

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

CORNELIA POP¹, CRISTINA BALINT²

ABSTRACT. Urban areas have been long since considered important tourism destinations. By offering a broad and heterogeneous range of attractions, urban tourism provide various choices for different types of tourists and segments of tourism market. Despite being considered an important form of tourism world-wide (Ashworth & Page, 2011), the aggregate volume and value of urban tourism remain unknown at global level (Heeley, 2015). In Romania also, urban tourism is also dominant from tourist arrivals viewpoint. Though, the official documents concerning tourism development in Romania do not include an integrated vision on urban tourism.

The present paper discusses the evolution of urban tourism accommodation facilities in Romania's urban areas between 2005 and 2016 at national and regional level and offers a complete picture of urban tourism evolution over a decade. The study includes all the officially registered lodgings, as they appear in the official database offered by the central authority for tourism, including 40 counties and 7 development regions. Furthermore, the survey includes all the types of accommodation facilities registered in urban areas and the whole range of lodging capacities, including the category of 1 to 4 rooms not taken into consideration by the National Institute of Statistics (NIS). The study also provides a profile of the lodging facilities for the Romanian urban localities.

The present study complements the previous study of Pop et al. (2017) and use the same structure for presenting the data in order to allow the comparison between urban and rural tourist accommodation facilities development between urban and rural areas in 2005 and 2016.

Keywords: urban tourism, lodging, growth, Romania

JEL Classification: L83

¹ Prof. dr., Department of Business, Faculty of Business, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, cornelia.pop@tbs.ubbcluj.ro

² Lecturer dr., Department of Business, Faculty of Business, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, cristina.balint@tbs.ubbcluj.ro

Recommended citation: Pop, C., Balint, C., Romanian Urban Tourism: a Survey of Accommodation Facilities, *Studia UBB Negotia*, vol. 63, issue 2 (June), 2018, pp. 53-108, doi:10.24193/subbnegotia.2018.2.03.

Introduction and literature review

Urban areas have been long since considered important tourism destinations (Postma et al., 2017; Moradi et al., 2017). The (main) characteristics that recommend cities for tourism are: a) an important concentration of historical and cultural attractions, including festivals and art (Moradi et al., 2017; Dumbroska & Fialova, 2014; Bock, 2015); b) a wide range of other leisure facilities (shopping centres, amusement and zoo parks, congresses and conferences, night-life), as mentioned by Moradi et al. (2017) and Ashworth (2012); c) sport and health facilities (Ashworth, 2012); d) a well-developed infrastructure of a wide range of services, from transportation and communications to food and accommodation (Dumbroska & Fialova, 2014; Scott & Cooper, 2010; Edwards et al., 2008); e) hosting important economic and administrative entities; f) an increased level of accessibility through airports, railway stations and other scheduled services (Edwards et al., 2008).

Hence, by offering a broad and heterogeneous range of attractions, urban tourism provide various choices for different types of tourists and segments of tourism market (Romao et al., 2018; Ashworth, 2012; UNWTO, 2018).

Urban tourism continues to be a growing phenomenon world-wide (Ashworth & Page, 2011; Fernandez & Escampa, 2017) and its popularity grew due to changes in the way of travelling and in the decreasing length of holidays (Fernandez & Escampa, 2017). During the last decades the trend of replacing a long annual holiday with several shorter holidays (Bock, 2015) made cities more attractive for tourists due to the variety of services, products and experiences on offer (Jesus & Franco, 2016). Moreover, the cities (mainly the large ones) accommodate and absorb almost effortlessly a wide range of tourist preferences, motivations and cultural perspectives (Ashworth & Page, 2011; Jesus & Franco, 2016). Therefore, urban tourism tends to be less seasonal, though in some cases it presents important differences between the working days, weekends and/or bank holidays (Fernandez & Escampa, 2017).

Due to its adaptability, urban tourism can represent a solution to problems like deindustrialization (Fernandez & Escampa, 2017) or the revitalization and development of historic town centers (Jesus & Franco, 2016). Nonetheless, it cannot be seen as a panacea, since the cities that are most economic dependent upon tourism are likely to benefit the least from it, while the cities with a large and varied economic base are in a better position to capture tourism's benefits, as highlighted by Ashworth & Page (2011).

Despite being considered an important form of tourism worldwide (Ashworth & Page, 2011), the aggregate volume and value of urban tourism remain unknown at global level (Heeley, 2015). Furthermore, although a growing phenomenon at international level (Fernandez & Escampa, 2017), urban tourism received a relative modest amount of attention from scholars (Ashworth & Page, 2011). The urban tourism field of study remains fragmented and, in some areas, incipient (Postma et al. 2017). The scarcity of studies concerning urban tourism, mainly regarding Central Europe, is further revealed by Dumbroska & Fialova (2014).

For Romania, based on the average figures for 2001-2017 (2018 National Institute of Statistics/NIS data via Tempo Online), urban tourist arrivals represented 86.49% of total tourist arrivals at national level. Of the total urban tourist arrivals, Bucharest concentrated 17.44%, while the other 40 county residences had a share of 30.12%. Nonetheless, the 2007-2026 Master Plan for National Tourism Development does not include an integrated vision for urban tourism development, though scattered mentions exist under the sections dedicated to business tourism and Bucharest city breaks.

Furthermore, despite the important position of urban tourism, to the best of our knowledge, no comparative longitudinal studies regarding urban tourism, including the accommodation facilities, are available for Romania, following the scarcity pattern already mentioned in the international academic studies. Though, various aspects of urban tourism were investigated for several Romanian cities in a series of academic studies, like the topic of cultural tourism in historic towns by Bucurescu (2015) and the role of urban festivals for several Romanian cities by Popescu & Corbos (2012). Among the most frequent studied cities are Bucharest (Iovitu et al., 2013; Zamfir & Corbos, 2015; Tigu et al., 2018), Brasov (Popescu & Corbos, 2010; Candrea et al., 2012; Candrea et al., 2017), Craiova (Badita, 2012; Badita, 2013; Cianga & Popescu, 2013), Cluj-Napoca, also studied as European Youth Capital in 2015 (Cosma, 2006; Cosma &

Negrusa, 2008; Yolal et al., 2014, Fleseriu et al.2018), and Sibiu, mainly studied as European Capital of Culture in 2007 (Cosma et al., 2009; Draghici et al., 2015; Richards & Rotariu, 2015).

The present paper discusses the evolution of urban tourism accommodation facilities in Romania's urban areas between 2005 and 2016 at national and regional level and offers a complete picture of urban tourism evolution over a decade. The study includes all the officially registered lodgings, as they appear in the official database offered by the central authority for tourism, including 40 counties and 7 development regions³. Furthermore, the survey includes all the types of accommodation facilities registered in urban areas and the whole range of lodging capacities, including the category of 1 to 4 rooms not taken into consideration by the National Institute of Statistics (NIS). The study also provides a profile of the lodging facilities for the Romanian urban localities.

The present study complements the previous study of Pop et al. (2017) and use the same structure for presenting the data in order to allow the comparison between urban and rural tourist accommodation facilities development between urban and rural areas in 2005 and 2016.

Data and methodology

Similar with Pop et al. (2017), this study is based on the data provided by the official database offered by the central authority for tourism at the end of 2005 and respectively 2016⁴. The observations made by Pop et al. (2017) regarding this database remain valid for the present study.

The study includes all the accommodation types located in urban areas and the component localities⁵. Romanian urban localities are of two categories: municipalities, usually larger and with better urban facilities, and towns, smaller and with a lower number of urban facilities.

Since the study complements the previous study of Pop et al. (2017) regarding the rural lodgings, for comparative reasons, Ilfov county and Bucharest were excluded. Ilfov county's urban localities were considered to be under the influence of Bucharest due to its proximity. Bucharest was excluded due to its special position as Romania's capital.

³ See Annex 8 for detail on the counties and development regions.

⁴ <http://tourism.gov.ro/web/autorizare-turism/>

⁵ Usually the localities surrounding the urban localities (located at 200 m or less from the urban locality limit, measured on the access roads) are under the respective municipality or town administration (http://sgg.gov.ro/legislativ/docs/2016/08/kj08r7nvyfgph2szw_x3.pdf.)

The study also uses the number of lodgings and the number of rooms to express the lodging capacity for the same reasons mentioned by Pop et al. (2017) in Data and methodology section.

The present paper uses mainly descriptive statistics and critical interpretation of the available data in order to construct the accommodation profile of urban areas in Romania.

Findings and discussions

At the end of 1989, Romania had 55 municipalities and 203 towns. Between 1990 and 2005, a number of 47 towns became municipalities, increasing the number of these urban localities at 102. During the same period, 52 communes became towns. The year with the highest number of transformations was 2004, when 1 town became municipality and 39 communes became towns⁶. The last transformation of a commune in a town took place in 2006. Since 2007 there were no more transformations of rural localities in urban localities. All these numbers do not take into consideration the Ilfov county and Bucharest. The structure by population of Romania's municipalities and towns in 2005 and 2016 is presented in Appendix 7.

The growth of urban lodging facilities

Between 2005 and 2016, the urban accommodation registered an overall growth. The urban lodgings number grew 1.94 times (slightly higher than the 1.85 times for the total lodgings), while the lodging capacity increased 1.40 times (slightly lower than the 1.56 times for total rooms). These data are supported by the descriptive statistics in Table 1 which shows an advance in mean and median for urban lodgings and rooms. This development of urban lodgings is based on the following

⁶ Four other years registered a relative high number of such transformations: during 1994, 9 towns became municipalities and 2 communes became towns; during 1995, 13 towns became municipalities; during 2000, 9 towns became municipalities and 1 commune became town; during 2003, 6 towns became municipalities and 7 communes became towns. However, within 6 counties no transformations occurred between 2005 and 2016, these counties continuing to have the same number and structure of urban localities. These counties are: Bistrita-Nasaud and Salaj (North-West region), Braila, Galati and Tulcea (South-East region) and Giurgiu (South Muntenia region).

supporting factors: a) the increased availability of financing resources via bank loans, easier to access in urban areas; b) the increased interest for urban lodgings as an alternative for business diversification and, in some cases, for the ownership of a vanity or trophy property as suggested by Pop & Coros (2011).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of urban lodgings and rooms based on the 40 counties

Descriptive statistics	Urban lodgings		Urban rooms	
	2005	2016	2005	2016
Mean	77	150	2,236	3,122
Median	37	82	905	1,472
First quartile	16	32	397	737
Third quartile	83	189	1,742	3,048
Minimum	3	15	110	348
Maximum	580	1,048	41,070	44,118
Observations	40	40	40	40

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

In Appendix 1 a more detailed situation is presented by counties and development regions, including the resorts of national and local interests (see Appendix 7a and 7b of Pop et al., 2017) and the mention of urban localities hosting a WHS (World Heritage Site).

Within all the counties, the urban lodgings registered an increase in number. The only county which registered a decrease in urban rooms is Ialomita. This can be explained by its special situation: Ialomita county includes a spa resort of national interest, the town of Amara, developed mainly during the communist period and where one of the largest hotel in the country was built⁷. The database of 2016 does not include this hotel. Despite the increase in urban lodging number, the new lodgings, of small capacity, could not compensate for the absence of the above mentioned hotel from the database.

Table 2 presents the top 5 and the last 5 counties based on urban lodging and respectively urban room growth rate. In top 5 counties, with the exception of Mures county, the urban lodgings were less than 25 in

⁷ Hotel Lebada with 507 rooms, from Amara, was identified by (Pop et al.2007) among the Romanian largest hotels. The hotel is not included in the 2016 database, the reason why being unclear.

2005, while the number of urban rooms was less than 500 at 2005 level for all these counties. With the exception of Mures and Alba counties, which became increasingly popular as urban destinations during the last 5 years, the remaining counties are not well known for their urban tourist destinations.

The last 5 counties, with the exception of Botosani, include well known spa and mountain resorts of national and local interests, with a developed accommodation base dating back to the communist period. Therefore, any new development was reported to an existing important number of lodgings, generating lower growth rates.

Table 2. The top 5 and the last 5 counties based on the growth rate between 2005 and 2016

Top 5			
County	Urban lodging growth rate (%)	County	Urban room growth rate (%)
Teleorman	433.33	Gorj	295.82
Salaj	366.67	Salaj	288.29
Gorj	316.67	Alba	249.53
Mures	278.26	Teleorman	216.36
Satu-Mare	266.67	Satu-Mare	165.63
Last 5			
County	Urban lodging growth rate (%)	County	Urban room growth rate (%)
Prahova	26.10	Ialomita	-26.98
Ialomita	38.89	Caras-Severin	6.87
Covasna	46.00	Constanta	7.42
Sibiu	54.89	Bistrita-Nasaud	10.39
Valcea	56.83	Botosani	19.56

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

The spatial distribution of urban lodgings

Appendix 2 presents the spatial distribution of urban lodgings and rooms, by counties and regions, in relation with the urban resorts of national and local interests and the WHSs located in urban areas.

The level of urban lodging and room concentration diminished between 2005 and 2016, as shown by the decrease in median values

and the maximum values, and also by the increase in minimum values in Table 3. Furthermore, this decrease is confirmed by decline in concentration level for the top 5 (respectively top 20) counties which concentrated in 2005 about 54.84% (90.07%) of urban lodgings and 69.75% (90.91%) of urban rooms versus 46.96% (86.68%) urban lodgings and 56.10% (87.53%) of urban rooms in 2016. This evolution suggests that new urban destinations emerged within various counties, confirmed by the data in Table 2 for the top 5 counties growth rates.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of urban lodgings and room distribution based on 40 counties

Descriptive statistics	% of county urban lodgings of total urban lodgings		% of county urban rooms of total urban rooms	
	2005	2016	2005	2016
Mean	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
Median	1.18	1.37	1.01	1.18
First quartile	0.53	0.53	0.44	0.59
Third quartile	2.69	3.15	1.95	2.44
Minimum	0.10	0.25	0.12	0.28
Maximum	18.81	17.49	45.91	35.33
Observations	40	40	40	40

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Table 4 presents the top 5 and the last 5 counties based on the urban lodgings and rooms spatial distribution. The top 5 counties in 2005 own their positions to the communist period when an important number of hotels were built on the Romanian littoral (Constanta county), within the mountain resorts of Prahova and Brasov counties and the spa resorts of Valcea and Caras-Severin counties. The majority of the littoral, mountain and spa resorts within these counties are resorts of national interest. The only exception is Sibiu county which does not host resorts of national interest. As of 2016 the situation registered a slight change with the entries of Suceava and Mures counties. Suceava county witnessed the upgrade of two towns to the status of resorts of national interests (Vatra Dornei, a known spa resort and Gura Humorului) which seems to trigger an increase in lodging development. Mures county

evolution seems to be influenced by the increase in popularity of Sovata (spa resort of national interest) and of Sighisoara (with its historic city center as WHS).

The dominant position of Constanta County in 2005 and 2016 (despite a decrease in percentages showing the spatial concentration level) reflects the popularity of Romanian littoral as a tourist destination. The gap between Constanta county and the second position of Brasov county in 2016 is important and cannot be easily reduced, even if Brasov county urban lodgings will continue to grow at the same pace over the next decade. It is interesting to mention for Constanta County the decrease in lodging size (number of rooms); Appendix 5 shows a decrease of about 17% for the lodgings with more than 50 rooms, between 2005 and 2016.

Prahova county, which includes Prahova Valley, a popular mountain destination, concentrates the urban accommodation facilities mainly in 6 resorts (4 of national interest and 2 of local interest). The previous lodging developments, partly related to the communist period, caused a slower growth of urban lodging offer, reflected by Prahova's third position in 2016 (Table 4). It is worth mentioning that between 2005 and 2016, the Prahova county urban lodging size grew from the dominant 1-4 rooms in 2005 to 10-49 rooms in 2016.

It is also worth mentioning the position of Brasov county which maintains the second rank also in 2016 from urban room viewpoint, being the only county (apart from Constanta county) with more than 5,000 rooms in 2005 and respectively 10,000 rooms in 2016. This progress was mainly due to the county residence emergence as an attractive and important tourist destination.

The last 5 counties are also the least known for their tourist attractions. Though these counties also registered an increase in lodgings from less than 10 urban lodgings and less than 300 rooms per county in 2005, to more than 15 urban lodgings and more than 350 rooms per county as of 2016. Three of these counties (Calarasi, Giurgiu and Teleorman) are located along the Danube and neither of these counties tried to exploit the potential attraction represented by this important European river.

