

Designing and Implementing Engagement Strategies with Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities and Afrodescendant Peoples: Lessons Learned from the Science Panel for the Amazon

Authors: Jaime Serrano and André Junqueira

Consultants for the Science Panel for the Amazon (SPA)

SUMMARY

This document synthesizes the key lessons learned from the process of designing and implementing the **Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities and Afrodescendant Peoples' Engagement Strategy** (hereafter, the IPs, LCs and APs Engagement Strategy) of the Science Panel for the Amazon (SPA). It is intended to serve as a practical reference for organizations and initiatives seeking to engage with Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities and afrodescendant Peoples through knowledge dialogues, drawing on the experience of the SPA. The process was carried out between June and December 2025, with the objective of creating a solid, intercultural and replicable framework that 1) enables the SPA to promote horizontal dialogues between academic science and Indigenous and Local Knowledge (ILK) across its activities (e.g., consultations, institutional engagement, outreach, etc.) and publications (Assessment Reports, white papers, policy briefs, etc.), and 2) promotes the participation of IPs, LCs and APs in knowledge co-construction within the SPA. While these objectives were pursued within SPA, they reflect challenges shared by many scientific and policy-oriented initiatives working with IPs, LCs and APs.

The process involved several activities, including an initial analysis of previous SPA work, consultations with experts in facilitating knowledge dialogues (IPs, LCs and APs representatives and non-IPs, LCs and APs experts), articulation with IPs, LCs and APs and civil society organizations, the tracking and analysis of IPs, LCs and APs participation in the [Amazon Assessment Report 2025 \(AR2025\)](#), the development of a [synthesis document for IPs, LCs, and APs](#) based on the AR2025, and the organization and facilitation of events and dialogues during UNFCCC COP30 in Belém. The lessons learned synthesized here aim to guide the institutionalization of the IPs, LCs and APs Engagement Strategy for SPA, its scaling up, and its application in future work of the panel, as well as supporting the work of other organizations who are interested in conducting similar work.

1. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

The Science Panel for the Amazon (SPA), convened under the auspices of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN), is the first high-level regional scientific initiative dedicated to the Amazon. The Panel was established to communicate the scientific, economic, and moral case for conservation of the Amazon and address widespread deforestation, forest degradation, and wildfires that had intensified in recent years. The SPA has the mission “to synthesize and communicate scientific knowledge about the Amazon, interweaved with Indigenous and Local Knowledge, to accelerate solutions for sustainable and equitable development” and the vision “to become a global authority providing state-of-the-art, policy-relevant science and knowledge about the Amazon”. Today, the Panel is composed of over 350 scientists who released the [2021 Amazon Assessment Report \(AR2021\)](#) at COP26, which has been called an “encyclopedia” of the Amazon region. In 2025, the SPA launched its second landmark report, the 2025 Amazon Assessment Report (AR2025) at COP30 in Belém.

The SPA recognizes the Amazon as a complex, living system in which ecological, climatic, social, cultural, and spiritual dimensions are deeply interconnected. Understanding and responding to the challenges the Amazon faces today requires approaches that move beyond disciplinary silos and sectoral perspectives, and that are capable of ensuring engagement with this complexity in a meaningful and grounded way.

Within this context, Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities and Afrodescendant Peoples (IPs, LCs and APs) are not simply stakeholders or knowledge holders to be consulted. They are long-term co-creators of knowledge about and for the Amazon, having developed sophisticated systems of observation, interpretation, and territorial governance over generations of continuous interaction with ecosystems, climatic cycles, and biodiversity. Their knowledge systems are not complementary or ancillary to academic science; they are constitutive of any rigorous understanding of the Amazon as an interconnected biophysical and socio-cultural system.

Scientific panels, research networks, and policy-oriented initiatives worldwide increasingly recognize the need to engage meaningfully with IPs, LCs and APs, yet often

lack structured approaches to move beyond consultation toward knowledge co-creation. The experience of SPA reflects this broader institutional transition.

