR deformation, integrating hydrometeorological streams, detecting land-cover and ecosystem change, and prioritising field validation. Multimodal systems can combine images, terrain, river observations, infrastructure maps and text-based field reports. Natural-language systems can help triage local observations and translate technical risk information into accessible decision briefs.

However, AI should remain decision support rather than decision authority. Every consequential output should carry provenance, uncertainty, explanation and a human owner. The higher the potential consequence, the stronger the requirement for field validation and independent review. This is consistent with the framework’s original safeguards: explainability, uncertainty disclosure, local knowledge and human accountability.

9. A prospective validation protocol

A credible claim of efficacy requires prospective testing. The following protocol would allow a government, research institute or university consortium to test the framework without waiting for another catastrophe.

Phase 1 — Baseline and design (0–90 days)

- Select one glacier-fed basin with documented downstream exposure and one comparison basin.
- Create a shared inventory of glaciers/lakes, river reaches, ecosystems, settlements, critical infrastructure and institutional decision owners.
- Pre-register indicator definitions and action thresholds; do not change them retrospectively after an event unless the change is recorded as recalibration.
- Baseline current warning latency, data-sharing time, warning reach, evacuation readiness, governance readiness and pre-arranged finance.

Phase 2 — Live operational trial (3–12 months)

- Run the Detect–Interpret–Prioritise pipeline continuously using existing remote sensing, hydromet and field/community data.
- For every threshold exceedance, record time from detection to interpretation, decision ownership, alert issue, community dissemination and action.
- Capture false alarms, missed events, disagreement between models and field observations, and reasons for human override.
- Conduct at least two multi-agency exercises under realistic communications and access constraints.
- Track whether adaptation and maintenance budgets remain available after the initial pilot period.

Phase 3 — Evaluation

Evaluation domain	Prospective outcome measures
Technical	Detection lead time; calibration; false/missed alert rate; data completeness; model uncertainty.
Governance	Decision latency; acknowledgement rate; named action owner; audit completeness; community warning reach.
Resilience	Evacuation time; disruption avoided during exercises/real events; critical-asset downtime; recovery time.
Capital	Pre-event vs post-event spending; maintenance continuity; avoided-loss scenarios; proportion of high-risk assets with financed mitigation.
Legitimacy	Stakeholder trust; explanation quality; inclusion of local observations; documented reasons for decisions and overrides.

A prospective study of this kind would move L-ARC™ from retrospective construct validation to testable operational efficacy. Crucially, it would make both successes and failures visible. A framework should be considered credible not because it never fails, but because it makes assumptions, decisions, uncertainties and learning pathways explicit.

10. Policy recommendations

- 1. Create asset-linked cryosphere risk registers.** Every dangerous or rapidly changing high-mountain source should be linked to downstream settlements, roads, bridges, hydropower, schools, health facilities and ecosystems — not maintained as a standalone glacier/lake inventory.
- 2. Establish “no warning without an action owner”.** Every risk threshold should map to a named institution, decision authority, action and escalation path. A warning with no owner is information, not governance.
- 3. Measure Governance Response Readiness.** Assess monitoring capacity, legal mandate, data sharing, contingency resources, inter-agency protocols, last-mile reach and accountability alongside physical hazard and exposure.
- 4. Stress-test hydropower and transport against cascading hazards.** Design standards should account for debris-rich floods, temporary dam failures, rock–ice avalanches and upstream GLOFs, not only historical monsoon discharges.
- 5. Institutionalise anticipatory finance.** Pre-agreed funding windows should be connected to transparent triggers and allowed to release resources before visible loss where thresholds are met.
- 6. Use communities as an evidence layer.** Local observations of snow, river behaviour, slope change, water availability and ecosystem stress should enter the same evidence architecture as remote sensing and formal monitoring, with provenance retained.
- 7. Adopt interoperable alert standards.** Common Alerting Protocol and other standardised message structures can reduce ambiguity and improve last-mile consistency across agencies and channels [19].
- 8. Require post-event learning loops.** Every major event should trigger an independent review of what was detected, what was missed, who acted, what delayed action, how finance moved, and which thresholds need recalibration.

9. Strengthen transboundary data agreements. High-mountain hazards can propagate across national boundaries faster than conventional diplomatic or administrative processes. Near-real-time sharing of river, cryosphere and hazard data should be operational rather than ad hoc.

10. Keep AI auditable. Model outputs should include uncertainty, data provenance, explanation and a responsible human decision owner. High-stakes actions must remain reviewable and contestable.

11. Conclusion

The evidence now available from the Hindu Kush Himalaya strengthens the central argument of the original framework. The crisis is not only that ice is melting or that high-mountain hazards are becoming more complex. The deeper problem is that environmental intelligence is frequently fragmented from authority, trust, finance and action.

South Lhonak shows that serious hazard knowledge can exist before catastrophe and still fail to prevent catastrophic downstream loss. Thame shows that similar physical processes can produce very different human outcomes and that continued monitoring matters after the initial flood. Nepal's 2024 floods show that a technically strong forecast — 93% accurate according to WMO — can coexist with major mortality and loss when conversion to actionable alerts and last-mile delivery is incomplete. The 2026 Bhote Koshi–Trishuli disaster shows, with painful immediacy, how cryosphere-linked hazards can become infrastructure, humanitarian, governance and financing crises within minutes.