Table 4. The top 5 and the last 5 counties based on lodging and room distribution

2005 - Top 5					
County	Urban lodgings	% of total urban lodgings	County	Urban rooms	% of total urban rooms
Constanta	580	18.81	Constanta	41,070	45.91
Prahova	433	14.04	Brasov	5,530	6.18
Brasov	355	11.51	Prahova	1,747	6.87
Sibiu	184	5.97	Valcea	1,474	5.80
Valcea	139	4.51	Caras-Severin	1,269	4.99
2005 - Last 5					
County	Urban lodgings	% of total urban lodgings	County	Urban rooms	% of total urban rooms
Calarasi	8	0.26	Vaslui	251	0.28
Giurgiu	8	0.26	Vrancea	232	0.26
Vaslui	7	0.23	Giurgiu	221	0.25
Salaj	6	0.19	Salaj	111	0.12
Teleorman	3	0.10	Teleorman	110	0.12
2016 - Top 5					
County	Urban lodgings	% of total urban lodgings	County	Urban rooms	% of total urban rooms
Constanta	1,048	17.49	Constanta	44,118	35.33
Brasov	669	11.16	Brasov	10,151	8.13
Prahova	546	9.11	Prahova	6,444	5.16
Sibiu	285	4.76	Valcea	5,106	4.09
Suceava	266	4.44	Mures	4,233	3.39
2016 - Last 5					
County	Urban lodgings	% of total urban lodgings	County	Urban rooms	% of total urban rooms
Botosani	18	0.30	Vrancea	401	0.32
Vaslui	18	0.30	Calarasi	400	0.32
Giurgiu	16	0.27	Botosani	379	0.30
Teleorman	16	0.27	Vaslui	358	0.29
Calarasi	15	0.25	Teleorman	348	0.28

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Considering the concentration of urban lodgings at regional level (Appendix 2), Macro-region 1 (including North-West and Center regions) is leading from number of lodgings viewpoint, followed closely by Macro-region 2 (including North-East and South-East regions). Macro-region 2 has the leading position from urban rooms' perspective and this is due to the top position of Constanta county (included in South-East region) discussed above.

Within both these Macro-regions, the spatial distribution of urban lodgings and rooms is relatively unbalanced. In the case of Macro-region 1, the Center region has the highest concentration of lodgings and rooms, with Brasov county in the leading position followed at an important gap by the other counties in Center and North-West regions. In the case of Macro-region 2, the unbalance distribution is more evident, no county within this region having a comparable position to Constanta county.

Macro-region 3 shows a high level of concentration of urban lodgings and rooms within Prahova county and comparatively negligible positions for the other counties. Macro-region 4 was similar to Macro-region 3 regarding the lodging number in 2005, but there was an important discrepancy from urban rooms' viewpoint. This discrepancy continued to grow in 2016, as the lodging and room concentration of Macro-region 3 diminished under the influence of Prahova county's declining position. Macro-region 4 also show and unbalanced distribution among West and South-West region, with the West region in leading position. While the South-West region is dominated by Valcea county, the West region has a more equilibrate lodging distribution of urban lodgings and rooms.

In all the cases, the urban lodging and room concentration is related to the presence of the urban resorts of national and local interest.

In relation with the distribution of urban lodgings and rooms, Appendix 3 presents the number of urban localities reporting lodgings versus the total number of urban localities. At national level, this number grew from 70.32% in 2005 to 83.60% in 2016. Macro-region 1 is in the leading position with a percentage of reporting urban localities of 83.84% in 2005 and 92.00% in 2016, while Macro-region 2 is on the last position with 61.73% in 2005 and 70.37% in 2016. Within the Macro-regions, the North-West and Center regions both have a percentage of reporting urban localities above 80% in 2005 and over 90% in 2016. Though, these regions were surpassed by the West region with a percentage of 97.62% in 2016. This increase was due growth in the number of urban localities reporting lodgings within 3 of the 4 component counties of the West region by 3 localities per each county.

It is also interesting to mention that as of 2005, only within 5 counties (of which 4 of Macro-region 1) all the urban localities reported lodgings. This number increased to 12 counties (of which 5 of Macro-region 1) as of 2016. Center region concentrates 3 of these counties, similar to West region.

These results support the previous presented findings regarding

the growth in number of new urban localities penetrating the market for accommodation facilities. They also confirm the higher concentration of urban tourist offer mainly within Macro-region 1.

The number of urban localities with 0 lodgings in 2005 and reporting lodgings in 2016 is 49 of which 4 municipalities⁸ and 45 towns⁹. Of these 49 localities, 34 (2 municipalities and 32 towns) have the status of urban localities since before 1989, while 15 (2 municipalities and 13 towns) acquired their new urban ranks between 1990 and 2006 (of which 8 in 2004 and 1 in 2006). Macro-region 4 leads, with 17 transformations of urban localities, of which 10 within the West region. The remaining 32 transformations are spread almost equally among the remaining regions: 12 in Macro-region 1, 10 in Macro-region 2 and 10 in Macro-region 3. The majority of these urban localities (40) host a population between 5,000 and 19,999 people, while all 4 municipalities have a population between 20,000 and 49,999 people.

Nevertheless, a number of 7 urban localities (all towns¹⁰) exit the market of accommodation facilities, between 2005, when lodgings were registered, and 2016, when they registered 0 lodgings. Three of these towns are located in Macro-region 1 (one in the North-West region and the other 2 in Center region), other 3 towns are located in Macro-region 2 (all 3 in South-East region), while the remaining town is located in Macro-region 3. Five of these localities got their urban status since before 1989, while two became towns in 2003 and respectively 2004. Six of these towns host a population between 5,000 and 19,999 people and one town has a population between 1,000 and 4,999 people. The decrease to 0 of lodging facilities in 2016 can be considered, at least, peculiar for Panciu, located in the proximity the Panciu vineyards, but also for Harsova and Isaccea, both locate on Danube and with potential to develop tourist ports. Neither of these new entry localities have the status of nor do they include resorts of national or local interest.

⁸ The 4 municipalities are: Turnu Magurele (Teleorman county) and Tecuci (Galati county), both municipalities since before 1989, Adjud (Vrancea county) declared municipality in 2000, Salonta (Bihor county) declared municipality in 2001.

⁹ Of these 49 urban localities as of 2016, 1 (Livada, Satu-Mare county) was a commune in 2005 and become a town in 2006.

¹⁰ The seven towns are: Huedin (Cluj county), Miercurea Nirajului (Mures county), Agnita (Sibiu county), Harsova (Constanta county), Isaccea (Tulcea county), Panciu (Vrancea county), and Cazanesti (Ialomita county).

Other 44 urban localities (1 municipality and 43 towns) did not report any accommodation facilities in 2005 and 2016. All these localities are mentioned in Appendix 3. About half of these urban localities (21) are located within Macro-region 2; the North-East region concentrating 14 of these localities (7 of them in Suceava county). Within Macro-region 4, the South-West region concentrates 11 such localities, of which 1 is a municipality. Of these 44 urban localities, 25 had this status since before 1989, 1 became municipality in 1997 and the remaining 18 became towns during 2000s (15 of them in 2004). The majority of these urban localities (38) host a population between 5,000 and 19,000 people. It is difficult to understand such a situation for at least 3 of these urban localities: Dolhasca, which hosts a WHS, Murfatlar and Segarcea both towns situated within vineyards regions. Further investigations will be necessary to understand why at least some of these localities have no accommodation facilities.

It is also interesting to mention that of the 39 communes that became towns in 2004, 15 did not capitalize on their new status and no lodgings were developed between 2005 and 2016, while 1 town (Cazanesti in Ialomita county) lost the existing lodgings. Other 7 new towns capitalize on their new position and developed lodgings between 2005 and 2016. The remaining 16 localities continue to host lodging facilities, of which one had constantly more than 10 lodgings (Saliste in Sibiu county).

Appendix 3 includes information regarding the urban localities with at least 10 lodgings. The information was included to permit a comparison with the situation in rural areas as presented by Pop et al. (2017). One can argue that the minimum limit of 10 lodgings might be irrelevant in the case of urban localities given the size of some urban accommodations, mainly hotels. Nonetheless, given the fact that about two-thirds of Romanian urban localities are towns with less than 20,000 people, some smaller than some rural communes, the threshold of 10 is appropriate. Furthermore, this is confirmed by the data in Appendix 6 that shows the small size of urban lodgings.

As Appendix 3 shows, there is an important gap between the number of urban localities reporting lodgings (70.32% in 2005 increasing to 83.60% in 2016 of the total urban localities) and the localities with at least 10 lodgings (21.94% in 2005 increasing to 33.76% in 2016). Nonetheless, in most cases, the localities with at least 10 lodgings concentrate more than 60% of lodgings and rooms within the respective counties.

Further, the data in Appendix 3 show that, as of 2005, within 12 counties there were no localities with at least 10 lodgings, 14 counties have only one such locality¹¹, while the remaining 14 counties had at least 2 such localities. Prahova county, covering the popular tourist area of Prahova Valley, was the only county including 6 localities with at least 10 lodgings.

As of 2016, the structure changes and only 3 counties remains in the category with no localities with at least 10 lodgings. These 3 counties are Giurgiu, Ialomita and Teleorman, all located in Macro-region 3. According to the data in Table 2 and Table 3, these counties rank among the least 5 either from growth rate or spatial distribution viewpoint. The number of counties with 1 locality registering at least 10 lodgings remains 14¹², but this group composition changes: 6 counties remained in this group since 2005 (Arad, Bistrita-Nasaud, Braila, Dolj, Galati, and Iasi), while 8 counties come from the former group with no localities with at least 10 lodgings (Botosani, Buzau, Calarasi, Dambovita, Olt, Salaj, Vaslui, and Vrancea). The remaining 23 counties have at least 2 localities with at least 10 lodgings, of which 3 counties having 6 such localities (Hunedoara, Maramures, and Sibiu) and other 3 counties having 7 such localities (Harghita, Prahova, and Valcea). Within the group of 23 counties, 4 counties remained with the same number of localities with at least 10 lodgings in 2005 and 2016 (Brasov, Caras-Severin, Mures, and Tulcea); other 11 counties increased the number of such localities with 1; a number of 7 counties increased the number of such localities with 2 (Gorj from 0 localities – only for me); and one county, Bacau, increased the number of these localities by 4.

As the data Appendix 3 show, the number of urban localities with at least 10 lodgings is of 68 (of which 37 municipalities and 31 towns) in 2005 and of 105 (64 municipalities and 41 towns) in 2016. As of 2005, the 37 municipalities included 27 county residences and 10 other municipalities. While the majority of the county residences (26 out of 27¹³) are localities with more than 50,000 people, the other 10 municipalities have a population between 10,000 and 49,000 people and 60% of them have an enhanced tourist attraction by being or including resorts of

¹¹ It is interesting to mention that in 13 cases this locality was, as expected, the respective county residence. In one case (Bacau county), this locality was a town with the status of resort of national interest, Slanic Moldova.

¹² Within all these 14 counties, the only locality with at least 10 lodgings is the respective county's residence.

¹³ The only county residence with less than 50,000 people is Miercurea Ciuc, Harghita county.

local or national interest or hosting WHSs (Sighisoara). Of these other municipalities, 3 had the status since before 1989, 3 became municipalities during 1990s, while 4 gained their status between 2000 and 2004. Of the 31 towns, 29 have a population between 1,000 and 19,000 people¹⁴ and 79.31% of them, similar to the other 10 municipalities, are or include local or national resorts or host WHSs. It is also interesting to mention that 29 of these 31 towns had their urban status since before 1989, while the remaining 2 became towns between 2000 and 2004.

Until 2016, the following changes occurred for the urban localities with at least 10 lodgings: a) two towns¹⁵ (of which one hosts a WHS) exit this group of localities; b) 10 more county residences entered the group, of which 60% have between 50,000 and 99,000 people; c) 17 more of other municipalities also became part of this group of localities, of which only 3 are or include resorts of local or national interest; 11 of these municipalities have between 20,000 and 49,000 people; these municipalities received their status as follow: 6 since before 1989, 6 during the 1990s and 5 between 2000 and 2004; d) 12 more towns move into this group, of which 7 are or include resorts of local or national interest; 83.33% of these towns have a population between 1,000 and 19,000 people; it is interesting to mention that all these 12 towns have their urban status since before 1989.

The above findings suggest:

a) that the status of county residence, concentrating the local government institutions and, most of the time, the main economic entities of the respective county, support the development of lodging facilities;

b) the status of municipality for the other (than county residences) urban localities seems to act as an enhancing factor for the development of lodgings; the size of the respective municipality (population), the period when the status was acquired, and the existence of a local or national resort seems to be have a marginal influence; further investigations are necessary to understand the development of accommodation facilities within these other municipalities;

c) for the towns, the presence of a local or national resort or of a

¹⁴ The only two towns with more than 20,000 people were Borsa, also resort of local interest, (Maramures county) and Zarnesti (Brasov county)

¹⁵ These two towns are Talmaciu (Sibiu county) and Targu Lapus (Maramures county), which also hosts a WHS. They continue to register accommodation facilities, though less than 10 lodgings.

WHSs seems to stimulate the development of lodgings; the towns with urban status since before 1989 appear in a better position for developing accommodation facilities; nonetheless, exception exists, as the results regarding the 43 towns with 0 lodgings in 2005 and 2016 show.

Further, Table 5 presents the urban localities with more than 1,000 rooms as of 2016. The only exception is Amara, Ialomita county, resort of national interest, which lost an important number of rooms due to the absence of Hotel Lebada from 2016 database (see footnote 2). The rooms concentrated by the localities in Table 5 represent slightly more than 65% of the urban rooms as of 2016. The data in Table 5 confirms the findings presented at points a) and c) above. The majority of the municipalities in Table 5 are county residences, and only one other municipality, while the towns, with one exception, are national resorts. The presence of Navodari town in Table 5 is due to its location, north of Constanta (and the component resort Mamaia) on Romanian littoral.

The majority of the municipalities and towns in Table 5 show an increase in lodgings and rooms, with three exceptions: the cases of Amara, already presented above, Mangalia and Baile Herculane. The last 2 localities registered an increase in lodgings but a decrease in rooms, indicating that lodgings with a smaller capacity entered the market. The situation might be also due to the absence from the 2016 database of some hotels of larger capacity¹⁶.

Table 5. Municipalities & towns with more than 1,000 rooms

Municipalities and their component resorts	2005		2016	
	Lodgings	Rooms	Lodgings	Rooms
Brasov - county residence (includes Poiana Brasov, resort of national interest)	105	2,968	283	5,165
Cluj-Napoca - county residence	61	1,579	199	3,296
Constanta - county residence (includes Mamaia, resort of national interest)	134	11,153	241	13,380
Mangalia (resorts of national interest; includes Cap Aurorar, Jupiter, Neptun, Olimp, Venus, Saturn also resorts of national interest)	214	19,918	243	15,499

¹⁶ The reasons for these absences is not clear. Either the respective lodgings were permanently closed, or their authorization needs renewal, or simply omission due to human error. In any case, there is only this one official and public available database and its data content cannot be ignored.