The AR2025 marked a significant step forward for the SPA in this regard. IPs, LCs and APs authors contributed across all chapters, and a full chapter was led by IPs, LCs and APs representatives. This represented an important institutional shift toward more inclusive and intercultural scientific practice. However, the AR2025 experience also made clear that meaningful participation and knowledge co-construction cannot rely on ad hoc arrangements or individual goodwill alone. Without a clear, shared, and institutionalized framework, participation risks remain uneven, episodic, or limited to validation stages rather than shaping scientific agendas, methodologies, and outputs from the outset. This institutional gap—between intention and operationalization—is common across many scientific and policy initiatives. Goodwill alone does not produce intercultural engagement; it requires institutional design, allocation of resources, methodological clarity, and long-term commitment.

The IPs, LCs and APs Engagement Strategy responds directly to this challenge. It seeks to provide the SPA with a coherent and replicable institutional framework that enables sustained dialogue, participation, and co-creation with IPs, LCs and APs across all SPA activities and products—assessment reports, white papers, policy briefs, and future initiatives. More than a participation mechanism, the strategy is conceived as an enabling architecture for intercultural scientific collaboration: one that supports equitable relationships between knowledge systems, strengthens scientific rigor, and enhances the relevance and legitimacy of SPA outputs for territorial, policy, and global decision-making processes. As emphasized by Harold Ipuchima during a knowledge dialogue event at Casa da Floresta at COP30, advancing Amazonian science requires going beyond consultation and dialogues toward genuine knowledge co-creation. He highlighted the need to recognize the value of Indigenous and local knowledge systems and the importance of building sustained alliances between academia and IPs, LCs and APs as a pathway to generate more relevant, grounded, and transformative knowledge.

The rationale for this strategy is both epistemological and political. Epistemologically, the complexity of the Amazon

cannot be fully understood through any single knowledge system. Addressing phenomena such as climate regulation, biodiversity loss, hydrological cycles, fire dynamics, and socio-ecological resilience requires collective intelligence built through dialogue between academic and Indigenous sciences. Politically, IPs, LCs and APs are central actors in the protection and governance of Amazonian territories, and their meaningful involvement in knowledge co-production is inseparable from questions of rights, autonomy, legitimacy, and justice.

This document synthesizes the lessons learned from the process of designing and consolidation of the SPA IPs, LCs and APs Engagement Strategy between June and December 2025. These lessons aim to inform the institutionalization, scaling, and long-term sustainability of the strategy within the SPA, ensuring that engagement with IPs, LCs and APs becomes a structural component of the Panel's work rather than a one-off feature of a single assessment cycle. It also aims to contribute to other organisations that want to reflect on their processes regarding these issues.

2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR ENGAGEMENT

The design and implementation of the IPs, LCs and APs Engagement Strategy is grounded in a set of foundational principles that pre-date the Science Panel for the Amazon itself. These principles are not the outcome of the process, but the ethical and epistemological starting point from which the work has been conceived. They reflect a long-standing commitment to intercultural engagement, shaped through sustained work alongside Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities and Afrodescendant Peoples, and informed by ways of relating to knowledge, territory, and life that are deeply rooted in the Amazon. These principles are also in accordance with the best practices compiled by SPA, based on consultations with experts and a review of existing experiences across the Amazon, and were compiled in the white paper '[Promoting Knowledge dialogues in Amazonia: learning from best practices and experiences](#)'.

Horizontal relationships: Refers to engagement guided by a commitment to horizontal relationships among knowledge systems and actors. This implies rejecting

hierarchical or extractive approaches to knowledge production, and instead fostering spaces where different ways of knowing can interact on equal footing, with mutual respect and shared responsibility.

Intrinsic value of Indigenous and Local Knowledge:

Indigenous and local knowledge systems are recognized as intrinsically valuable, complete, and rigorous in their own right. Therefore, these shall not be approached as complementary inputs to technical/academic knowledge, but as living systems of knowledge that have sustained territories, ecosystems, and societies over long temporal scales and are proven successful strategies for the protection of the Amazon.

Relational understanding of territory and life: Indigenous worldviews understand humans as part of broader living systems, inseparable from the ecosystems, cycles, and territories they inhabit. Knowledge is therefore not abstract or detached, but relational—emerging from ongoing interactions between people, land, water, forests, and non-human beings and crystallized into skills and practices that guide daily life.

