



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The exploitation of plant genetic information: Political strategies in crop development

Pistorius, R.J.; van Wijk, J.C.A.C.

Publication date

1999

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Pistorius, R. J., & van Wijk, J. C. A. C. (1999). *The exploitation of plant genetic information: Political strategies in crop development*.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Appendix ii

Note on the interviews

During the fieldwork in Chile and Colombia, 102 persons representing around 75 organizations or departments were interviewed (Figure I). Of the total number of 91 interviews, 23 were carried out in 1994 and 68 in 1996. The interviewees in Chile and Colombia were basically selected by means of the "snowball" method, which means that a small group of persons who were involved in crop development were identified, interviewed, and used as informants to identify others who qualified for inclusion in our sample. This method of sampling was considered to be appropriate as it met our aim to provide an overview of the various opinions on plant-related conservation and intellectual property protection. As many of the interviewees represented a specific social category, we were able to relate their opinions to the specific position of this category in the agro-industrial production process.

We tried very actively to include in the sample all individuals and organizations that had previously expressed an opinion on biodiversity conservation and plant-related intellectual property protection. We interviewed representatives of most governmental departments and institutions that were responsible for policy in this field. As far as the views of farmers and indigenous peoples are concerned, we relied on the position of the main organizations that represent these groups. We also interviewed the main associations of the crop development industry, as well as a significant number of individual companies. Most, if not all, public and private plant breeding organizations in the two countries were included in the sample. Added to the sample were specialists from universities, NGOs, and international agricultural research organizations who either played a direct role in the design of biodiversity conservation or intellectual property policy, or who appeared to have a specific interest in it.

Two additional comments on the categorization of interviewees should be made:

- a) Some organizations are involved in more than one activity. For example, several farmers associations also have their own plant breeding programmes. In such cases the interviewees are categorized according to the department they were working for, i.e. representing either a breeding organization, or a farmers' interest association.
- b) A private firm is considered to be domestic when 51 per cent or more of the capital is owned by national shareholders. Foreign companies are those companies of which 51 per cent of the capital is owned by foreign shareholders. Because data about the companies' shares are not publicly available, it was left to the respondent to indicate whether or not a company is considered to be national or foreign according to our criterion.

Figure 1 Number of interviewees by country and type of organization

	Government ¹	Breeder			Propagator ⁵	Cultivator ⁶	Association			Indigenous ¹⁰	International ¹¹	University ¹²	Other ¹³	Total
		Private D ²	Private F ³	Public ⁴			Industry ⁷	Farmers ⁸	NGO ⁹					
Chile	9	3	2	4	2	1	3	2	7	6	3	7	1	50
Colombia	10	4	2	3	6	1	1	5	7	2	4	2	5	52
Total	19	7	4	7	8	2	4	7	14	8	7	9	6	102

¹ Government, including both Members of Parliament and officials from ministries in the area of agriculture, industry, forestry, and environmental protection

² Private domestic seed company with plant breeding activities

³ Private foreign seed company with plant breeding activities

⁴ Public institute with plant breeding activities

⁵ Private domestic seed company with propagation activities

⁶ Private domestic cultivating companies

⁷ Associations of breeders, propagators, or cultivators

⁸ Associations of farmers

⁹ Non-governmental organizations in the area of nature protection or small-scale farming

¹⁰ Organizations of indigenous peoples

¹¹ International organizations, including: CIAT, FAO, IPGRI, IICA

¹² University departments with research on agriculture or biodiversity conservation

¹³ Other organizations with an interest in crop development

Figure 1. Diagram of the experimental design. The figure is a flowchart showing the sequence of events in the experiment. It starts with 'Pre-test' leading to 'Main test' and 'Post-test'. The 'Main test' is divided into 'Pre-test' and 'Post-test' phases. The 'Pre-test' phase includes 'Pre-test' and 'Post-test' sub-phases. The 'Post-test' phase includes 'Pre-test' and 'Post-test' sub-phases. The 'Main test' is further divided into 'Pre-test' and 'Post-test' phases. The 'Pre-test' phase includes 'Pre-test' and 'Post-test' sub-phases. The 'Post-test' phase includes 'Pre-test' and 'Post-test' sub-phases.