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

Municipalities and their component resorts	2005		2016	
	Lodgings	Rooms	Lodgings	Rooms
Sibiu - county residence (includes Paltinis, resort of local interest)	65	1,225	160	2,598
Timisoara - county residence	75	1,831	130	2,814
% of urban accommodation (national level)	21.21%	43.23%	20.96%	34.23%
Arad - county residence	43	967	81	1,533
Pitesti - county residence	23	722	42	1,083
Oradea - county residence	17	434	54	1,290
Craiova - county residence	18	602	55	1,296
Targu Mures - county residence	24	641	52	1,169
Vatra Dornei (resort of national interest)	54	950	95	1,375
% of urban accommodation (national level)	5.81%	4.82%	6.33%	6.20%
Towns and their component localities	2005		2016	
	Lodgings	Rooms	Lodgings	Rooms
Predeal (resort of national interest)	148	2,052	185	2,793
Baile Herculane (resort of national interest)	31	2,467	77	2,303
Eforie (resort of national interest)	183	8,876	379	10,778
Covasna (resort of national interest)	17	1,106	25	1,284
Busteni (resort of national interest)	176	1,146	241	1,843
Sinaia (resort of national interest)	154	2,433	168	2,684
Baile Olanesti (resort of national interest)	33	1,168	49	1,426
Calimanesti (resort of national interest; includes Caciulata)	34	1,409	52	1,816
% of urban accommodation (national level)	25.17%	23.09%	19.63%	19.96%
Amara (resort of national interest)	8	1,031	7	546
Sovata (resort of national interest)	21	944	116	1,803
Navodari	8	233	149	3,646
% of urban accommodation (national level)	1.20%	2.47%	4.54%	4.80%
Total % of urban accommodation (national level)	53.39%	73.62%	51.45%	65.20%

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

The classification of urban lodgings

The current Romanian classification system from 1 star to 5 stars for accommodation facilities was introduced in 1993 (see Pop et al.2007 for more details). One of the current system drawbacks is the absence of a consistent set of requirements for the accommodation facilities developed within historic buildings, hence there is not real support for

preserving these buildings as accommodation facilities. This might become a problem in the decades to come since Romanian urban localities host such buildings within the respective old city centers.

Appendix 4 shows a shift from a dominant 2 star classification to a dominant 3 star classification between 2005 and 2016. This trend is similar with the trend identified by Pop (2014) for all Romanian accommodation facilities. The motives for this shift are already discussed by Pop & Coros (2011) and Pop et al. (2017), highlighting that the change might not always be concordant with the tourism demand and/or related to the quality of offered services.

The shift is consistent at national and regional level. However, at county level the situation presents some nuances: for 19 counties registered the shift from 2 stars to 3 stars for both the lodgings and rooms, for 9 counties the shift from 2 to 3 stars took place only for lodgings, while for other 5 counties the shift was registered only for rooms. The remaining counties registered various other situations, for which no clear pattern could be identified.

The portfolio of lodgings also diversified from classification viewpoint. As of 2005, 8 counties offered the entire range of lodgings, from 1 to 5 stars, and one county (Olt) offered the range from 2 to 5 stars. As of 2016, the number of counties offering 1 to 5 star lodgings grew to 17. Of these 9 new counties offer 1 to 5 star lodgings, 2 (Bistrita-Nasaud and Alba) diversified their portfolio from 1 to 3 stars, while one county (Galati) diversified the portfolio from 2 to 4 stars. The same evolution was recorded for the 1 to 4 stars portfolio, from 8 counties in 2005 to 19 counties in 2016. Of the newly added 11 counties, Gorj diversified its portfolio from 2 to 3 stars, while Olt, added 1 star lodgings and lost 5 star lodgings. The counties with the least diversified portfolios of lodgings from classification viewpoint are: Vaslui, Giurgiu, Salaj, and Teleorman, counties also associated with a low number of lodgings and lodging capacity.

The urban accommodation lodging capacity

In Appendix 5 is presented the structure of urban accommodation facilities by lodging capacity (number of rooms). The data confirm the general trend of decreasing lodging capacity mentioned by Pop (2014). At

national level the dominant lodging capacity in 2005 as well as in 2016 is 10-49 rooms. However, a closer look shows a decrease of lodgings larger than 50 rooms and an increase of lodgings with a capacity between 5 and 9 rooms. Macro-region 2 (with the component regions North-East and South-East), Macro-region 4 (with the component regions West and South-West), and North-West region (from Macro-region 1) follow the same trend as the one identified at national level. For Macro-region 1 (and the component Center region) and Macro-region 3 (which is composed only of South-Muntenia region) the situation is slightly different. In all these cases, in 2005, the dominant lodging capacity was 1-4 rooms, while in 2016 the dominant capacity became 10-49 rooms. Similar to the national level and other regions, in the cases of Macro-region 1 and Macro-region 3, the lodgings larger than 50 rooms registered a decrease, while the lodgings with 5 to 9 rooms increased in importance.

At county level, for 28 counties, the dominant lodging capacity of 10-49 rooms remains unchanged between 2005 and 2016. In the majority of these cases, these lodging capacity is followed on the second position by 5-9 rooms as of 2016. There is only one county with an unchanged and smaller dominant capacity: Covasna, where the lodgings between 5 and 9 rooms are the most numerous, followed, in 2016, by the 10-49 room lodgings.

Considering the portfolio of lodgings from capacity viewpoints, it is interesting to mention that as of 2005, only Caras-Severin county offered the entire range, from 1-4 rooms to more than 500 rooms; another county, Ialomita, offered the range from 5-9 rooms to more than 500 rooms. Both counties hosted, each one, a hotel with more than 500 rooms located in well-known spa resorts of national interest, Baile Herculane (Caras-Severin) and Amara (Ialomita)¹⁷. As of 2016, only Valcea county offered the complete portfolio of lodging capacities, the largest hotel reported by the official database being Compex Cozia (in fact a facility composed from 3 hotels) with more than 600 rooms. However, in 2016 all Valcea lodgings having between 50 and 499 rooms decreased in number. For 23 counties the lodging portfolio offer from capacity viewpoint registered changes only in structure, while 14 counties registered changes in their portfolio (8 counties diversified their portfolio, 6 county reduced their portfolio). The counties

¹⁷ For more details regarding these hotels see Pop et al. (2007).

with the least diversified portfolio of lodgings are Salaj (offering 1-4 rooms to 10-49 rooms) and Olt (5-9 rooms to 50-99 rooms), both counties with unchanged portfolios in 2005 and 2016.

A brief profile of counties and regions based on urban accommodation facilities

In Appendix 6 the profile of each county and region is presented. The data include how many types of urban accommodation facilities are hosted within each county/region, the dominant lodging and dominant rooms, the most widespread classification rank and the most frequent lodging capacity. Appendix 6 also includes the growth rate of urban lodgings and rooms and the importance of urban lodgings within the respective counties/regions.

The lodging and room growth rates, the dominant classification and the most frequent lodging capacity were discussed in the previous paragraphs. However, the topics of dominant type of accommodation facilities and the weight of urban accommodation at county/region level are yet to be considered.

Between 2005 and 2016, the type of accommodation facilities registered by the official database grew from 16 to 17, as explained by Pop et al. (2017) in footnote 20. Appendix 6 shows that neither county hosted the entire range of accommodation types, though the majority of them registered a diversification of the accommodation type portfolio. As of 2005, 11 counties had between 2 and 4 accommodation types, while only 5 counties registered at least 10 accommodation types. As of 2016, all counties had at least 5 accommodation types, while the number of counties with at least 10 accommodation types increased to 16. Most of the counties (24) added to their urban accommodation portfolio between 1 and 3 facilities types, while 11 added between 4 and 5 facilities types. However, in 2 cases, the portfolio was reduced, the accommodation types decreasing from 9 to 7 for Iasi county, and from 11 to 10 for Prahova county. For other 3 counties (Arad, Constanta, and Mehedinti) no diversification occurred.

As of 2005, the most diversified accommodation portfolio was in Constanta county (13 accommodation types), followed by Brasov county with 12, while the least diversified portfolio, with only 2 accommodation types, was registered in the counties of Botosani and Teleorman. As of 2016, the most diversified accommodation portfolio can be found in the

counties of Brasov and Neamt (14 accommodation types), followed by the counties of Constanta, Hunedoara and Valcea with 13, while the least diversified portfolio, of only 5 accommodation types, was registered in the counties of Botosani and Buzau.

The diversified accommodation type portfolio of Constanta county and Brasov county is expected since they are popular tourist destination, the first county covering the Romanian littoral, while the second concentrate several popular mountain resorts. In the cases of Hunedoara county and Neamt county, further investigations are necessary in order to understand better their development, both counties adding 5 new accommodation types to the existing portfolio. However, in both cases, new resorts of national interest were declared in 2002: one included in the municipality of Petrosani (Hunedoara county); two (Piatra Neamt and Targu Neamt) within Neamt county. This situation might have a contribution to the accommodation type's diversification.

The dominant type of lodging, from number viewpoint, is represented by urban pensions. This dominance is present at national level and regional level. The only exception is represented by Macro-region 2 under the influence of South-East region within which Constanta county has an important position, since is covering the littoral and the county with the highest lodging concentration (see Appendix 2). Also Constanta county is still under the heavy influence of hotel development during the communist period. Therefore this explains the dominance of hotels, from number viewpoint, within the South-East region and respective Macro-region 2.

When the counties are considered, the situation changed between 2005 and 2016. As of 2005, the situation was rather balanced, with urban pensions as dominant type for 21 counties, and the hotels as dominant type for 18 counties. There was only one exception, of Giurgiu county, where the motels dominante from number viewpoint. Though, as of 2016, urban pensions become the dominant accommodation type for 31 counties, while hotels remained dominant only within 8 counties. There is also an exception: Satu-Mare county which has as dominant lodging type the rooms for rent. This situation can be explained by the fact that urban pensions have a more relaxed regulation for classification and for being operated as accommodation facilities, therefore more appropriated for small (family) businesses. The influence of pre- and post-accession

funds for developing such accommodation facilities, mainly within small towns, is not clear and is difficult to investigate.

From lodging capacity viewpoint, the dominance of hotels is clear in 2005 (in all 40 counties) and in 2016 (in 37 counties)¹⁸. These findings enhance the results reported by Pop (2014) regarding the importance of hotels' lodging capacity. The situation can be easily explained by the development of hotels in almost all municipalities that existed before 1989 and within the spa resorts like Sangeorz Bai, Sovata, Slanic Moldova, Vatra Dornei, Pucioasa, Amara, Slanic, Baile Herculane, Baile Olanesti, and Calimanesti, to which the above mentioned developments on Romanian littoral must be added. This dominance of hotels is expected to continue for the next period.

Nonetheless, the dominance of pensions as number and of hotels from lodging capacity viewpoint is slightly decreasing, confirming the previous findings regarding the diversification of accommodation facilities portfolio and the decreasing size of urban lodgings.

Appendix 6 also shows the concentration of urban lodgings and rooms within each county and region. Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics for the respective percentages and indicates that slightly more than half of accommodation facilities are located in urban areas. However, the decrease in mean and media is consistent with the findings of Pop et al. (2017), the decline in importance of urban accommodation being compensated by an increase of rural accommodation from number point of view. Nonetheless, the urban accommodations concentrate about two thirds of total rooms due to a slightly higher lodging size, confirmed by the first and third quartile for urban rooms.

Table 6 data confirm at least the following previous findings: a) the growth of urban accommodation, confirmed by the increase of minimum and maximum values; b) the decrease of urban lodging capacity, confirmed by the first and third quartile for urban rooms.

¹⁸ As of 2016 within only 2 counties, Covasna and Harghita, urban pensions represent the dominant type also from lodging size viewpoint. However, further investigations are needed to understand this particular situation. Also, 2016 has one other exception, Giurgiu county, where the rooms on fluvial ships are dominant, a rather normal situation since this county residence is located near the Danube.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics for the urban lodging and room concentration within a county

Descriptive statistics	% of urban lodgings of county lodgings		% of urban rooms of county rooms	
	2005	2016	2005	2016
Mean	54.47	52.96	71.77	66.07
Median	57.94	52.60	78.53	66.86
First quartile	37.23	39.46	59.88	55.13
Third quartile	69.29	68.46	86.25	80.75
Minimum	14.29	22.34	14.70	26.07
Maximum	100.00	89.29	100.00	97.96
Observations	40	40	40	40

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Table 7 presents the top 5 and last 5 counties in 2005 and 2016 taking into consideration the lodging and room concentration. Table 7 is complementary to Table 7 of Pop et al. (2017). The presence in top 5 of Olt and Teleorman county in 2005 is due to the absence of rural accommodation facilities. While the counties of Prahova and Constanta host well known tourist destination (Prahova Valley and respective the Romanian littoral) and most of these destinations are either municipalities or towns. For the remaining counties the situation is explained by the modest development of accommodation facilities in rural areas. An alternative explanation comes from the fact that within these remaining top 5 counties, the urban localities, in most cases the county residences, concentrate the main economic and administrative activities. This situation is combined with a low tourist attractiveness of these counties either due to a low number of tourist attractions and/or to the lack of local initiatives.

Table 7. The top 5 and the last 5 counties based on lodging and room concentration within a county

2005 - Top 5			
County	% of urban lodgings of county lodgings	County	% of urban rooms of county rooms
Olt	100.00	Olt	100.00
Teleorman	100.00	Teleorman	100.00
Ialomita	94.74	Ialomita	99.60
Prahova	84.24	Constanta	92.75
Galati	78.57	Vaslui	91.94

2005 - Last 5			
County	% of urban lodgings of county lodgings	County	% of urban rooms of county rooms
Bihor	23.60	Alba	42.22
Buzau	23.53	Tulcea	36.10
Harghita	16.34	Buzau	32.90
Alba	14.84	Vrancea	32.45
Vrancea	14.29	Bihor	14.70
2016 - Top 5			
County	% of urban lodgings of county lodgings	County	% of urban rooms of county rooms
Ialomita	89.29	Ialomita	97.96
Prahova	84.39	Olt	92.33
Galati	83.02	Galati	90.71
Olt	82.05	Teleorman	86.14
Satu-Mare	74.76	Prahova	85.36
2016 - Last 5			
County	% of urban lodgings of county lodgings	County	% of urban rooms of county rooms
Neamt	24.85	Arges	40.40
Bihor	24.23	Neamt	35.06
Arges	23.62	Tulcea	31.44
Buzau	22.56	Buzau	31.20
Tulcea	22.34	Bihor	26.07

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

The counties in the last 5 group, own their positions either to the presence of important resorts in rural areas (the case of Bihor and Buzau) or to the important development of accommodation facilities in rural areas, as highlighted by Pop et al. (2017).

Pop et al. (2017) documented the increase of rural accommodation facility concentration at county and regional level, therefore the urban accommodation facility concentration complement this development. Consequently, within the majority of counties (26 of 40 counties) the concentration of urban lodgings decreased in favor of rural counterparts, while within other 5 counties only the urban room concentration decreased, while the number of urban lodgings slightly increased. Two counties registered some exceptions: Arad county where the percentage of urban lodgings and rooms remained almost unchanged, and Valcea county where the concentration of urban lodgings decreased, while the concentration of urban rooms increased due to the re-inclusion

in the official database of Complex Cozia, as mentioned above. Only within 7 counties (Bihor, Cluj, Maramures, Alba, Harghita, Galati, and Vrancea) the concentration of urban lodgings and rooms increased. These are also the counties¹⁹ mentioned by Pop et al. (2017) registering a decreased in rural lodging and rural room concentration. Further investigations are needed to explain this evolutions.

Hence, at regional level, 5 regions (3 Macro-regions) register a decreased in the concentration of urban lodgings and urban rooms, consistent with the same phenomenon at component counties' level. North-West region is the only one with an increase in the concentration of urban lodgings and urban rooms, under the influence of the component counties of Bihor, Cluj, and Maramures, while the Center region records only an increased concentration of urban lodgings. At national level, under the influence of Macro-region 1 (including the North-West and Center regions) developments, the concentration of urban lodgings increased slightly (with 2%), while the concentration of urban rooms decreased. This finding support the results presented above: while urban lodgings continue to grow, the new entities entering the market have a small to medium lodging capacity.

Conclusions

The present paper reveals the growth of urban accommodation facilities between 2005 and 2016. However, in order to establish how much of this growth can be credited to the central and regional initiatives (2007-2026 Master Plan for National Tourism Development) and/or to the county and local measures more investigations are needed.

While new urban destinations (49 localities, of which 4 municipalities and 45 towns) made their entry on the accommodation market, therefore decreasing the urban lodging and room concentration, the spatial distribution of urban accommodation facilities remains uneven. Constanta county continues in a leading position (Table 4), followed at an important gap by the other counties. Covering the Romanian littoral, Constanta county benefited from the developments

¹⁹ By a slight error, within this group of counties, Pop et al. (2017) included also Mures county. However, Mures county registered only an increase in the concentration of rural rooms.

of the communist period. Remaining a popular tourist destination, mainly among domestic tourists, the littoral continued to witness further growth mainly in the number of lodgings. The impressive growth of accommodation facilities registered by the town of Navodari (Table 5) confirms these evolutions. The developments within the other top 5 counties of Table 4 deserve closer investigations for a better understanding of their evolutions.

