

Breakdown of Ratings & Comments (in the order received)

Rater 1 4.0 = 0.5,1,1,1,0.5
(no comments)

Rater 2 4.0 = 1,0.5,0.5,1,1
(no comments)

Rater 3 4.0 = 1, 0.5, 0.5, 1,1
Comments:

“Fuegoblanco is definitely making an effort and it's interesting to see that no meat is served there - apart from being ethical, it is a healthy diet one would have visiting the place. Great idea that they are also making their own soap:) The rating I would give it, would be 4 - partly because there could be more energy saving devices, there is no mention of how the architecture perhaps contributes to energy-saving (eg insulation) and air-conditioning units are definitely not very eco...ceiling fans would be much better. Also, on the side of the community involvement side, they could perhaps be a bit more active, although I do understand they are small, and relatively new in the area - as they seem to have a very good attitude, they perhaps will develop their community links with time (I am debating whether teaching Spanish to expatriates counts as local community involvement...hmmm...are they counted as local?). It very nice that they help with the donkey and dog sanctuaries.”

Rater 4 3.0 = 0, 1,1,0.5,0.5
Comments:

“Criterion 1: Rating: 0 only part time locals, and only open to guests so locals not allowed to visit”

Rater 5 3.0 = 0.5,1,0.5,0.5,0.5
Comments:

“1. Points: 0,5

General remark: I am not really sure whether i should rate the Mongolian yurt (negative) in this criterion or in 5. I chose to rate it on 1. I might be biased but my attention is always on the promotion of local culture and heritage. I would like to see more information on the fencing of his property.

2. Points: 1

Well thought system. I would like to know more on the plant species and whether these are native (partly covered in 3). Also a bit more information on the equipment and furniture used.

3.Points: 0,5

This is a reluctant one, as the owners efforts do not concentrate to the local area or establishing closer ties with the local community. Reforestation in Kenya is one thing, what about reforestation or rehabilitation of forests in Spain? A distance between the owner and the local community is evident in some of his answers, but maybe its just the way he puts its on paper.

4. Point: 0,5

Being a small establishment what he does is sufficient but again I don't see a strong link with local population

5. Point: 0,5

Same issue. On the other hand I cannot rate whether there are local guides in the village and he just doesn't recommend them (unlikely though). The range of activities is sufficient. There is no information by the owner on nature interpretation or interpretation in general

Overall remarks are that he seems to be genuinely interested in ecotourism and that he has something concrete in his mind in terms of developing his business. His philosophy is not far from ecotourism therefore i believe he deserves to be certified. For the size of his business what he has achieved so far are more than sufficient. I would really like to see though more development regarding the benefits to local society and interpretation. Ecotourism should also animate rural areas and his efforts should be more focused on this.”

Rater 6 3.5 = 0.5,1,1,0.5,0.5
(no comments)

Rater 7 3.0 = 0.5,0.5,1,0.5,0.5
Comments:

“2. Environment: There doesn't seem to be a ton of eco info on the environment of the inn. No info regarding solid and other water wastes. However, considering they are dealing with a previous construction, they are making good strides to make things as eco-friendly as possible.

3. Economic: Considering that Spain is not a third world country and so does not face many of the same issues as those locations, they are doing a good job for what the community needs. Perhaps if there are things around to be toured they could recommend local guides? But perhaps the location and it's attractions do not qualify it for guided tours.

I think they are making good progress with the location they have purchased. My only other comment would be about the website. It does not mention an abundance of the eco-factors they have described here in the application. They should take a look at it and provide additional information and capitalize on all the good they are doing! “

Rater 8 4.0 = 1,1,0.5,1,0.5
(no comments)

Rater 9 3.5 = 1,1,0.5,0.5,0.5
(no comments)

Rater 10 4.0 = 1,1,1,0.5,0.5

“In my opinion should improve the social and cultural sections. “