Respect, reciprocity, and balance: All engagements are to be grounded in respect for the autonomy, governance systems, and cultural protocols of IPs, LCs and APs. Reciprocity and balance are understood as essential conditions for trust, requiring that interactions generate mutual value and avoid one-sided extraction of information or provision of legitimacy.

Cooperation and collective responsibility: Commitment to cooperation rather than competition, and to share a collective responsibility for the outcomes of knowledge production, rather than individual proclamation over knowledge property. This includes recognizing shared accountability for how knowledge is generated, interpreted, applied, amplified and mobilized in policy and decision-making contexts.

Care for process and relationships: Time, presence, and continuity are treated as essential components of meaningful engagement. Processes shall be designed to privilege trust-building and long-term relationships over efficiency-driven timelines, acknowledging that intercultural collaboration requires patience, emergence, adaptability, and attentiveness to territorial rhythms.

Together, these principles provided the ethical and methodological foundation for the SPA IPs, LCs and APs Engagement Strategy. They have informed decisions about how dialogues are structured, how partnerships are built, and how knowledge co-construction has been pursued throughout the process, shaping an approach that seeks to integrate diverse knowledge systems in ways that are equitable, respectful, and life-centered.

Implications for Other Organizations and Initiatives

For organizations seeking to design engagement processes with IPs, LCs and APs, clarifying foundational principles at the outset is crucial. Making these explicit helps prevent extractive dynamics and misaligned expectations. Organizations designing engagement strategies may consider:

- Explicitly defining their epistemological stance toward Indigenous and Local Knowledge before initiating engagement processes.
- Clarifying whether participation is consultative, collaborative, or co-creative.
- Establishing minimum standards for reciprocity, interpretation, and decision-making inclusion.
- Aligning timelines and outputs with territorial rhythms rather than institutional urgency.
- Ensuring internal alignment around shared terminology and expectations before engaging externally.
- The mapping of IPs, LCs and APs participation across authorship roles, governance bodies, and decision-making spaces revealed that numerical inclusion does not automatically translate into structural influence. This underscores a broader design challenge: engagement strategies must assess not only who participates, but where and at which stage of institutional processes.
- A critical review of previous SPA initiatives involving IPs, LCs and APs exposed conceptual and procedural inconsistencies in how knowledge dialogues were understood and implemented. This suggests that institutions seeking intercultural engagement should invest early in shared definitions, minimum standards, and internal alignment before scaling participation mechanisms.
- The identification of governance and coordination gaps highlighted that intercultural engagement cannot rely solely on informal champions. Durable processes require dedicated coordination structures capable of ensuring continuity beyond individual cycles or personalities.
- The multi-scalar mapping of IPs, LCs and APs organizations, as well as experienced ILK practitioners and civil society actors, revealed the political complexity of representativeness. Engagement strategies must therefore be informed by deliberate ecosystem analysis, recognizing layered forms of legitimacy and avoiding over-reliance on highly visible umbrella organizations.
- Identifying potential long-term partners during the diagnostic phase shifted the logic from episodic consultation toward relational infrastructure. For institutions operating in science–policy interfaces, this implies that engagement should be conceived as an ongoing institutional commitment rather than an event-based activity.

3. LESSONS LEARNED

Based on the SPA experiences in designing and implementing its engagement strategy with IPs, LCs and APs, we have compiled some of the learning outcomes under five main topics. While these are grounded in the Amazonian context and in SPA's institutional trajectory, they are also intended to function as a transferable reference framework. They outline not only what SPA did, but also the structural conditions, methodological choices, and relational investments that enabled progress—elements that may inform other organizations seeking to design or refine their own engagement strategies.

A. Institutional Diagnosis as a Foundation for Engagement

Intercultural engagement requires institutional diagnosis before operational design. In SPA, this process combined internal review and external actor mapping, generating lessons that extend beyond the specific case.

B. Consultations with experts as co-design rather than validation

In SPA, consultations with experienced practitioners—both IPs, LCs and APs representatives and non-IPs, LCs and APs experts in knowledge dialogues—were integrated into the

Together, these elements indicate that institutional diagnosis—of internal capacities, governance design, and external ecosystems—is a foundational component of engagement architecture, not a preliminary exercise.

design phase of the Engagement Strategy. This approach generated several important lessons.