The portfolio of accommodation facilities (by types) recorded, between 2005 and 2016, a diversification for the majority of the counties, though neither county offers the entire range of accommodation types in 2016. Two counties (Iasi and Prahova) registered a decrease in accommodation types, while three other counties (Arad, Constanta, and Mehedinti) show no diversification from this point of view.

The classification of urban lodgings shifted from a dominant 2 star classification in 2005 to a dominant 3 star classification in 2016. As of 2016, 19 counties offered a portfolio of urban lodgings classified between 1star and 4 stars, while other 17 counties offered the entire range of classification from 1 star to 5 stars for their respective urban lodgings.

While the dominant lodging capacity (10 to 49 rooms) remained unchanged between 2005 and 2016, Appendix 5 shows, for the majority of counties, a decrease in importance of the lodgings with capacities of 50 rooms or more and an increase for the small lodgings of 5 to 9 rooms and 10 to 49 rooms. This situation supports the idea that between 2005 and 2016, the newly developed accommodation facilities have a smaller lodging capacity.

The profile of an urban accommodation facility is that of an urban pension, usually classified at 3 stars and with a lodging capacity between 10 to 49 rooms. Nonetheless, while urban pensions became dominant as number, their lodging capacity cannot compete with that of hotels (mainly those developed before 1989), therefore the hotels continue to dominate from lodging capacity viewpoint the urban accommodation offer.

The development of rural accommodation facilities influenced the importance of urban accommodations within each county. In the majority of the cases, the concentration of urban lodgings and rooms decreased in favor of rural lodgings and rooms. However, exceptions exists, mainly for the 7 counties (Bihor, Cluj, Maramures, Alba, Harghita, Galati, and Vrancea), where the urban lodging and room concentration continued to grow. Further in-depth research is needed to understand these evolutions.

When the attention is focused of the urban localities, it is clear that the status of county residence has an important influence on the accommodation facilities' development, a fact supported by the data in Appendix 2a which shows that for more than half of the counties, the urban lodgings and urban rooms are concentrated mainly within the respective county residences. Nonetheless, only 10 of the 40 county residences offer more than 1,000 rooms in 2016. Of the remaining 62 municipalities, only 2, both resorts of national interest, concentrate more than 1,000 rooms in 2016 (Table 5). In the case of towns, the status of resort (of local or national interest), usually well known as tourist destination since before the communist period, seems to be the main factor in developing accommodation facilities. Only 11 towns, of 209 towns, offer more than 1,000 rooms as of 2016.

Interesting and open for further research is also the case of the 44 urban localities (1 municipality and 43 towns) with no lodgings in 2005 and 2016, of which at least five can exploit various tourist attractions.

While being the dominant type of tourism in Romania, urban tourism has still room for further development. For the already established urban destinations, mainly those mentioned in Table 5, the quality and the diversification of entertainment facilities might play an important role. For the smaller urban localities, the identification and adequate presentation of their tourist attractions, combined with an adequate level of services' quality, might generate the desired increase in tourist arrivals. Nonetheless, most of the urban destinations need in-depth investigations in order to understand in which of the five stages of a tourist area life cycle they find themselves and which are the necessary steps for the future development and/or rejuvenation of the respective destinations. Romanian urban localities can learn a lot from other European urban destinations, mainly how to avoid and/or to deal with tourist overcrowding, while remaining attractive and interesting for their potential visitors.

REFERENCES

1. Ashworth, G.J., 2012, Do we Understand Urban Tourism? *Journal of Tourism & Hospitality*, 1(4), 1-2, DOI: 10.4172/2167-0269.1000e117
2. Ashworth, G., Page, S.J., 2011, Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes, *Tourism Management*, 32(1), 1-15, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.02.002>

3. Badita, A., 2012, Assessment of tourism supply, demand and market trends in Craiova city, Romania, *Journal of Tourism*, 14, 34-40, <http://revistadeturism.ro/rdt/article/view/35/18>
4. Badita, A., 2013, Approaches to the analysis and evaluation of urban tourism system within urban destinations, *Journal of tourism – studies and research in tourism*, 16, 58-66, <http://revistadeturism.ro/rdt/article/view/165>
5. Bock, K., 2015, The changing nature of city tourism and its possible implications for the future of cities, *European Journal of Futures Research* 3(20), 1-8, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-015-0078-5>
6. Bucurescu, I., 2015, Managing tourism and cultural heritage in historic towns: examples from Romania, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 10:3, 248-262, DOI: 10.1080/1743873X.2014.968162
7. Candrea, A.N., Constantin, C., Ispas, A., 2012, Tourism market heterogeneity in Romanian urban destinations, the case of Brasov, *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 18(1), 55-68
8. Candrea, A.N., Constantin, C., Ispas, A., 2017, Public-Private Partnerships for a Sustainable Tourism Development of Urban Destinations. The Case of Brasov, Romania, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, Special Issue (Haruta C., Moldovan, O. eds.), 38-56
9. Cianga, N., Popescu, A.C., 2013, Green spaces and urban tourism development in Craiova municipality in Romania, *European Journal of Geography*, 4(2), 34-45
10. Cosma, S., 2006, Tourist destination Cluj-Napoca Romania, *Studia UBB Negotia*, 51(2), 51-74
11. Cosma, S., Negrusa, A., 2008, The place of cultural tourism for Cluj-Napoca, Romania as a tourist destination, *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, 5(7), 403-413
12. Cosma, S., Negrusa, A., Popovici, C., 2009, Impact of Sibiu European Capital of Culture 2007 event on country tourism, in *Recent Advances in cultural heritage and tourism*, Proceedings of the 2nd WSEAS International Conference on Cultural Heritage and Tourism, 68-73
13. Draghici, C., Papuc, R.M., Iordache, S., Dobrea, C.R., Pintilii, R-D., Teodorescu, C., Peptenatu, D., Diaconu, D., Simion, A., 2015, The role of European Capital of Culture status in structuring economic profile of Sibiu, Romania, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 26, 785 – 791
14. Dumbroska, V., Fialova, D., 2014, Tourist intensity in capital cities in Central Europe: comparative analysis of tourism in Prague, Vienna and Budapest, *Czech Journal of Tourism*, 3(1), 5-26, DOI: 10.2478/cjot-2014-0001
15. Edwards, D., Griffin, T., Hayllar, B., 2008, Urban tourism research. Developing an agenda, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(4), 1032-1052, doi:10.1016/j.annals.2008.09.002

16. Fernandez, D.B., Escampa, M.H., 2017, Spatial analysis of tourist activities and services in the historic city: The cases of Malaga and Plymouth, *European Journal of Geography*, 8(1), 139-160
17. Fleseriu, C., Cosma, S.A., Bota, M., 2018, Cluj-Napoca European Youth Capital: Why to attend a major event, in Katsoni, V., Velander, K. (eds.), *Innovative Approaches to Tourism and Leisure*, Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics, Springer, Cham, 89-99
18. Heeley, J., 2015, Urban destination marketing in contemporary Europe – what does “good” look like?, *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 1(1), 36 – 49, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-08-2014-0003>
19. Iovitu, M., Radulescu, C., Dociu, M., 2013, Tourism planning in urban areas – Trends, best practices and priorities in Bucharest, *Journal of Knowledge Management, Economics and Information Technology*, 3(5), 1-15
20. Jesus, C., Franco, M., 2016, Cooperation networks in tourism: A study of hotels and rural tourism establishments in an inland region of Portugal, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 29, 165-175, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.07.005>
21. Moradi, A.M., Tabarsa, M.A., Choobdar, A.K., Olfat, H., 2017, Examining the factors influencing tourism in the city of Mashhad in order to design hotel, *The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication - TOJDAC* April 2017 Special Edition, 31-44, available at: http://www.tojdac.org/tojdac/VOLUME7-APRLSPCL_files/tojdac_v070ASE103.pdf
22. Pop, C., (2014), The current profile of Romanian hotel industry: does it enhance the attractiveness of Romania as a tourist destination? *Studia UBB Negotia*, 59(3), 35-78
23. Pop, C., Cosma, S., Negrusa, A., Marinescu, N. and Ionescu, C., (2007), *Romania as a tourist destination and the Romanian hotel industry*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, UK.
24. Pop, C., & Coros, M.M., (2011), Romanian accommodation establishments—an investigation regarding the reasons for their development, *Studia UBB Negotia*, 56(1), 5-28
25. Pop, C., Coros, M.M., Balint, C., 2017, Romanian rural tourism: A survey of accommodation facilities, *Studia UBB Negotia*, 62(2), 71-126, DOI:10.24193/subbnegotia.2017.2.05
26. Popescu, R-I., Corbos, R-A., 2010, The role of urban tourism in the strategical development of Brasov area, *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 5(7), 69-85
27. Popescu, R-I., Corbos, R-A., 2012, The role of festivals and cultural events in the strategic development of cities. Recommendations for urban areas in Romania, *Informatica Economica* 16(4), 19-28

28. Postma, A., Buda, D-M., Gugerell, K., 2017, The future of city tourism, *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 3(2), 95-101, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-09-2017-067>
29. Richards, G., Rotariu, I., 2015, Developing the eventful city in Sibiu, Romania, *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 1(2), 89 - 102, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-08-2014-0007>
30. Romao, J., Kourtit, K., Neuts, B., Nijkamp, P., 2018, The smart city as a common place for tourists and residents: A structural analysis of the determinants of urban attractiveness, *Cities*, 78, 67-75, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2017.11.007>
31. Scott, N., Cooper, C., 2010, Innovation for sustainable urban tourism: Some thoughts on best practice, *Revista de Administracao Publica*, 44(5), 1171-1190
32. Tigu, G., Garcia Sanchez, A., Stoenescu, C., Gheorghe, C. and Sabou, G.C., 2018. The destination experience through stopover tourism – Bucharest case study, *Amfiteatru Economic*, 20(12), 967-981
33. UNWTO/WTTCF, 2018, City tourism performance research, World Tourism Organization, Madrid, Spain, DOI: 10.18111/9789284419616
34. Yolal, M., Cosma, S.A., Rus, R.V., 2014, Motivations for attending a film festival: The case of Transilvania International Film Festival, in Cosma, S., Tutunea, M., Petrescu C., (eds), *Trends in Hospitality, Proceedings of the International Conference Entrepreneurship in the Hospitality Industry 3rd edition*, 219-227
35. Zamfir, A., Corbos, R-A., 2015, Towards sustainable tourism development in urban areas: Case study on Bucharest as tourist destination, *Sustainability*, 7(9), 12709-12722, doi:10.3390/su70912709

Appendix 1: Comparative evolution of lodgings by counties and regions

County	Urban lodgings		Urban rooms		No. of urban localities	No. of urban localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants including county residences	No of urban resorts and WHS (others than the localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants)	The name of county residence and other information
	2005	2016	2005	2016				
Bihor	38	95	728	1,837	10 4 municipalities; 6 towns	2 2 municipalities	0	Oradea
Bistrita-Nasaud	19	43	1,068	1,179	4 1 municipalities; 3 towns	1 1 municipality	1 Sangeorz Bai*	Bistrita
Cluj	81	239	1,862	3,847	6 5 municipalities; 1 town	5 5 municipalities (Turda includes Baile Turda** Gherla includes Baile Baita**)	0	Cluj-Napoca

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County	Urban lodgings		Urban rooms		No. of urban localities	No. of urban localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants including county residences	No of urban resorts and WHS (others than the localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants)	The name of county residence and other information
	2005	2016	2005	2016				
Maramures	89	179	1,157	2,106	13 2 municipalities; 11 towns	3 2 municipalities; 1 town (Borsa includes Baile Borsa**)	3 Baia Sprie**, Viseu de Sus**, Targu Lapus ¹	Baia-Mare
Salaj	6	28	111	431	4 1 municipality; 3 towns	1 1 municipality	0	Zalau
Satu-Mare	21	77	448	1,190	6 2 municipalities; 4 towns	2 2 municipalities	1 Tasnad**	Satu-Mare
North-West	254	661	5,374	10,590	43 15 municipalities; 28 towns	14 13 municipalities; 1 town	5 1 national resort 3 local resorts 1 WHS host	
Alba	23	81	426	1,489	11 4 municipalities; 7 towns	5 4 municipalities; 1 town	0	Alba-Iulia
Brasov	355	669	5,530	10,151	10 4 municipalities; 6 towns	5 4 municipalities; 1 town	2 Predeal*; Rasnov*	Brasov (includes Poiana Brasov*)
Covasna	50	73	1,443	1,734	5 2 municipalities; 3 towns	2 2 municipalities	1 Covasna*	Sfantu Gheorghie
Harghita	126	219	1,627	2,909	9 4 municipalities; 5 towns	2 2 municipalities	4 Baile Tusnad* Gheorgheni (includes Lacu Rosu)** Borsec**; Vlahita (Baile Homorod)**	Miercurea Ciuc (includes Baile Harghita**)
Mures	69	261	1,914	4,233	11 4 municipalities; 7 towns	4 4 municipalities (Sighisora ²)	1 Sovata*	Targu Mures
Sibiu	184	285	1,829	3,905	11 2 municipalities; 9 towns	3 2 municipalities; 1 town	1 Ocna Sibiului**	Sibiu (includes Paltinis**)
Center	807	1,588	12,769	24,421	57 20 municipalities; 37 towns	21 18 municipalities; 3 towns	9 5 national resorts 4 local resorts	2 county residences including national resorts 1 county residence includes a local resort

CORNELIA POP, CRISTINA BALINT

County	Urban lodgings		Urban rooms		No. of urban localities	No. of urban localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants including county residences	No of urban resorts and WHS (others than the localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants)	The name of county residence and other information
	2005	2016	2005	2016				
Macro-region 1	1,061	2,249	18,143	35,011	100 35 municipalities; 65 towns	35 31 municipalities; 4 towns	14 6 national resorts 7 local resorts 1 WHS host	2 county residences include national resorts 1 county residence includes a local resort
Bacau	50	138	1,379	2,125	8 3 municipalities; 5 towns	5 3 municipalities; 3 towns	2 Slanic Moldova* Tg.Ocna*	Bacau
Botosani	11	18	317	379	7 2 municipalities; 5 towns	2 2 municipalities	0	Botosani
Iasi	38	95	1,066	2,114	5 2 municipalities; 3 towns	2 2 municipalities	0	Iasi
Neamt	36	83	792	1,240	5 2 municipalities; 3 towns	3 2 municipalities; 1 town (Targu Neamt*)	0	Piatra Neamt*
Suceava	133	266	2,282	3,858	16 5 municipalities; 11 towns	4 4 municipalities (Campulung Moldovenesc*)	2 Vatra Dornei* Gura Humorului* ³	Suceava (hosts a church included in WH List of churches of Moldavia)
Vaslui	7	18	251	358	5 3 municipalities; 2 towns	3 3 municipalities	0	Vaslui
North-East	275	618	6,087	10,074	46 17 municipalities; 29 towns	19 16 municipalities; 3 towns	4 4 national resorts	1 county residence is a national resort
Braila	14	27	418	524	4 1 municipality; 3 towns	1 1 municipality	0	Braila
Buzau	12	30	307	526	5 2 municipalities; 3 towns	2 2 municipalities	0	Buzau
Constanta	580	1,048	41,070	44,118	12 3 municipalities; 9 towns	4 3 municipalities; 1 town (Mangalia includes resorts of national interest***)	2 Eforie* Techirghiol*	Constanta (includes Mamaia*)

