Context and participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Haiti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rural mountainous and forested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Area with high risks of disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities part of the project?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Valuation of Biodiversity Project (PVB), Unit II of the Pine Forest, Phase IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What common risks and hazards do you face in this region?</td>
<td>Cyclones and landslides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous risk survey participation</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Program „Preservation and Enhancement of Biodiversity - PVB“, funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and implemented by HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation since 2003, aims at contributing to the development of a participatory and sustainable management of protected areas in Haiti, which combines preservation of natural resources and socio-economic needs of local communities. The strategy aims at empowering local stakeholders (local elected officials, community-based organization) and accompanying statutory authorities (ANAP / Ministry of Environment) to the development of mechanisms for the construction of a form of sustainable management of the reserve.

Figure 1: Participants at the resilience workshop in Haiti, mountainous area
Matrix of risks

This matrix was filled in by the representative group of the community which was interviewed. It shows the most important risks that were identified by the community and their perceptions of risks. For each risk, they agreed together where to position it according to the impact they have and likelihood of occurrence.

Reported risks and impacts

Figure 3 was produced from the matrix of risks. Based on the perceptions from the representative group, it shows the main identified risks. These risks are ranked according to the combination of each risk’s impact (5 ranks) and likelihood (5 ranks) of occurrence and are cumulated and measured on a scale of 10 ranks. The scale of Figure 4 is based on the risk’s impact (5 ranks) divided by the number of times it was mentioned.
Most commonly reported actions and barriers

### Most commonly reported actions

1. Sensitization & prevention measures
2. Community mobilisation
3. Health & market mobile services
4. Hard infrastructure measures
5. Soil conservation measures
6. Use of traditional knowledge

### Most commonly reported barriers

1. Poor governance – disbelief
2. Lack of financial and technical means
3. Lack of mobilisation / disbelief
4. Land tenure issues
5. Lack of infrastructure
6. Lack of information
Analysis of characteristics of the community

- **Assets and resources:** The community living in the area where the activities of the PVB project are implemented completely depends on natural resources (very few imports and limited resources). The access to water and to varied nutrition is limited, largely because of the hostile climate (drought, heavy rains, flooding, land degradation, etc.), the great poverty of this area and a lack of financial and technical means, and insufficient crop diversification. Community members are mobilized in times of crisis for support, but often they quickly reach their limits. When it is reached, they either have to migrate to cities to earn, or temporarily place one or some of their children in other more healthy families (“Restavek”). The PVB project has significantly contributed to the spirit of mobilisation in the area.

- **Infrastructure:** There is hardly any infrastructure in the area: no roads, very few brick-built houses, no or little shelter for livestock, no infrastructure for the market, no schools, no hospital, not enough tanks for water reserves, no irrigation, etc. Following various cyclones, the community began to build shelters for livestock to reduce losses. There has been some construction of more robust homes. In general, it is the churches which play the role of school and social shelter. Dry-stone walls to reduce erosion and landslides have been built. Most of the buildings and infrastructure resulted from project activities.

- **Institutions & processes:** The state is almost non-existent in this area. The communities are left to themselves. Community mobilisation is quite limited, but thanks to the project activities it has increased. CASEC\(^1\) gathers area managers and facilitates decision-making by allocating roles.

- **Knowledge & learning:** The community is mainly based on their expertise and their traditional knowledge. There are still some teachers for a few primary schools but of very poor quality because they are often volunteers who have not even followed real training. The church remains if not the most secure means of transmission, which folds to the community. The community has limited access to external information, and is relatively closed on itself.

- **Values & attitudes:** A strong sense of distrust among the community is caused by the political climate and lack of state help. People are reluctant to make changes and it is difficult to generate interest and community confidence in order to adopt new models / new practices.

---

\(^1\)Conseils d’Administration des Sections Communales (CASEC)
Survey analysis based on the three capacities

- **Absorptive capacity:** The community somehow tries to absorb shocks, and appeals to mutual aid with neighbours whenever it is possible (despite distrust during emergencies, drought, famine). The community quickly reaches its absorptive limits.

- **Adaptive capacity:** This ability is poorly developed by the community. The main adaptations which took place were thanks to project activities. Without the project, most people would immigrate to the cities because they do not have the means to adapt and have insufficient knowledge and there is a general lack of mutual help.

- **Transformative capacity:** In most cases there is migration to cities when there are no other means available. This is the case when there is severe drought and famine ad during post-hurricane periods and for the education of children, etc. In this case this is not a positive, but a negative transformation as the core functions of the community are not maintained. Women are often left to themselves with several children, the husband goes to the city to earn more money and sends it to his family. This causes loosening of family ties and the poverty cycle.

Figure 5: The resilience triangle