- Engaging experts early allowed SPA to build upon well-established intercultural methodologies rather than designing engagement mechanisms from scratch. For similar initiatives, this underscores the importance of recognizing and leveraging accumulated experiences.
- Bringing together internal SPA members and external practitioners revealed different understandings of what “knowledge dialogue” means in practice. This highlighted the need for shared terminology and methodological clarity before scaling engagement.
- Treating consultations as spaces for joint reflection—rather than requests for endorsement—allowed the strategy itself to evolve. Initial assumptions were revised, and accumulated experience informed methodological choices.
- Beyond technical input, consultations also strengthened long-term relationships. Trust and continuity emerged not as by-products, but as central outcomes of the process. For science–policy initiatives working with IPs, LCs and APs, consultation processes should therefore be conceived not only as knowledge exchanges, but as necessary trust building exercises.
- SPA’s experience indicates that consultations are most effective when embedded as early-stage co-design mechanisms and when approached as both methodological refinement and relational infrastructure.

SPA’s experience suggests that consultations are most effective when conceived as early-stage co-design processes. When embedded from the beginning, they enhance legitimacy, clarity, and continuity.

C. Institutional Articulation and Multi-Scale Network Building

Intercultural engagement in science–policy initiatives depend not only on internal design, but on how institutions position themselves within broader political and organizational ecosystems. Robust engagement strategies depend on deliberate multi-scale positioning and long-term relational continuity. In SPA, institutional articulation involved direct dialogue with IPs, LCs and APs organizations across local, national, and regional scales, as well as engagement with allied academic and civil society actors. This experience generated several structural insights.



- Establishing direct contact with IPs, LCs and APs organizations at multiple scales revealed that representativeness is layered and context-dependent. Engagement strategies must, therefore, move beyond reliance on highly visible umbrella organizations and intentionally design multi-scalar articulation.
- Sustained dialogue with territorial and national organizations demonstrated that legitimacy cannot be assumed through affiliation alone; it is built through transparency, continuity, and reciprocal presence over time.
- Identifying and engaging experienced institutional allies—across universities, research institutes, and civil society—helped situate SPA within existing networks rather than operating in isolation. For similar initiatives, engagement strategies benefit from recognizing and integrating into broader relational ecosystems.
- Working across local, regional, and global spaces made visible how priorities and political agendas vary by scale. This suggests that engagement architecture should be flexible enough to accommodate diverse territorial realities rather than imposing a single framework.
- The process underscored that trust functions as institutional capital. Long-term relationships, repeated interaction, and visible commitment across spaces contribute to the perception of the initiative as a credible and safe interlocutor.

D. Embedding Knowledge Dialogues Across the Publication Cycle

The engagement around the Amazon Assessment Report (AR2025) included a number of activities that promoted knowledge dialogues across the publication cycle. This experience offers several considerations for similar science-policy initiatives:

- Participation in authorship alone does not ensure meaningful co-construction. SPA's experience showed that intercultural engagement must be embedded from the framing of questions through drafting, review, and dissemination, rather than concentrated at validation stages.
- Dedicated spaces for oral exchange expand epistemic inclusion. The organization of an ILK Dialogue Workshop during the AR2025 public consultation phase demonstrated the value of creating dedicated spaces for oral exchange. Allowing contributions in

non-written formats—such as audio messages and spoken interventions—expanded participation and surfaced perspectives that might otherwise remain excluded in text-based processes. Institutions designing engagement processes should consider multiple modes of expression as structural design choices rather than optional accommodations.

- The systematization of oral inputs into structured documents illustrate the importance of translation—not only linguistic, but conceptual and political. Intercultural translation requires reframing findings in ways that resonate with governance priorities and territorial realities. The development of a tailored [Synthesis Document for IPs, LCs and APs](#) highlighted that dissemination formats matter. Scientific outputs gain relevance when adapted to the contexts in which they are expected to circulate and be mobilized.
- Ensuring simultaneous interpretation during meetings proved essential to equitable participation. This reinforces that logistical design is not neutral; language access is a structural condition for inclusion.

SPA's experience suggests that knowledge dialogues are most effective when embedded across the full lifecycle of scientific outputs and when accompanied by intentional design choices regarding format, translation and participation.