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County	Urban lodgings		Urban rooms		No. of urban localities	No. of urban localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants including county residences	No of urban resorts and WHS (others than the localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants)	The name of county residence and other information
	2005	2016	2005	2016				
Galati	22	44	532	928	4 2 municipalities; 2 towns	2 2 municipalities	0	Galati
Tulcea	46	88	717	1,325	5 1 municipality; 4 towns	1 1 municipality	1 Sulina ⁴	Tulcea
Vrancea	9	30	232	401	5 2 municipalities; 3 towns	2 2 municipalities	0	Focsani
South-East	683	1,267	43,276	47,822	35 11 municipalities; 24 towns	12 11 municipalities; 1 town	3 2 national resorts 1 part of WHS	1 county residence includes a national resort
Macro-region 2	958	1,885	49,363	57,896	81 28 municipalities; 53 towns	31 27 municipalities; 4 towns	7 6 national resorts 1 town part of WHS	1 county residence is a national resort 1 county residence includes a national resort
Arges	37	81	1,017	1,648	7 3 municipalities; 4 towns	4 3 municipalities; 1 town	0	Pitesti
Calarasi	8	15	261	400	5 2 municipalities; 3 towns	2 2 municipalities	0	Calarasi
Dambovita	19	36	559	811	7 2 municipalities; 5 towns	2 2 municipalities	1 Pucioasa*	Targoviste
Giurgiu	8	16	221	479	3 1 municipality; 2 towns	1 1 municipality	0	Giurgiu
Ialomita	18	25	1,249	912	7 3 municipalities; 4 towns	2 2 municipalities	1 Amara*	Slobozia
Prahova	433	546	4,877	6,444	14 2 municipalities; 12 towns	2 2 municipalities	6 Azuga*; Busteni*; Sinaia*; Slanic*; Breaza**; Valenii de Munte**	Ploiesti
Teleorman	3	16	110	348	5 3 municipalities; 2 towns	3 3 municipalities	0	Alexandria

CORNELIA POP, CRISTINA BALINT

County	Urban lodgings		Urban rooms		No. of urban localities	No. of urban localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants including county residences	No of urban resorts and WHS (others than the localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants)	The name of county residence and other information
	2005	2016	2005	2016				
South-Muntenia	526	735	8,294	11,042	48 16 municipalities; 32 towns	16 15 municipalities; 1 town	8 6 national resorts 2 local resorts	
Macro-region 3	526	735	8,294	11,042	48 16 municipalities; 32 towns	16 15 municipalities; 1 town	8 6 national resorts 2 local resorts	
Arad	56	105	1,124	1,845	10 1 municipality; 9 towns	1 1 municipality	1 Lipova**	Arad
Caras-Severin	58	139	2,882	3,080	8 2 municipalities; 6 towns	2 2 municipalities	1 Baile Herculane*	Resita (includes Secu**)
Hunedoara	119	248	1,713	3,037	14 7 municipalities; 7 towns	7 6 municipalities; 1 town Lupeni includes Straja** Petrosani includes Parang*	1 Geoagiu (includes Geoagiu Bai*)	Deva
Timis	96	173	2,572	3,721	10 2 municipalities; 8 towns	2 2 municipalities	1 Buzias*	Timisoara
West	329	665	8,291	11,683	42 12 municipalities; 30 towns	12 11 municipalities; 1 town	4 3 national resorts 1 local resort	1 county residence includes a local resort
Dolj	20	65	655	1,455	7 3 municipalities; 4 towns	1 1 municipality	0	Craiova
Gorj	24	100	335	1,326	9 2 municipalities; 7 towns	2 2 municipalities	0	Targu Jiu
Mehedinti	17	43	458	794	5 2 municipalities; 3 towns	1 1 municipality	0	Drobeta-Turnu Severin
Olt	9	32	253	566	8 2 municipalities; 6 towns	3 2 municipalities; 1 town	0	Slatina
Valcea	139	218	3,661	5,106	11 2 municipalities; 9 towns	2 2 municipalities	Baile Govora*; Baile Olanesti* Calimanesti*; Horezu**5	Ramnicu Valcea
South-West	209	458	5,362	9,247	40 11 municipalities;	9 8 municipalities;	4 3 national	

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County	Urban lodgings		Urban rooms		No. of urban localities	No. of urban localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants including county residences	No of urban resorts and WHS (others than the localities with more than 20,000 inhabitants)	The name of county residence and other information
	2005	2016	2005	2016				
					29 towns	1 town	resorts 1 local resort and WHS host	
<i>Macro-region 4</i>	538	1,123	13,653	20,930	82 23 municipalities; 59 towns	21 19 municipalities; 2 towns	8 6 national resorts 2 local resorts of which one hosts a WHS	1 county residence includes a local resort
Total urban at national level	3,083	5,992	89,453	124,879	311 102 municipalities; 209 towns	103 92 municipalities; 11 towns	37 24 national resorts 11 local resorts of which two host a respective WHS 1 town hosts a WHS 1 town part of WHS Danube Delta	3 county residences include national resorts 2 county residences include local resorts 1 county residence is a national resort

Note *: resorts of national interest

Note **: resorts of local interest

Note ***: Mangalia includes the following resorts of national interest: Cap Aurora; Jupiter; Neptun-Olimp; Saturn; Venus

Note 1: hosts a wooden church (Rogoz) part of WHL (World Heritage List)

Note 2: the center of Sighisoara is declared WHS

Note 3: hosts a painted church (Voronet) part of WHL

Note 4: Sulina is part of Danube Delta, natural WHS

Note 5: Horezu also hosts Horezu Monastery listed as WHS

Appendix 2: Lodgings and rooms distribution by counties and regions

County/ Region	% of total urban lodgings		% of total urban rooms		Urban resorts of national interest		Urban resorts of local interest		World (UNESCO) heritage sites in urban areas
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	
Bihor	1.23	1.59	0.82	1.47	0	0	0	0	
Bistrita-Nasaud	0.62	0.72	1.19	0.94	1	1	0	0	
Cluj	2.63	3.99	2.08	3.08	0	0	2	2	
Maramures	2.89	2.99	1.29	1.69	0	0	1	1	Tg.Lapus hosts a WHS (church)

CORNELIA POP, CRISTINA BALINT

County/ Region	% of total urban lodgings		% of total urban rooms		Urban resorts of national interest		Urban resorts of local interest		World (UNESCO) heritage sites in urban areas
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	
Salaj	0.19	0.47	0.13	0.35	0	0	0	0	
Satu-Mare	0.68	1.28	0.50	0.95	0	0	0	1	
North-West	8.24	11.04	6.01	8.48	1	1	3	4	
Alba	0.75	1.35	0.48	1.19	0	0	0	0	
Brasov	11.51	11.16	6.18	8.13	1	3	0	0	
Covasna	1.62	1.22	1.61	1.39	1	1	0	0	
Harghita	4.09	3.65	1.82	2.33	1	1	4	4	
Mures	2.24	4.36	2.14	3.39	1	1	0	0	Sighisoara historic center is listed as WHS
Sibiu	5.97	4.76	2.04	3.13	0	0	1	2	
Center	26.18	26.50	14.27	19.56	4	6	5	6	
Macro-region 1	34.42	37.54	20.28	28.04	5	7	8	10	
Bacau	1.62	2.30	1.54	1.71	2	2	0	0	
Botosani	0.36	0.30	0.35	0.30	0	0	0	0	
Iasi	1.23	1.56	1.19	1.69	0	0	0	0	
Neamt	1.17	1.38	0.89	0.99	0	1	0	0	
Suceava	4.31	4.44	2.55	3.09	0	2	0	0	Suceava hosts a WHS (church)
Vaslui	0.23	0.30	0.28	0.29	0	0	0	0	
North-East	8.92	10.31	6.80	8.07	0	3	0	0	
Braila	0.45	0.45	0.47	0.42	0	0	0	0	
Buzau	0.39	0.50	0.34	0.42	0	0	0	0	
Constanta	18.81	17.49	45.91	35.33	9	9	0	0	
Galati	0.72	0.73	0.59	0.71	0	0	0	0	
Tulcea	1.49	1.47	0.80	1.06	0	0	0	0	Sulina is located within WHS Danube Delta
Vrancea	0.29	0.50	0.27	0.32	0	0	0	0	
South-East	22.15	21.14	48.38	38.29	9	9	0	0	
Macro-region 2	31.07	31.45	55.18	46.36	9	12	0	0	
Arges	1.20	1.35	1.14	1.32	0	0	0	0	
Calarasi	0.26	0.25	0.29	0.32	0	0	0	0	
Dambovita	0.62	0.60	0.62	0.65	0	1	0	0	
Giurgiu	0.26	0.27	0.25	0.38	0	0	0	0	
Ialomita	0.58	0.42	1.40	0.73	1	1	0	0	
Prahova	14.04	9.11	5.45	5.16	2	4	1	2	
Teleorman	0.10	0.27	0.12	0.28	0	0	0	0	
South-Muntenia	17.06	12.27	9.27	8.84	3	6	1	2	
Macro-region 3	17.06	12.27	9.27	8.84	3	6	1	2	
Arad	1.82	1.75	1.26	1.48	0	0	1	1	
Caras-Severin	1.88	2.32	3.23	2.47	1	1	1	1	
Hunedoara	3.86	4.14	1.91	2.43	1	1	0	0	
Timis	3.11	2.89	2.88	2.98	1	1	0	0	
West	10.67	11.10	9.28	9.36	3	3	2	2	
Dolj	0.65	1.08	0.73	1.17	0	0	0	0	
Gorj	0.78	1.67	0.37	1.06	0	0	0	0	
Mehedinti	0.55	0.72	0.52	0.63	0	0	0	0	
Olt	0.29	0.53	0.28	0.45	0	0	0	0	

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/ Region	% of total urban lodgings		% of total urban rooms		Urban resorts of national interest		Urban resorts of local interest		World (UNESCO) heritage sites in urban areas
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	
Valcea	4.51	3.64	4.09	4.09	2	3	0	1	Horezu hosts a WHS (monastery)
South-West	6.78	7.64	5.99	7.40	2	3	0	1	
Macro-region 4	17.45	18.74	15.27	16.76	5	6	2	3	
National level (urban)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	22	31	11	15	

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Appendix 3: Number of towns and municipalities reporting lodgings, number of towns and municipalities concentrating 10 lodgings or more

County/ Region	Urban localities (INSSE)		Urban localities reporting lodgings		Concentration 2005 (10 or more lodgings)			Concentration 2016 (10 or more lodgings)			Urban localities with 0 lodgings in 2005 and 2016
	2005	2016	2005	2016	Towns and muni	% of lodgings	% of rooms	Towns and muni	% of lodgings	% of rooms	
Bihor	10	10	8	9	1	44.74	59.62	2	77.89	82.09	Vascau
Bistrita-Nasaud	4	4	4	4	1	63.16	33.33	1	60.47	59.37	-
Cluj	6	6	6	5	1	75.31	84.80	3	94.98	95.35	-
Maramures	13	13	10	12	5	88.76	91.62	6	88.83	92.69	Dragomiresti
Salaj	4	4	2	4	0	0	0	1	57.14	71.93	-
Satu-Mare	5	6	4	5	1	71.43	73.21	2	87.01	88.82	Ardud
North-West	42	43	34	39	9	72.44	69.91	15	86.08	88.28	3 urban localities (towns) with 0 lodgings
Alba	11	11	9	11	1	47.82	69.25	2	58.02	75.96	-
Brasov	10	10	10	10	5	96.34	97.58	5	97.16	97.72	-
Covasna	5	5	5	5	2	70.00	94.25	3	84.93	95.27	-
Harghita	9	9	7	8	5	90.48	95.33	7	98.63	99.35	Balan
Mures	11	11	9	10	3	88.41	96.24	3	90.42	89.18	-
Sibiu	11	11	9	9	4	88.04	82.23	6	95.79	95.03	Copsa Mica
Center	57	57	49	53	20	89.84	93.57	26	93.45	94.50	2 urban localities (towns) with 0 lodgings
Macro-region 1	99	100	83	92	29	85.67	86.56	41	91.29	92.62	5 urban localities (towns) with 0 lodgings
Bacau	8	8	7	8	1	48.00	45.32	5	92.03	95.48	-
Botosani	7	7	2	2	0	0	0	1	72.22	86.81	Bucecea, Darabani, Flamanzi, Saveni, Stefanesti
Iasi	5	5	4	4	1	84.21	88.93	1	93.68	97.40	Harlau
Neamt	5	5	4	5	2	41.67	76.52	3	93.98	88.15	-

CORNELIA POP, CRISTINA BALINT

County/ Region	Urban localities (INSSE)		Urban localities reporting lodgings		Concentration 2005 (10 or more lodgings)			Concentration 2016 (10 or more lodgings)			Urban localities with 0 lodgings in 2005 and 2016
	2005	2016	2005	2016	Towns and muni	% of lodgings	% of rooms	Towns and muni	% of lodgings	% of rooms	
Suceava	16	16	10	10	4	87.96	92.81	5	90.23	93.68	Cajvana, Dolhasca – WHS host, Liteni, Milisauti, Salcea, Vicovu de Sus
Vaslui	5	5	3	3	0	0	0	1	55.56	50.00	Murgeni, Negresti
North-East	46	46	30	32	8	68.36	70.59	16	90.13	92.35	14 urban localities (towns) with 0 lodgings
Braila	4	4	1	2	1	100.00	100.00	1	85.19	93.13	Faurei, Insuratei
Buzau	5	5	4	4	0	0	0	1	56.67	69.39	Pogoanele
Constanta	12	12	8	9	4	97.93	99.32	5	98.76	99.56	Murfatlar, Negru Voda
Galati	4	4	1	2	1	100.00	100.00	1	81.82	89.44	Beresti, Targu Bujor
Tulcea	5	5	4	4	2	93.48	95.26	2	96.59	97.06	-
Vrancea	5	5	2	4	0	0	0	1	70.00	71.32	-
South-East	35	35	20	25	8	94.73	98.03	11	96.05	98.66	7 urban localities (towns) with 0 lodgings
Macro- region 2	81	81	50	57	16	87.16	94.64	27	94.11	97.56	21 urban localities (towns) with 0 lodgings
Arges	7	7	5	6	1	62.16	70.99	3	87.65	92.05	Costesti
Calarasi	5	5	2	2	0	0	0	1	86.67	94.75	Budesti, Fundulea, Lehliu-Gara
Dambovita	7	7	4	6	0	0	0	1	50.00	46.73	Racari
Giurgiu	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Ialomita	7	7	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	Fierbinti- Targ
Prahova	14	14	10	14	6	95.84	93.99	7	96.52	95.53	-
Teleorman	5	5	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
South- Muntenia	48	48	32	41	7	83.27	63.97	12	85.58	76.35	6 urban localities (towns) with 0 lodgings
Macro- region 3	48	48	32	41	7	83.27	63.97	12	85.58	76.35	6 urban localities (towns) with 0 lodgings
Arad	10	10	7	10	1	76.79	86.03	1	77.14	83.09	-
Caras-Severin	8	8	5	8	3	94.83	99.13	3	86.33	92.76	-
Hunedoara	14	14	13	14	4	71.43	67.37	6	85.89	84.72	-

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/ Region	Urban localities (INSSE)		Urban localities reporting lodgings		Concentration 2005 (10 or more lodgings)			Concentration 2016 (10 or more lodgings)			Urban localities with 0 lodgings in 2005 and 2016
	2005	2016	2005	2016	Towns and muni	% of lodgings	% of rooms	Towns and muni	% of lodgings	% of rooms	
Timis	10	10	6	9	1	78.13	71.19	2	84.97	80.99	Ciacova
West	42	42	31	41	9	78.42	82.13	12	84.36	85.40	1 urban locality (town) with 0 lodgings
Dolj	7	7	2	4	1	90.00	91.91	1	84.62	89.07	Bailesti (muni), Dabuleni, Segarcea
Gorj	9	9	5	7	0	0	0	2	81.00	80.17	Rovinari, Targu Carbunesti
Mehedinti	5	5	3	3	1	70.59	85.37	2	95.35	97.10	Strehaia, Vanju Mare
Olt	8	8	3	5	0	0	0	1	34.38	53.00	Draganesti- Olt, Piatra-Olt, Potcoava
Valcea	11	11	9	10	5	91.37	96.83	7	95.41	97.94	Balcesti
South-West	40	40	22	29	7	75.12	84.63	13	86.46	91.18	11 urban localities (1 muni and 10 towns) with 0 lodgings
Macro- region 4	82	82	53	70	16	77.14	83.11	25	85.22	87.95	12 urban localities (1 muni and 11 towns) with 0 lodgings
National level (urban)	310	311	218	260	68	84.24	88.40	105	90.34	92.69	44 urban localities (1 muni and 43 towns) with 0 lodgings

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database, on NIS data

Appendix 4: Structure of accommodation facilities by classification (%)

