HARNESSING SOCIAL MEDIA TO DEVELOP LOCAL NETWORKS

PARTICIPANTS
Thomas Snellmann (Finland, proposer), Zoltan (Hungary), Axel (UK), Ben (UK), Andrea (Italy), Monica (Poland), Stephan (Austria), Martin (Austria), Antoine (Belgium) and Chrystelle (Belgium)

TOPICS
Use of technologies (what works and encountered limits), recognition of the different models : customer -led, producer -led, group hubs, commercial

FACEBOOK	
+	-
Low cost	Not used by everyone
Good to create local awareness	Farmers less likely to be users
Can be used for direct producer-consumer communication	Little use between producers

→ *Word of mouth furthers communication and reaches beyond users. Encourage it !*
→ *Can be used to attract people for events not directly related with the base activity.*

WEBSITES	
+	-
Can be used for more specific needs : registration Private members' parts	Requires ressources : technical (design) human (contents/updates) financial (hosting and above)
	Can be hard to find

→ *Websites can be hard to find, need to aggregate ressources.*

TWITTER	
+	-
	Need to be followed/advertised, before events ? Do it

→ Let's not forget old media : magazines are a good tool. In Finland, large scale press coverage helped a lot.

KEYWORDS
Visibility, Awareness raising, Dissemination of the Movement, Management.

ACTIONS
→ Create a Twitter handle, encourage farmer networking
→ Discuss a suitable way to aggregate ressources
→ Contact interested discussers to discuss ways they can help