E. Dissemination and Outreach as the Continuation of Engagement

The dissemination of AR2025 and the IPs, LCs and APs Synthesis Document was conceived not as a separate communication phase, but as a continuation of the engagement process itself. SPA's outreach activities included joint events, circulation of tailored synthesis materials, and sustained dialogue beyond the launch moment. This phase revealed several considerations that are relevant for similar science-policy initiatives.

- The joint organization of dissemination activities with IPs, LCs and APs partners reinforced shared ownership over how findings were interpreted and mobilized. This shows that dissemination processes can either reproduce extractive dynamics or foster co-construction, depending on how they are structured.
- The development and circulation of a tailored IPs, LCs and APs AR2025 synthesis document, aligned with their governance agendas and territorial concerns, gained resonance. This shows how designing and

disseminating outreach products specifically for IPs, LCs and APs is not a neutral transmission, but requires a well suited contextual translation.

- Engaging across different institutional and territorial settings expanded the circulation pathways of AR2025 findings. The experience highlighted how knowledge travels differently depending on scale and audience, underscoring the importance of designing dissemination with these dynamics in mind.
- Sustained presence builds continuity. Follow-up engagement beyond major events helped consolidate relationships and reinforced trust, preventing outreach from becoming episodic.

4. FINAL REFLECTIONS

The development of the SPA IPs, LCs and APs Engagement Strategy revealed that intercultural engagement is not a technical add-on to scientific work, but a structural transformation on how knowledge is framed, produced and mobilized. Through sustained engagement with authors and IPs, LCs and APs leaders in an open dialogue process, a shared understanding became increasingly clear: the Amazon cannot be understood through a single epistemic lens. Its ecological, political, cultural and spiritual dimensions require forms of collective intelligence capable of mobilizing distinct knowledge systems without subordinating one to another.

This process has shown that dialogue among different knowledge systems is not an exercise for incorporation or validation, but an opportunity to strengthen scientific practice as a whole. It entails recognizing that IPs, LCs and APs have long developed rigorous observation systems, methodologies, and highly sophisticated forms of territorial analysis, embedded in their ways of life, territorial governance, spiritual frameworks, and ongoing relationships with ecological cycles. It also highlights that scientific practice, when grounded in dialogue and co-creation across knowledge systems, becomes better equipped to respond to contemporary global crises. The experience further demonstrates that the protection of the Amazon cannot rely solely on conventional policy, conservation, or research models. The engagement strategy should, therefore, not be understood merely as a participation mechanism, but as an enabling framework for sustained intercultural scientific collaboration. It creates

the conditions for IPs, LCs and APs to contribute not only empirical insights, but also epistemological perspectives—helping shape research questions, methodologies, and pathways for action.

From a practical standpoint, the SPA IPs, LCs and APs Engagement Strategy highlights the need to move from ad hoc participation toward more structured and predictable engagement mechanisms. This requires governance adjustments, coordination mechanisms, methodological clarity, and sustained relational investment. Engagement proved to be less about adding new actors to existing processes and more about reshaping how those processes are designed.

Experience also shows that knowledge dialogues are most effective when embedded throughout institutional processes rather than treated as isolated consultation moments. This requires adapting timelines to territorial rhythms, investing in long-term, trust-based relationships with IPs, LCs and APs organizations at multiple scales, and diversifying engagement formats beyond written feedback. Tailored synthesis products, combined with sustained presence in relevant policy-design and territorial spaces, have proven particularly effective to enhance legitimacy, accessibility, and impact.

For initiatives operating at science–policy interfaces, engagement frameworks should be treated as evolving institutional architectures rather than fixed protocols. Their strength lies not in formal adoption, but in their capacity to adapt, respond, and deepen over time. Ultimately, the engagement strategy represents a long-term commitment to relational scientific practice—one that seeks to align methodological rigor with territorial realities, shared responsibility and epistemic justice.