Together, these cases do not prove that L-ARC™ is a predictive model. They do something more defensible and useful at this stage: they demonstrate that the framework is pointed at the right problem. Anticipatory Intelligence without Governance Legitimacy can become technically impressive but socially weak. Governance without Capital Sustainability can become reactive and temporary. Capital without anticipatory intelligence can be spent after avoidable loss rather than before it.

The policy challenge is therefore to move from observation to governed intelligence: detect early, interpret in context, prioritise transparently, assign responsibility, act with legitimacy, finance resilience before loss and monitor whether the intervention actually worked. That is the practical proposition of L-ARC™ for Himalayan resilience.

Final research position

The current evidence is sufficient to justify prospective institutional pilots of L-ARC™. It is not sufficient to claim causal disaster-prevention efficacy. The most rigorous next move is therefore not stronger rhetoric, but live deployment with pre-registered indicators, auditable decisions and measurable outcomes.

References

- Maharjan, S.B. & Sherpa, T.C. (2026). Changing dynamics of glaciers in the Hindu Kush Himalayan region from 1990 to 2020. ICIMOD. DOI: 10.53055/ICIMOD.1122. [Source](#)
- ICIMOD (2023). Water, ice, society, and ecosystems in the Hindu Kush Himalaya: An outlook (HI-WISE). DOI: 10.53055/ICIMOD.1028. [Source](#)
- ICIMOD (2023). Landmark report on impacts of disappearing snow and ice in the Hindu Kush Himalaya. [Source](#)
- Sattar, A. et al. (2021). Future Glacial Lake Outburst Flood (GLOF) hazard of the South Lhonak Lake, Sikkim Himalaya. *Geomorphology*, 388, 107783. DOI: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2021.107783. [Source](#)
- Sattar, A. et al. (2025). The Sikkim flood of October 2023: Drivers, causes and impacts of a multihazard cascade. *Science*, 387, eads2659. DOI: 10.1126/science.ads2659. [Source](#)
- ISRO/NRSC (2023). Satellite image-based studies of South Lhonak Lake, 4 October 2023. [Source](#)
- World Bank (2025). Dam safety and climate-resilient risk management document referencing the October 2023 South Lhonak GLOF impacts. [Source](#)
- Maharjan, S.B., Sherpa, T.C. & Shrestha, A.B. (2025). Thame Valley Glacial Lake Outburst Flood 2024: Causes, impacts and future risks. ICIMOD / NDRRMA. DOI: 10.53055/ICIMOD.1101. [Source](#)
- Maharjan, S.B. et al. (2026). The 2024 cascading glacial lake outburst flood in the Thame Valley of Everest region, Nepal: process, impacts and implications. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 26, 4131–. [Source](#)
- World Meteorological Organization (2025). Early Warnings for All — Pillar 2 report: Nepal flash-flood case study. [Source](#)
- United Nations Nepal (2026). United Nations Country Team Nepal Results Report 2024. [Source](#)
- OCHA / CERF (2024). Nepal Monsoon Floods — Anticipatory Action Framework, 2024 revision. [Source](#)
- Government of Nepal, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2026). Daily Situation Update on Bhote Koshi River Floods — 10 September 2026. [Source](#)

14. Government of Nepal, Health Emergency Operation Centre (2026). Rasuwa Flash Floods 2026 — Health Sector Response. [Source](#)
15. United Nations Sustainable Development Group (2026). Flood-ravaged Nepal calls for climate justice, 9 September 2026. [Source](#)
16. United Nations Nepal (2026). Nepal floods: UN and partners launch US\$49.6 million emergency appeal, 4 September 2026. [Source](#)
17. International Organization for Migration (2026). Nepal — Flash Floods — Displacement Snapshot (27–31 August 2026). [Source](#)
18. UNOSAT / UNITAR (2026). Satellite-detected mudflow and rockflow extent in Rasuwa and Nuwakot Districts, 26–27 August 2026. [Source](#)
19. World Meteorological Organization (2025). WMO strengthens Early Warning Services in Nepal — Common Alerting Protocol implementation. [Source](#)
20. World Bank (2022). Nepal Country Climate and Development Report — key highlights and resilience recommendations. [Source](#)

About this white paper

This website-oriented white paper is a research synthesis and evidence update derived from the author’s Environmental Climate Governance and L-ARC™ work. It deliberately separates retrospective evidence support from prospective causal validation. Publicly available evidence was checked against official and peer-reviewed sources available through 12 September 2026. Current-event figures, especially for the 26 August 2026 Nepal disaster, are time-sensitive and may be revised by authorities.

L-ARC™ refers to the Lahiri AI-Resilience Continuum, structured around Anticipatory Intelligence, Governance Legitimacy and Capital Sustainability. The framework is intended to support research, policy design and accountable environmental decision-making. It does not replace statutory emergency-management systems, specialist hazard models, local knowledge or professional judgement.