County/Region & year		1*	1*	2*	2*	3*	3*	4*	4*	5*	5*
		No	Rooms	No	Rooms	No	Rooms	No	Rooms	No	Rooms
Bihor	2005	31.58	31.18	34.21	19.78	26.32	21.29	7.89	27.75	0.00	0.00
	2016	5.26	7.35	27.37	14.10	58.95	46.11	8.42	32.44	0.00	0.00
Bistrita- Nasaud	2005	26.32	39.04	31.58	34.83	42.11	26.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	2.33	1.61	32.56	42.92	55.81	37.83	6.98	12.81	2.33	4.83
Cluj	2005	7.41	4.78	29.63	38.78	44.44	30.83	17.28	24.87	1.24	0.74
	2016	4.60	4.96	19.25	12.92	59.83	48.40	14.64	29.35	1.68	4.37
Maramures	2005	3.37	12.45	67.42	34.65	22.47	39.33	6.74	13.57	0.00	0.00
	2016	1.68	2.52	39.11	25.93	53.63	61.63	5.58	9.92	0.00	0.00
Salaj	2005	0.00	0.00	33.33	14.41	66.67	85.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	0.00	0.00	10.71	7.89	75.00	74.94	14.29	17.17	0.00	0.00
Satu-Mare	2005	23.81	17.86	23.81	21.88	42.86	57.81	9.52	2.45	0.00	0.00
	2016	7.79	6.64	32.47	26.39	54.55	61.43	5.19	5.54	0.00	0.00

CORNELIA POP, CRISTINA BALINT

County/Region & year		1*	1*	2*	2*	3*	3*	4*	4*	5*	5*
		No	Rooms	No	Rooms	No	Rooms	No	Rooms	No	Rooms
North-West	2005	12.20	17.81	43.31	32.62	34.25	33.81	9.85	15.50	0.39	0.26
	2016	3.93	4.50	27.84	20.36	57.79	52.00	9.68	21.01	0.76	2.13
Alba	2005	21.74	13.15	60.87	79.10	17.39	7.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	6.17	1.07	24.69	22.63	55.56	62.79	11.11	11.48	2.47	2.03
Brasov	2005	26.48	15.30	31.27	29.39	32.95	43.55	8.45	11.27	0.85	0.49
	2016	6.88	4.76	21.23	15.44	55.16	48.16	15.25	28.32	1.48	3.32
Covasna	2005	24.00	10.82	54.00	71.79	22.00	17.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	15.07	8.77	38.36	46.83	42.47	35.87	4.10	8.53	0.00	0.00
Harghita	2005	10.32	8.97	73.01	58.45	16.67	32.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	8.68	7.32	38.81	33.14	51.14	54.11	1.37	5.43	0.00	0.00
Mures	2005	8.70	11.08	37.67	48.43	43.48	35.89	7.25	3.55	2.90	1.05
	2016	3.07	4.56	31.03	22.47	52.49	46.42	12.26	25.02	1.15	1.53
Sibiu	2005	24.46	16.07	58.15	48.50	15.76	34.23	1.63	1.20	0.00	0.00
	2016	3.86	2.61	31.58	19.80	52.98	55.16	10.88	21.95	0.70	0.48
Center	2005	21.69	13.39	46.72	45.13	26.27	35.52	4.71	5.58	0.61	0.38
	2016	6.30	4.75	28.09	22.13	53.21	49.70	11.33	21.57	1.07	1.85
Macro-region 1	2005	19.42	14.70	45.90	41.43	28.18	35.02	5.93	8.52	0.57	0.33
	2016	5.60	4.67	28.01	21.59	54.56	50.41	10.85	21.40	0.98	1.93
Bacau	2005	16.00	3.84	54.00	62.22	26.00	32.56	4.00	1.38	0.00	0.00
	2016	7.25	3.95	26.81	30.64	57.25	52.75	7.97	12.24	0.72	0.42
Botosani	2005	18.18	11.99	45.45	68.14	18.19	9.46	18.18	10.41	0.00	0.00
	2016	11.11	5.54	22.22	17.15	44.45	41.43	22.22	35.88	0.00	0.00
Iasi	2005	21.05	13.51	36.84	28.99	28.95	41.18	10.53	15.95	2.63	0.37
	2016	5.27	2.22	21.05	16.93	56.84	45.88	15.79	31.93	1.05	3.04
Neamt	2005	11.11	13.64	63.89	28.78	25.00	57.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	8.43	10.97	30.12	21.29	59.04	54.92	2.41	12.82	0.00	0.00
Suceava	2005	10.53	9.82	52.63	44.35	29.32	36.81	7.52	9.02	0.00	0.00
	2016	3.76	3.27	25.19	22.60	50.00	47.15	20.30	26.31	0.75	0.67
Vaslui	2005	14.29	9.56	57.14	54.58	28.57	35.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	11.11	6.70	38.89	27.93	50.00	65.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
North-East	2005	13.45	9.71	52.00	45.34	27.64	37.85	6.55	7.03	0.36	0.07
	2016	5.83	4.35	25.89	22.93	53.72	49.45	13.92	22.29	0.64	0.98
Braila	2005	14.29	3.35	35.71	55.02	42.86	40.43	7.14	1.20	0.00	0.00
	2016	14.81	6.30	14.81	17.37	51.85	67.18	18.53	9.15	0.00	0.00
Buzau	2005	50.00	33.88	41.67	62.87	8.33	3.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	6.67	3.42	33.33	36.50	56.67	55.33	3.33	4.75	0.00	0.00
Constanta	2005	23.97	18.94	42.07	54.25	25.17	21.11	7.76	5.19	1.03	0.51
	2016	8.58	5.73	29.29	32.15	50.29	47.51	8.02	13.19	3.82	1.42
Galati	2005	0.00	0.00	50.00	46.99	36.36	41.17	13.64	11.84	0.00	0.00
	2016	6.82	7.87	20.45	13.04	61.37	63.58	9.09	12.28	2.27	3.23
Tulcea	2005	6.52	7.81	28.26	23.99	36.96	48.68	26.09	18.40	2.17	1.12
	2016	1.14	0.45	18.18	10.57	52.27	64.68	27.27	23.17	1.14	1.13
Vrancea	2005	11.11	46.55	44.45	40.95	44.44	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	0.00	0.00	23.33	34.16	53.34	45.39	23.33	20.45	0.00	0.00
South-East	2005	22.11	18.62	41.29	53.66	26.65	21.83	8.93	5.38	1.02	0.51
	2016	7.89	5.56	27.86	31.09	51.07	48.58	9.87	13.37	3.31	1.40
Macro-region 2	2005	19.62	17.52	44.36	52.63	26.93	23.80	8.25	5.59	0.84	0.46
	2016	7.21	5.35	27.21	29.67	51.95	48.73	11.19	14.93	2.44	1.32
Arges	2005	13.51	20.06	35.14	26.25	45.95	52.61	2.70	0.49	2.70	0.59
	2016	2.47	1.88	23.46	17.05	64.20	63.23	8.64	17.48	1.23	0.36
Calarasi	2005	12.50	10.34	37.50	50.58	50.00	39.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	0.00	0.00	13.33	3.75	60.00	48.00	26.67	48.25	0.00	0.00

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region & year		1*	1*	2*	2*	3*	3*	4*	4*	5*	5*
		No	Rooms	No	Rooms	No	Rooms	No	Rooms	No	Rooms
Dambovita	2005	10.53	3.22	68.42	75.85	21.05	20.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	5.56	4.93	38.89	50.93	50.00	41.92	5.55	2.22	0.00	0.00
Giurgiu	2005	37.50	15.84	62.50	84.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	25.00	12.73	31.25	15.87	43.75	71.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ialomita	2005	33.33	14.81	50.00	81.27	16.67	3.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	0.00	0.00	32.00	17.21	64.00	78.51	4.00	4.28	0.00	0.00
Prahova	2005	27.94	15.67	45.50	40.43	22.63	27.11	3.70	16.61	0.23	0.18
	2016	3.85	2.79	31.87	22.92	52.38	52.22	9.34	19.52	2.56	2.55
Teleorman	2005	33.33	9.09	66.67	90.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	0.00	0.00	31.25	47.13	56.25	44.54	12.50	8.33	0.00	0.00
South-Muntenia	2005	26.43	14.99	46.01	49.39	23.95	25.62	3.23	9.83	0.38	0.17
	2016	3.95	2.83	30.88	23.39	54.01	55.71	9.12	16.53	2.04	1.54
Macro-region 3	2005	26.43	14.99	46.01	49.39	23.95	25.62	3.23	9.83	0.38	0.17
	2016	3.95	2.83	30.88	23.39	54.01	55.71	9.12	16.53	2.04	1.54
Arad	2005	19.64	11.03	53.57	39.59	25.00	35.15	1.79	14.23	0.00	0.00
	2016	8.57	7.59	38.10	30.24	48.57	48.13	4.76	14.04	0.00	0.00
Caras-Severin	2005	13.79	8.12	60.35	84.42	24.14	5.59	1.72	1.87	0.00	0.00
	2016	5.75	2.44	26.62	31.78	63.31	57.47	4.32	8.31	0.00	0.00
Hunedoara	2005	22.69	22.24	60.50	65.56	13.45	11.33	3.36	0.87	0.00	0.00
	2016	9.68	5.66	38.71	34.67	43.95	48.83	6.45	9.91	1.21	0.92
Timis	2005	7.29	7.70	32.29	38.88	45.84	36.31	14.58	17.11	0.00	0.00
	2016	5.20	6.50	17.34	18.30	61.85	48.57	15.03	26.50	0.58	0.13
West	2005	16.11	11.30	51.06	60.32	26.75	20.31	6.08	8.07	0.00	0.00
	2016	7.52	5.38	30.53	28.00	53.38	50.92	7.97	15.42	0.60	0.28
Dolj	2005	5.00	0.92	45.00	43.51	40.00	48.55	10.00	7.02	0.00	0.00
	2016	1.54	0.34	20.00	11.48	56.92	49.35	21.54	38.83	0.00	0.00
Gorj	2005	0.00	0.00	66.67	58.21	33.33	41.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	2.00	0.45	31.00	27.15	61.00	66.44	6.00	5.96	0.00	0.00
Mehedinti	2005	11.76	10.48	47.06	45.63	41.18	43.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	6.98	2.14	18.60	19.40	69.77	72.67	4.65	5.79	0.00	0.00
Olt	2005	0.00	0.00	66.67	88.14	11.11	6.32	11.11	2.77	11.11	2.77
	2016	3.13	4.24	31.24	28.09	53.13	53.18	12.50	14.49	0.00	0.00
Valcea	2005	17.99	14.59	56.83	68.18	23.02	16.61	2.16	0.62	0.00	0.00
	2016	5.96	5.76	33.49	25.83	52.29	61.05	7.34	6.87	0.92	0.49
South-West	2005	13.40	10.97	56.46	63.56	26.79	23.93	2.87	1.42	0.48	0.12
	2016	4.37	3.74	29.48	23.35	56.55	60.50	9.17	12.14	0.43	0.27
Macro-region 4	2005	15.06	11.17	53.16	61.59	26.77	21.73	4.83	5.46	0.18	0.05
	2016	6.23	4.66	30.10	25.94	54.67	55.15	8.47	13.98	0.53	0.27
National level (urban)	2005	19.92	15.75	46.71	51.42	26.82	25.93	6.00	6.56	0.55	0.34
	2016	6.02	4.82	28.50	26.22	53.69	50.89	10.30	16.72	1.49	1.35

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Appendix 5: Structure of accommodation facilities by lodging capacity - number of rooms (%)

County/Region & year		1-4 rooms	5-9 rooms	10-49 rooms	50-99 rooms	100-199 rooms	200-499 rooms	≥500 rooms
Bihor	2005	26.32	23.68	42.11	2.63	5.26	0.00	0.00
	2016	13.68	29.47	50.53	2.11	4.21	0.00	0.00
Bistrita-Nasaud	2005	15.79	21.05	42.11	5.26	5.26	10.53	0.00
	2016	13.95	23.26	51.16	6.97	2.33	2.33	0.00
Cluj	2005	14.81	17.29	61.73	2.47	3.70	0.00	0.00
	2016	29.71	19.67	44.35	4.60	1.67	0.00	0.00

CORNELIA POP, CRISTINA BALINT

County/Region & year		1-4 rooms	5-9 rooms	10-49 rooms	50-99 rooms	100-199 rooms	200-499 rooms	≥500 rooms
Maramures	2005	57.30	12.36	23.60	4.49	2.25	0.00	0.00
	2016	27.37	34.64	34.64	2.79	0.56	0.00	0.00
Salaj	2005	0.00	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	3.57	28.57	67.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Satu-Mare	2005	14.29	23.81	52.38	4.76	4.76	0.00	0.00
	2016	10.39	32.47	55.84	0.00	1.30	0.00	0.00
North-West	2005	31.10	17.32	43.70	3.54	3.54	0.80	0.00
	2016	22.39	27.23	45.39	3.18	1.66	0.15	0.00
Alba	2005	17.39	21.74	52.17	4.35	4.35	0.00	0.00
	2016	13.58	32.10	49.38	2.47	1.23	1.24	0.00
Brasov	2005	34.65	27.61	30.99	3.66	2.54	0.55	0.00
	2016	17.94	31.84	45.74	2.84	1.49	0.15	0.00
Covasna	2005	30.00	32.00	22.00	4.00	10.00	2.00	0.00
	2016	19.18	34.25	32.88	6.85	5.47	1.37	0.00
Harghita	2005	48.41	22.22	23.81	2.38	3.18	0.00	0.00
	2016	16.44	39.73	39.73	2.73	1.37	0.00	0.00
Mures	2005	2.90	30.43	47.83	10.14	8.70	0.00	0.00
	2016	18.38	34.10	41.00	4.60	1.92	0.00	0.00
Sibiu	2005	55.98	19.57	20.11	3.25	1.09	0.00	0.00
	2016	26.32	32.28	36.49	3.51	1.40	0.00	0.00
Center	2005	38.17	25.28	28.87	3.97	3.34	0.37	0.00
	2016	19.14	33.50	42.07	3.40	1.70	0.19	0.00
Macro-region 1	2005	36.48	23.37	32.42	3.86	3.39	0.48	0.00
	2016	20.10	31.66	43.04	3.33	1.69	0.18	0.00
Bacau	2005	16.00	26.00	44.00	8.00	4.00	2.00	0.00
	2016	24.64	30.43	38.41	4.35	2.17	0.00	0.00
Botosani	2005	0.00	9.09	81.82	0.00	9.09	0.00	0.00
	2016	5.56	16.67	66.67	11.10	0.00	0.00	0.00
Iasi	2005	15.79	28.95	34.21	15.79	5.26	0.00	0.00
	2016	16.84	31.58	38.95	9.47	3.16	0.00	0.00
Neamt	2005	22.22	27.78	41.67	2.78	5.55	0.00	0.00
	2016	30.12	26.51	38.55	2.41	2.41	0.00	0.00
Suceava	2005	22.56	36.09	33.83	3.76	3.76	0.00	0.00
	2016	16.17	36.09	42.86	3.38	1.50	0.00	0.00
Vaslui	2005	0.00	14.29	57.14	28.57	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	16.67	27.78	44.44	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
North-East	2005	18.91	30.55	39.27	6.55	4.36	0.36	0.00
	2016	19.74	32.04	41.42	4.85	1.95	0.00	0.00
Braila	2005	7.14	28.57	42.86	14.29	7.14	0.00	0.00
	2016	3.70	40.74	48.15	7.41	0.00	0.00	0.00
Buzau	2005	8.33	16.67	66.67	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	10.00	26.67	60.00	0.00	3.33	0.00	0.00
Constanta	2005	12.24	14.14	35.34	10.17	16.21	11.90	0.00
	2016	13.55	17.18	47.81	7.73	8.78	4.95	0.00
Galati	2005	18.18	18.18	40.91	20.73	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	2.27	25.00	63.64	9.09	0.00	0.00	0.00
Tulcea	2005	19.57	41.30	32.61	4.35	2.17	0.00	0.00
	2016	10.23	34.09	50.00	3.41	2.27	0.00	0.00
Vrancea	2005	22.22	33.33	22.23	11.11	11.11	0.00	0.00
	2016	10.00	33.33	56.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
South-East	2005	12.88	16.69	35.87	10.25	14.20	10.11	0.00
	2016	12.55	19.73	49.01	7.10	7.50	4.11	0.00