In a global context marked by overlapping crises—climate, biodiversity, health, and justice—these lessons can play a meaningful role in demonstrating how science can evolve through intercultural dialogue. What is at stake is not only improving the quality and relevance of scientific knowledge, but also as a contribution for more holistic and life-centered pathways for collective action, where knowledge serves as a bridge rather than a boundary.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge and deeply appreciate the contributions of all IPs, LCs, and APs representatives, researchers, practitioners, institutions, and other partners who participated in the activities that informed the development of the IP, LC, and AP Engagement Strategy. This document reflects a collaborative and co-constructive process involving diverse knowledge holders, areas of expertise, sectors, experiences, and perspectives, brought together through intercultural dialogues and shared reflections. The authors are especially grateful to all those who shared their time, insights, and guidance throughout this process, in particular:

IPs, LCs and APs SPA authors: André Baniwa, Gloria Amparo Rivera, Gregorio Mirabal, Maria Páscoa Sarmento de Souza, Idjarrury Sompré, Fany Kuiru, Miqueias Santos, Nadino Calapucha, Raquel Tupinambá, Criseyda Roman Cordova, Meset Fernando Mashingashi Unkuch, Justino Resende, Alex Fernando Huambutzereque, Gasoda Paiter Suruí.

Non-IPs, LCs and APs SPA authors: Joice Ferreira, Marina Hirota, Adriane Esquivel, Bruno Carvalho, Carmen Josse, Juan Carlos Garzon Vergara, Luciana Villanova, Mariana Gómez Soto, Marianne Schminck, Sandra Hacon, Simone Athayde, Adriana Ramos, Fernanda Bortolotto, Fernando Hector Roca Alcazar, Mariana Varese, Martha Rosero, Paulo Moutinho, Silvia Futada, Luis Grupioni, Martin von Hildebrand.

Other consulted IPs, LCs and APs representatives: Freddy Mamani (Organización del Tratado de Cooperación Amazónica), Benhur Teteve Botyay (leader of the Bora people), Harold Ipuchima (Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica / Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia), Rufina Román (Comisión Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas de Colombia), Julio César Lopez Jamioy (Coordinadora de las

Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica), Tomás Candia Yusupim (Confederación de Pueblos Indígenas de Bolivia), Stanley Hubert Liaiw-Angie (Organisatie van Inheemsen in Suriname), Alcineide Neira (Universidade de Brasília), Oreme Ikpeng (Universidade Federal de São Carlos).

Other consulted non-IPs, LCs and APs experts: Maria Daniela Parra (Universidad Nacional de Colombia), David Ricardo Flores (Rainforest Norway), Maria Paula Estrada (Instituto Panamazónico), Mar del Rio Lanao (Charo (Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Programme), Silvia Gómez Echeverri (Climate and Land Use Alliance), Ana Luiza Melgaço Ramalho (Wildlife Conservation Society), Felipe Samper (Alianza Noramazónica), Sandra Valenzuela (World Wildlife Fund), Carlos Dias Jr. (Universidade Federal do Amazonas), Clara Pena Venegas (Instituto Amazónico de Investigaciones Científicas), Juan Felipe Guhl Samudio (Instituto Amazónico de Investigaciones Científicas -SINCHI-), Eduardo Malta (Instituto Socioambiental), Emilie Coudel (Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement), Gilton Mendes dos Santos (Universidade Federal do Amazonas), Gustavo Ribeiro (Operação Amazônia Nativa), Jay Mistry (Royal Holloway University London), Juliana Lins (Radboud University), Leonardo Rodrigues (Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas), Renzo Piana (Instituto del Bien Común), Marlene Soriano (Instituto Boliviano de Investigaciones Forestales), Nataly Ascarrunz (Instituto Boliviano de Investigación Forestal).

SPA Co-Chairs: Marielos Peña-Claros and Carlos Nobre.

SPA Strategic Coordinator: Emma Torres.

SPA Secretariat: Isabella Leite Lucas, Gabriel Sperandeo, Gabriela Arnal, Nina Witteveen, Federico Ernesto Viscarra Riveros, Julia Arieira, Diego Brandão, Julie Topf.

CONTACT

SPA Scientific-Technical Secretariat

New York

475 Riverside Drive | Suite 530
New York NY 10115 USA
+1 (212) 870-3920
spa@unsdsn.org

São José dos Campos

Av. Dr. Ademar de Barro, 195 | Jardim São Dimas
São José dos Campos SP | 12245-010 Brasil
+55 (12) 3921-8884
spasouthamerica@unsdsn.org

MORE INFORMATION AT

www.sp-amazon.org

FOLLOW US

#TheAmazonWeWant