**Question: What could constitute an effective structure for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, what should its different elements be, and how should they be organized?**

A post-2020 structure should include as an important element a strong connection between conservation actions and experiences at local level with decision and policy-making processes at higher levels (national, regional, international).

The structure would have to ensure support and promote inter-cultural and multi-lateral dialogue and cooperation among all actors (protected areas managers, scientists, civil society, decision-makers, donors, public institutions, stakeholders and local communities) at all levels.

**Question: How can the post-2020 global biodiversity framework incorporate or support the mainstreaming of biodiversity across society and economies at large**

The post-2020 framework needs to include strong leadership and action based on both a community-based “bottom-up” approach as well as leadership from national governments, international entities, NGOs and the private sector. Strong external communication is essential (with new channels and tools, and simple messages based on concrete case studies) to improve awareness, inform and influence the general public and public and private decision-makers about:

- The ecological and socio-economic values of protected areas;

- The challenges, added value and success stories of protected areas effective management; and

- The benefits of strongly (fully and highly) protected areas.

Scale-up communication and advocacy at local and national levels, by connecting local leaders to national and international opinion-leaders, and providing ready-to-use toolkits and messages on key topics and issues. This will particularly help to reach wider audience at those levels including general public (especially young generations) and economic stakeholders. This requires also that the « developed » world and international agencies facilitate the presence and message from “developing” world leaders (new faces and new messages). They should become international leaders (across ethnicities and across languages).

**Question: What are the lessons learned from the implementation of the current Strategic Plan? And how can the transition from the current decade to the post-2020 framework avoid further delays in implementation and where should additional attention be focused?**

We need to accelerate implementation of commitments on protected areas (insufficient coverage, weak management effectiveness and capacities of managers, poor integration of protected areas into the wider development context, and low protected areas funding availability). We also need to increase accountability of all involved in protected areas establishment to fulfill the promise of protected areas by committing to the long-term work of effective management.

To do so, we must financially and strategically support human networks of protected areas managers and partners at national, regional and international levels.

Those networks are successful in sharing knowledge and best management practices through effective communication and capacity building at practical level. They allow for exchanges with common issues in different local contexts, and generate creativity, problem solving and resource sharing.

Ecological connectivity will be better understood and protected by strong human connectivity.

Those networks build “protected area communities” at all levels, by connecting spatial planners and managers, decision-makers, scientists from different disciplines and other stakeholders, working towards the same overall goal of healthy, sustainable terrestrial and marine ecosystems that support economic well-being.

Those networks act as intermediary structures to reinforce the link between actions on the ground at local level with decision-making processes at national, regional and international levels.

**Question: What indicators, in addition to those already identified in decision XIII/28, are needed to monitor progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the national, regional and global scales?**

In addition to core data on protected areas (name, designation and type of designation, country, status, year of creation, IUCN category, nature of the site, total surface and marine surface, management authority name, governance type, existence of management plans), data are needed on protected area management (objectives and management, staff, budget and equipment, uses and pressures, regulations, monitoring and evaluation, habitats and species, education and awareness).

**Question: How can the effectiveness and implementation of the NBSAPs be strengthened, what additional mechanisms or tools, if any, are required to support implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how should these be reflected in the framework?**

Implementation can be supported through regional actions plans on biodiversity (especially for marine challenges).

**Question: How should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework address resource mobilization and what implications does this have for the scope and content of the framework?**

Effort must be focused on local, national, regional and international mechanisms to ensure sustainable financing for existing protected area management costs and networking of protected area managers.

**Question: How can the Global Environment Facility support the timely provision of financial resources to assist eligible Parties in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

The GEF should support networks of protected area managers at national and regional levels, as well as connections between those networks at global level. There is also a need to fund the long-term management activities such as planning, monitoring and enforcement and follow up on already funded projects.