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region & year	1-4 rooms	5-9 rooms	10-49 rooms	50-99 rooms	100-199 rooms	200-499 rooms	≥500 rooms	
Macro-region 2	2005	14.61	20.67	36.85	9.19	11.38	7.30	0.00
	2016	14.91	23.77	46.53	6.37	5.67	2.75	0.00
Arges	2005	5.41	24.32	59.46	8.11	0.00	2.70	0.00
	2016	4.94	22.22	66.67	3.70	2.47	0.00	0.00
Calarasi	2005	12.50	25.00	37.50	12.50	12.50	0.00	0.00
	2016	13.33	20.00	40.00	20.00	6.67	0.00	0.00
Dambovit	2005	15.79	36.84	21.05	15.79	10.53	0.00	0.00
	2016	5.56	36.11	44.44	8.33	5.56	0.00	0.00
Giurgiu	2005	0.00	25.00	62.50	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00
	2016	0.00	18.75	62.50	18.75	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ialomita	2005	0.00	22.22	55.56	5.56	5.56	5.55	5.55
	2016	0.00	0.00	84.00	8.00	4.00	4.00	0.00
Prahova	2005	48.50	23.79	24.02	1.62	1.85	0.22	0.00
	2016	30.77	32.42	34.62	0.92	1.10	0.17	0.00
Teleorman	2005	0.00	33.33	33.34	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	6.25	31.25	50.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
South-Muntenia	2005	41.06	24.33	28.33	3.04	2.47	0.58	0.19
	2016	24.08	29.80	41.36	2.86	1.63	0.27	0.00
Macro-region 3	2005	41.06	24.33	28.33	3.04	2.47	0.58	0.19
	2016	24.08	29.80	41.36	2.86	1.63	0.27	0.00
Arad	2005	7.14	30.36	57.14	1.79	3.57	0.00	0.00
	2016	3.81	30.48	63.81	0.95	0.95	0.00	0.00
Caras-Severin	2005	8.62	25.86	44.83	3.45	8.62	6.90	1.72
	2016	10.07	35.97	46.76	2.16	2.88	2.16	0.00
Hunedoara	2005	37.82	29.41	26.05	3.36	3.36	0.00	0.00
	2016	25.40	33.87	37.91	1.61	1.21	0.00	0.00
Timis	2005	2.08	20.83	66.67	5.21	5.21	0.00	0.00
	2016	8.67	21.97	61.85	4.62	2.31	0.58	0.00
West	2005	17.02	26.44	46.51	3.65	4.86	1.22	0.30
	2016	14.44	30.68	50.08	2.40	1.80	0.60	0.00
Dolj	2005	0.00	15.00	80.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	10.77	21.54	60.00	6.15	1.54	0.00	0.00
Gorj	2005	37.50	8.33	54.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	11.00	37.00	50.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mehedinti	2005	5.88	35.29	47.07	0.00	11.76	0.00	0.00
	2016	11.63	27.91	53.49	4.65	2.32	0.00	0.00
Olt	2005	0.00	22.22	66.67	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2016	0.00	31.25	62.50	6.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
Valcea	2005	33.81	22.30	33.09	4.32	2.16	4.32	0.00
	2016	12.39	31.65	49.54	2.75	1.83	1.38	0.46
South-West	2005	27.27	21.05	42.59	3.35	2.87	2.87	0.00
	2016	10.92	31.00	52.40	3.49	1.31	0.66	0.22
Macro-region 4	2005	21.00	24.35	44.98	3.53	4.09	1.86	0.19
	2016	13.00	30.81	51.02	2.85	1.60	0.62	0.09
National level (urban)	2005	27.77	22.87	35.29	5.32	5.84	2.85	0.06
	2016	17.62	28.79	45.43	4.14	2.92	1.08	0.02

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Appendix 6: The profile of counties and regions based on available lodgings and rooms

County/Region 1) <i>Growth rate of urban lodgings/rooms</i> 2) <i>Percentage of urban lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)</i>	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Bihor 1) <i>2.50 (no.) / 2.52 (rooms)</i> 2a) <i>23.60 % / 14.70% (2005)</i> 2b) <i>24.23% / 26.07% (2016)</i>	5	9	Pensions (no.) 55.26% Hotels (rooms) 60.99%	Pensions (no.) 37.89% Hotels (rooms) 58.14%	2 stars (no.) 34.21% 1 star (rooms) 31.18%	3 stars (no.) 58.95% 3 stars (rooms) 46.11%	10-49 rooms (no.) 42.11%	10-49 rooms (no.) 50.53%
Bistrita-Nasaud 1) <i>2.26 (no.) / 1.10 (rooms)</i> 2a) <i>37.25 % / 82.85% (2005)</i> 2b) <i>35.83% / 63.39% (2016)</i>	4	9	Hotels (no.) 52.63% Hotels (rooms) 92.32%	Pensions (no.) 34.89% Hotels (rooms) 71.76%	3 stars (no.) 42.11% 1 star (rooms) 39.04%	3 stars (no.) 55.81% 2 stars (rooms) 42.92%	10-49 rooms (no.) 42.11%	10-49 rooms (no.) 51.16%
Cluj 1) <i>2.95 (no.) / 2.07 (rooms)</i> 2a) <i>37.16 % / 64.50% (2005)</i> 2b) <i>51.40% / 67.06% (2016)</i>	7	10	Hotels (no.) 44.44% Hotels (rooms) 77.34%	Pensions (no.) 29.71% Hotels (rooms) 62.28%	3 stars (no.) 44.44% 2 stars (rooms) 38.78%	3 stars (no.) 59.83% 3 stars (rooms) 48.40%	10-49 rooms (no.) 61.73%	10-49 rooms (no.) 44.35%
Maramures 1) <i>2.01 (no.) / 1.82 (rooms)</i> 2a) <i>26.18 % / 56.80% (2005)</i> 2b) <i>42.22% / 57.03% (2016)</i>	7	10	Pensions (no.) 69.66% Hotels (rooms) 67.42%	Pensions (no.) 55.87% Hotels (rooms) 42.50%	2 stars (no.) 67.42% 3 stars (rooms) 39.33%	3 stars (no.) 53.63% 3 stars (rooms) 61.63%	1-4 rooms (no.) 57.30%	5-9 rooms & 10-49 rooms (no.) 34.64%
Salaj 1) <i>4.67 (no.) / 3.88 (rooms)</i> 2a) <i>50.00 % / 56.06% (2005)</i> 2b) <i>36.36% / 49.43% (2016)</i>	3	6	Hotels (no.) 50.00% Hotels (rooms) 76.58%	Pensions (no.) 53.57% Hotels (rooms) 44.55%	3 stars (no.) 66.67% 3 stars (rooms) 85.59%	3 stars (no.) 75.00% 3 stars (rooms) 74.94%	10-49 rooms (no.) 83.33%	10-49 rooms (no.) 67.86%
Satu-Mare 1) <i>3.67 (no.) / 2.66 (rooms)</i> 2a) <i>75.00 % / 85.17% (2005)</i> 2b) <i>74.76% / 78.65% (2016)</i>	7	9	Hotels (no.) 38.10% Hotels (rooms) 66.52%	Rented rooms (no.) 27.27% Hotels (rooms) 41.01%	3 stars (no.) 42.86% 3 stars (rooms) 57.81%	3 stars (no.) 54.55% 3 stars (rooms) 61.43%	10-49 rooms (no.) 52.38%	10-49 rooms (no.) 55.84%
North-West 1) <i>2.60 (no.) / 1.97 (rooms)</i> 2a) <i>31.36 % / 45.21% (2005)</i> 2b) <i>41.81% / 51.11% (2016)</i>	11	12	Pensions (no.) 42.13% Hotels (rooms) 75.05%	Pensions (no.) 33.89% Hotels (rooms) 55.57%	2 stars (no.) 43.31% 3 stars (rooms) 33.81%	3 stars (no.) 57.79% 3 stars (rooms) 52.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 43.70%	10-49 rooms (no.) 45.39%

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region 1) Growth rate of urban lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of urban lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Alba 1) 3.52 (no.) / 3.50 (rooms) 2a) 14.84 % / 42.22% (2005) 2b) 28.03% / 47.77% (2016)	6	9	Pensions (no.) 52.17%	Pensions (no.) 48.15%	2 stars (no.) 60.87%	3 stars (no.) 55.56%	10-49 rooms (no.) 52.17%	10-49 rooms (no.) 49.38%
			Hotels (rooms) 61.97%	Hotels (rooms) 39.76%	2 stars (rooms) 79.11%	3 stars (rooms) 62.79%		
Brasov 1) 1.88 (no.) / 1.84 (rooms) 2a) 54.70 % / 78.95% (2005) 2b) 53.26% / 66.32% (2016)	12	14	Pensions (no.) 53.52%	Pensions (no.) 45.89%	3 stars (no.) 32.96%	3 stars (no.) 55.16%	1-4 rooms (no.) 34.65%	10-49 rooms (no.) 45.74%
			Hotels (rooms) 56.26%	Hotels (rooms) 48.53%	3 stars (rooms) 43.56%	3 stars (rooms) 48.16%		
Covasna 1) 1.46 (no.) / 1.20 (rooms) 2a) 43.86 % / 81.66% (2005) 2b) 43.45% / 64.46% (2016)	7	10	Pensions (no.) 46.00%	Pensions (no.) 46.58%	2 stars (no.) 54.00%	3 stars (no.) 42.47%	5-9 rooms (no.) 32.00%	5-9 rooms (no.) 34.25%
			Hotels (rooms) 87.53%	Hotels (rooms) 73.01%	2 stars (rooms) 71.79%	2 stars (rooms) 46.83%		
Harghita 1) 1.74 (no.) / 1.79 (rooms) 2a) 16.34 % / 48.22% (2005) 2b) 41.95% / 59.28% (2016)	7	12	Pensions (no.) 72.22%	Pensions (no.) 57.99%	2 stars (no.) 73.02%	3 stars (no.) 51.14%	1-4 rooms (no.) 48.41%	5-9 rooms & 10-49 rooms (no.) 39.73%
			Hotels (rooms) 55.50%	Pensions & hotels (rooms) 36.92%	2 stars (rooms) 58.45%	3 stars (rooms) 54.11%		
Mures 1) 3.78 (no.) / 2.21 (rooms) 2a) 57.98 % / 85.71% (2005) 2b) 72.10% / 80.60% (2016)	8	11	Pensions (no.) 42.03%	Pensions (no.) 46.36%	3 stars (no.) 43.48%	3 stars (no.) 52.49%	10-49 rooms (no.) 47.83%	10-49 rooms (no.) 41.00%
			Hotels (rooms) 66.20%	Hotels (rooms) 53.86%	2 stars (rooms) 48.43%	3 stars (rooms) 46.42%		
Sibiu 1) 1.55 (no.) / 2.14 (rooms) 2a) 68.91 % / 77.37% (2005) 2b) 57.81% / 66.66% (2016)	11	12	Pensions (no.) 74.46%	Pensions (no.) 54.38%	2 stars (no.) 58.15%	3 stars (no.) 52.98%	1-4 rooms (no.) 55.98%	10-49 rooms (no.) 36.49%
			Hotels (rooms) 54.29%	Hotels (rooms) 50.19%	2 stars (rooms) 48.50%	3 stars (rooms) 55.16%		
Center 1) 1.97 (no.) / 1.91 (rooms) 2a) 38.89 % / 71.93% (2005) 2b) 51.39% / 65.77% (2016)	13	15	Pensions (no.) 59.73%	Pensions (no.) 49.31%	2 stars (no.) 46.72%	3 stars (no.) 53.21%	1-4 rooms (no.) 38.17%	10-49 rooms (no.) 42.07%
			Hotels (rooms) 61.09%	Hotels (rooms) 49.54%	2 stars (rooms) 45.13%	3 stars (rooms) 49.71%		

CORNELIA POP, CRISTINA BALINT

County/Region 1) <i>Growth rate of urban lodgings/rooms</i> 2) <i>Percentage of urban lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)</i>	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Macro-region 1 1) 2.12 (no.) / 1.93 (rooms) 2a) 36.78 % / 61.21% (2005) 2b) 48.15% / 60.52% (2016)	13	15	Pensions (no.) 55.51% Hotels (rooms) 65.23%	Pensions (no.) 45.66% Hotels (rooms) 51.36%	2 stars (no.) 45.90% 2 stars (rooms) 41.43%	3 stars (no.) 54.56% 3 stars (rooms) 50.40%	1-4 rooms (no.) 36.48%	10-49 rooms (no.) 43.04%
Bacau 1) 2.76 (no.) / 1.54 (rooms) 2a) 59.52 % / 81.36% (2005) 2b) 64.79% / 76.11% (2016)	6	11	Pensions (no.) 50.00% Hotels (rooms) 71.72%	Pensions (no.) 51.45% Hotels (rooms) 54.40%	2 stars (no.) 54.00% 2 stars (rooms) 62.22%	3 stars (no.) 57.25% 3 stars (rooms) 52.75%	10-49 rooms (no.) 44.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 38.41%
Botosani 1) 1.64 (no.) / 1.20 (rooms) 2a) 57.89 % / 84.76% (2005) 2b) 52.94% / 77.19% (2016)	2	5	Hotels (no.) 63.64% Hotels (rooms) 86.44%	Hotels (no.) 44.44% Hotels (rooms) 70.45%	2 stars (no.) 45.45% 2 stars (rooms) 68.14%	3 stars (no.) 44.44% 3 stars (rooms) 41.42%	10-49 rooms (no.) 81.82%	10-49 rooms (no.) 66.67%
Iasi 1) 2.50 (no.) / 1.98 (rooms) 2a) 69.09 % / 90.96% (2005) 2b) 67.38% / 82.03% (2016)	9	7	Hotels (no.) 36.84% Hotels (rooms) 81.14%	Pensions (no.) 36.84% Hotels (rooms) 73.70%	2 stars (no.) 36.84% 3 stars (rooms) 41.18%	3 stars (no.) 56.84% 3 stars (rooms) 45.88%	10-49 rooms (no.) 34.21%	10-49 rooms (no.) 38.95%
Neamt 1) 2.31 (no.) / 1.57 (rooms) 2a) 25.71 % / 42.24% (2005) 2b) 24.85% / 35.06% (2016)	9	14	Pensions (no.) 55.56% Hotels (rooms) 45.83%	Pensions (no.) 46.99% Hotels (rooms) 42.98%	2 stars (no.) 63.89% 3 stars (rooms) 57.58%	3 stars (no.) 59.04% 3 stars (rooms) 54.92%	10-49 rooms (no.) 41.67%	10-49 rooms (no.) 38.55%
Suceava 1) 2.00 (no.) / 1.69 (rooms) 2a) 43.04 % / 67.84% (2005) 2b) 40.49% / 57.16% (2016)	7	11	Pensions (no.) 59.40% Hotels (rooms) 62.62%	Pensions (no.) 55.26% Hotels (rooms) 48.11%	2 stars (no.) 52.63% 2 stars (rooms) 44.35%	3 stars (no.) 50.00% 3 stars (rooms) 47.15%	5-9 rooms (no.) 36.09%	10-49 rooms (no.) 42.86%
Vaslui 1) 2.57 (no.) / 1.43 (rooms) 2a) 63.64 % / 91.94% (2005) 2b) 51.43% / 70.61% (2016)	4	6	Hotels (no.) 57.14% Hotels (rooms) 82.07%	Pensions (no.) 33.33% Hotels (rooms) 62.01%	2 stars (no.) 57.14% 2 stars (rooms) 54.58%	3 stars (no.) 50.00% 3 stars (rooms) 65.36%	10-49 rooms (no.) 57.14%	10-49 rooms (no.) 44.44%

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region 1) Growth rate of urban lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of urban lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
North-East	12	14	Pensions (no.) 51.27%	Pensions (no.) 49.35%	2 stars (no.) 52.00%	3 stars (no.) 53.72%	10-49 rooms (no.) 39.27%	10-49 rooms (no.) 41.42%
1) 2.25 (no.) / 1.66 (rooms)			Hotels (rooms) 67.78%	Hotels (rooms) 55.51%	2 stars (rooms) 45.34%	3 stars (rooms) 49.45%		
2a) 44.50 % / 69.54% (2005)								
2b) 43.71% / 60.49% (2016)								
Braila	4	8	Hotels (rooms) 50.00%	Hotels (rooms) 37.40%	3 stars (no.) 42.86%	3 stars (no.) 51.85%	10-49 rooms (no.) 42.86%	10-49 rooms (no.) 48.15%
1) 1.93 (no.) / 1.25 (rooms)			Hotels (rooms) 80.14%	Hotels (rooms) 70.23%	2 stars (rooms) 55.02%	3 stars (rooms) 67.18%		
2a) 63.64 % / 51.29% (2005)								
2b) 57.45% / 47.21% (2016)								
Buzau	3	5	Hotels (no.) 50.00%	Pensions (no.) 33.33%	1 star (no.) 50.00%	3 stars (no.) 56.67%	10-49 rooms (no.) 66.67%	10-49 rooms (no.) 60.00%
1) 2.50 (no.) / 1.71 (rooms)			Hotels (rooms) 75.90%	Hotels (rooms) 49.05%	2 stars (rooms) 62.87%	3 stars (rooms) 55.32%		
2a) 23.53 % / 32.90% (2005)								
2b) 22.56% / 31.20% (2016)								
Constanta	13	13	Hotels (no.) 47.93%	Hotels (no.) 31.49%	2 stars (no.) 42.07%	3 stars (no.) 50.29%	10-49 rooms (no.) 35.34%	10-49 rooms (no.) 47.81%
1) 1.81 (no.) / 1.07 (rooms)			Hotels (rooms) 86.82%	Hotels (rooms) 74.38%	2 stars (rooms) 54.25%	3 stars (rooms) 47.50%		
2a) 77.85 % / 92.75% (2005)								
2b) 69.77% / 83.90% (2016)								
Galati	5	7	Hotels (no.) 45.45%	Hotels (no.) 40.91%	2 stars (no.) 50.00%	3 stars (no.) 61.36%	10-49 rooms (no.) 40.91%	10-49 rooms (no.) 63.64%
1) 2.00 (no.) / 1.74 (rooms)			Hotels (rooms) 82.52%	Hotels (rooms) 65.95%	2 stars (rooms) 46.99%	3 stars (rooms) 63.58%		
2a) 78.57 % / 90.17% (2005)								
2b) 83.02% / 90.71% (2016)								
Tulcea	8	11	Floating pontoons & pensions (no.) 28.26%	Pensions (no.) 44.32%	3 stars (no.) 36.96%	3 stars (no.) 52.27%	5-9 rooms (no.) 41.30%	10-49 rooms (no.) 50.00%
1) 1.91 (no.) / 1.85 (rooms)			Hotels (rooms) 57.32%	Hotels (rooms) 45.06%	3 stars (rooms) 48.68%	3 stars (rooms) 64.68%		
2a) 29.87 % / 36.10% (2005)								
2b) 22.34% / 31.44% (2016)								
Vrancea	3	6	Hotels & pensions (no.) 44.44%	Pensions (no.) 50.00%	2 stars & 3 stars (no.) 44.44%	3 stars (no.) 53.33%	5-9 rooms (no.) 33.33%	10-49 rooms (no.) 56.67%
1) 3.33 (no.) / 1.73 (rooms)			Hotels (rooms) 90.52%	Hotels (rooms) 47.63%	1 star (rooms) 46.55%	3 stars (rooms) 45.39%		
2a) 14.29 % / 32.45% (2005)								
2b) 33.33% / 45.26% (2016)								

CORNELIA POP, CRISTINA BALINT

County/Region 1) Growth rate of urban lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of urban lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
South-East 1) 1.86 (no.) / 1.11 (rooms) 2a) 64.25 % / 87.75% (2005) 2b) 57.10% / 77.75% (2016)	15	15	Hotels (no.) 45.68%	Hotels (no.) 30.47%	2 stars (no.) 41.29%	3 stars (no.) 51.07%	10-49 rooms (no.) 35.87%	10-49 rooms (no.) 49.01%
			Hotels (rooms) 86.16%	Rooms for rent (rooms) 60.18%	2 stars (rooms) 53.66%	3 stars (rooms) 48.58%		
Macro-region 2 1) 1.97 (no.) / 1.17 (rooms) 2a) 56.99 % / 85.00% (2005) 2b) 51.89% / 74.07% (2016)	16	16	Hotels (no.) 39.25%	Hotels (no.) 26.26%	2 stars (no.) 44.36%	3 stars (no.) 51.94%	10-49 rooms (no.) 36.85%	10-49 rooms (no.) 46.53%
			Hotels (rooms) 83.89%	Hotels (rooms) 69.83%	2 stars (rooms) 52.63%	3 stars (rooms) 48.73%		
Arges 1) 2.19 (no.) / 1.62 (rooms) 2a) 28.91 % / 60.90% (2005) 2b) 23.62% / 40.40% (2016)	6	8	Hotels (no.) 51.35%	Pensions (no.) 43.21%	3 stars (no.) 45.95%	3 stars (no.) 64.20%	10-49 rooms (no.) 59.46%	10-49 rooms (no.) 66.67%
			Hotels (rooms) 84.46%	Hotels (rooms) 68.93%	3 stars (rooms) 52.61%	3 stars (rooms) 63.23%		
Calarasi 1) 1.88 (no.) / 1.53 (rooms) 2a) 72.73 % / 90.94% (2005) 2b) 65.22% / 84.21% (2016)	3	6	Hotels (no.) 50.00%	Pensions (no.) 33.34%	3 stars (no.) 50.00%	3 stars (no.) 60.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 37.50%	10-49 rooms (no.) 40.00%
			Hotels (rooms) 90.04%	Hotels (rooms) 54.50%	2 stars (rooms) 50.57%	4 stars (rooms) 48.25%		
Dambovita 1) 1.89 (no.) / 1.45 (rooms) 2a) 40.43 % / 67.68% (2005) 2b) 34.95% / 49.09% (2016)	5	6	Pensions (no.) 42.11%	Pensions (no.) 41.67%	2 stars (no.) 68.42%	3 stars (no.) 50.00%	5-9 rooms (no.) 36.84%	10-49 rooms (no.) 44.44%
			Hotels (rooms) 80.32%	Hotels (rooms) 75.96%	2 stars (rooms) 75.85%	2 stars (rooms) 50.92%		
Giurgiu 1) 2.00 (no.) / 2.17 (rooms) 2a) 57.14 % / 79.21% (2005) 2b) 44.44% / 74.61% (2016)	4	6	Motels (no.) 37.50%	Motels & Hotels (no.) 31.25%	2 stars (no.) 62.50%	3 stars (no.) 43.75%	10-49 rooms (no.) 62.50%	10-49 rooms (no.) 62.50%
			Hotels (rooms) 62.90%	Ships (rooms) 36.74%	2 stars (rooms) 84.11%	3 stars (rooms) 71.40%		
Ialomita 1) 1.39 (no.) / 0.73 (rooms) 2a) 94.74 % / 99.60% (2005) 2b) 89.29% / 97.96% (2016)	6	7	Hotels (no.) 38.89%	Hotels (no.) 48.00%	2 stars (no.) 50.00%	3 stars (no.) 64.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 55.56%	10-49 rooms (no.) 84.00%
			Hotels (rooms) 82.71%	Hotels (rooms) 75.00%	2 stars (rooms) 81.27%	3 star (rooms) 78.51%		

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region 1) <i>Growth rate of urban lodgings/rooms</i> 2) <i>Percentage of urban lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)</i>	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Prahova 1) 1.26 (no.) / 1.32 (rooms) 2a) 84.24 % / 89.98% (2005) 2b) 84.39% / 85.36% (2016)	11	10	Pensions (no.) 37.41%	Pensions (no.) 32.23%	2 stars (no.) 45.50%	3 stars (no.) 52.38%	1-4 rooms (no.) 48.50%	10-49 rooms (no.) 34.62%
Hotels (rooms) 53.45%			Hotels (rooms) 45.42%	2 stars (rooms) 40.43%	3 stars (rooms) 52.22%			
Teleorman 1) 5.33 (no.) / 3.16 (rooms) 2a) 100.00 % / 100.00% (2005) 2b) 69.57% / 86.14% (2016)	2	6	Hotels (no.) 66.67%	Hotels (no.) 37.50%	2 stars (no.) 66.67%	3 stars (no.) 56.25%	10-49 rooms (no.) 33.34%	10-49 rooms (no.) 50.00%
Hotels (rooms) 90.91%			Hotels (rooms) 75.00%	2 stars (rooms) 90.91%	2 stars (rooms) 47.13%			
South-Muntenia 1) 1.40 (no.) / 1.33 (rooms) 2a) 71.47 % / 84.24% (2005) 2b) 61.10% / 70.19% (2016)	12	13	Pensions (no.) 35.93%	Pensions (no.) 32.38%	2 stars (no.) 46.01%	3 stars (no.) 54.01%	1-4 rooms (no.) 41.06%	10-49 rooms (no.) 41.36%
Hotels (rooms) 65.37%			Hotels (rooms) 54.32%	2 stars (rooms) 49.39%	3 stars (rooms) 55.71%			
Macro-region 3 1) 1.40 (no.) / 1.33 (rooms) 2a) 71.47 % / 84.24% (2005) 2b) 61.10% / 70.19% (2016)	12	13	Pensions (no.) 35.93%	Pensions (no.) 32.38%	2 stars (no.) 46.01%	3 stars (no.) 54.01%	1-4 rooms (no.) 41.06%	10-49 rooms (no.) 41.36%
Hotels (rooms) 65.37%			Hotels (rooms) 54.32%	2 stars (rooms) 49.39%	3 stars (rooms) 55.71%			
Arad 1) 1.88 (no.) / 1.64 (rooms) 2a) 58.33 % / 64.45% (2005) 2b) 58.33% / 64.35% (2016)	8	8	Pensions (no.) 57.14%	Pensions (no.) 52.38%	2 stars (no.) 53.57%	3 stars (no.) 48.57%	10-49 rooms (no.) 57.14%	10-49 rooms (no.) 63.81%
Hotels (rooms) 59.43%			Hotels (rooms) 55.61%	2 stars (rooms) 39.59%	3 stars (rooms) 48.13%			
Caras-Severin 1) 2.40 (no.) / 1.07 (rooms) 2a) 53.21 % / 85.39% (2005) 2b) 52.26% / 70.92% (2016)	8	12	Pensions (no.) 39.66%	Pensions (no.) 53.96%	2 stars (no.) 60.34%	3 stars (no.) 63.31%	10-49 rooms (no.) 44.83%	10-49 rooms (no.) 46.76%
Hotels (rooms) 83.41%			Hotels (rooms) 62.60%	2 stars (rooms) 84.42%	3 stars (rooms) 57.47%			
Hunedoara 1) 2.08 (no.) / 1.77 (rooms) 2a) 69.19 % / 78.11% (2005) 2b) 68.70% / 76.33% (2016)	8	13	Pensions (no.) 47.90%	Pensions (no.) 33.87%	2 stars (no.) 60.50%	3 stars (no.) 43.95%	1-4 rooms (no.) 37.82%	10-49 rooms (no.) 37.91%
Hotels (rooms) 49.15%			Hotels (rooms) 32.14%	2 stars (rooms) 65.56%	3 stars (rooms) 48.83%			

CORNELIA POP, CRISTINA BALINT

County/Region 1) Growth rate of urban lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of urban lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Timis 1) 1.80 (no.) / 1.45 (rooms) 2a) 69.57 % / 85.93% (2005) 2b) 68.38% / 81.57% (2016)	7	9	Hotels (no.) 47.92%	Pensions (no.) 42.20%	3 stars (no.) 45.83%	3 stars (no.) 61.85%	10-49 rooms (no.) 66.67%	10-49 rooms (no.) 61.85%
			Hotels (rooms) 74.34%	Hotels (rooms) 62.48%	2 stars (rooms) 38.88%	3 stars (rooms) 48.56%		
West 1) 2.02 (no.) / 1.41 (rooms) 2a) 63.88 % / 80.46% (2005) 2b) 62.74% / 74.17% (2016)	10	14	Pensions (no.) 45.59%	Pensions (no.) 43.16%	2 stars (no.) 51.06%	3 stars (no.) 53.38%	10-49 rooms (no.) 46.51%	10-49 rooms (no.) 50.08%
			Hotels (rooms) 70.27%	Hotels (rooms) 53.54%	2 stars (rooms) 60.32%	3 stars (rooms) 50.91%		
Dolj 1) 3.25 (no.) / 2.22 (rooms) 2a) 64.52 % / 87.22% (2005) 2b) 69.15% / 81.19% (2016)	5	6	Hotels (no.) 50.00%	Hotels (no.) 46.15%	2 stars (no.) 45.00%	3 stars (no.) 56.92%	10-49 rooms (no.) 80.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 60.00%
			Hotels (rooms) 73.28%	Hotels (rooms) 74.64%	3 stars (rooms) 48.55%	3 stars (rooms) 49.35%		
Gorj 1) 4.17 (no.) / 3.96 (rooms) 2a) 64.86 % / 63.81% (2005) 2b) 51.02% / 62.72% (2016)	5	9	Pensions (no.) 54.17%	Pensions (no.) 43.00%	2 stars (no.) 66.67%	3 stars (no.) 61.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 54.17%	10-49 rooms (no.) 50.00%
			Hostels (rooms) 38.51%	Hotels (rooms) 37.78%	2 stars (rooms) 58.21%	3 stars (rooms) 66.44%		
Mehedinti 1) 2.53 (no.) / 1.73 (rooms) 2a) 38.64 % / 68.87% (2005) 2b) 42.57% / 61.17% (2016)	6	6	Pensions (no.) 41.18%	Pensions (no.) 37.21%	2 stars (no.) 47.06%	3 stars (no.) 69.77%	10-49 rooms (no.) 47.07%	10-49 rooms (no.) 53.49%
			Hotels (rooms) 67.69%	Hotels (rooms) 52.27%	2 stars (rooms) 45.63%	3 stars (rooms) 72.67%		
Olt 1) 3.56 (no.) / 2.24 (rooms) 2a) 100.00 % / 100.00% (2005) 2b) 82.05% / 92.33% (2016)	3	6	Hotels (no.) 44.44%	Pensions (no.) 37.50%	2 stars (no.) 66.67%	3 stars (no.) 53.13%	10-49 rooms (no.) 66.67%	10-49 rooms (no.) 62.50%
			Hotels (rooms) 66.01%	Hotels (rooms) 61.66%	2 stars (rooms) 88.14%	3 stars (rooms) 53.18%		
Valcea 1) 1.57 (no.) / 1.39 (rooms) 2a) 69.85 % / 75.88% (2005) 2b) 62.64% / 79.99% (2016)	10	13	Pensions (no.) 30.22%	Pensions (no.) 39.91%	2 stars (no.) 56.83%	3 stars (no.) 52.29%	1-4 rooms (no.) 33.81%	10-49 rooms (no.) 49.54%
			Hotels (rooms) 70.61%	Hotels (rooms) 65.00%	2 stars (rooms) 68.18%	3 stars (rooms) 61.05%		

ROMANIAN URBAN TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region 1) Growth rate of urban lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of urban lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
South-West 1) 2.19 (no.) / 1.72 (rooms) 2a) 65.31 % / 76.39% (2005) 2b) 58.87% / 75.80% (2016)	10	13	Pensions (no.) 33.01% Hotels (rooms) 67.87%	Pensions (no.) 37.77% Hotels (rooms) 61.32%	2 stars (no.) 56.46% 2 stars (rooms) 63.56%	3 stars (no.) 56.55% 3 stars (rooms) 60.50%	10-49 rooms (no.) 42.59%	10-49 rooms (no.) 52.40%
Macro-region 4 1) 2.09 (no.) / 1.53 (rooms) 2a) 64.43 % / 78.81% (2005) 2b) 61.10% / 74.88% (2016)	12	14	Pensions (no.) 40.71% Hotels (rooms) 69.33%	Pensions (no.) 40.96% Hotels (rooms) 56.98%	2 stars (no.) 53.16% 2 stars (rooms) 61.59%	3 stars (no.) 54.67% 3 stars (rooms) 55.15%	10-49 rooms (no.) 44.98%	10-49 rooms (no.) 51.02%
National level (urban) excluding Bucharest & Ilfov 1) 1.94 (no.) / 1.40 (rooms) 2a) 50.24 % / 77.87% (2005) 2b) 52.24% / 69.49% (2016)	16	17	Pensions (no.) 39.28% Hotels (rooms) 76.17%	Pensions (no.) 36.25% Hotels (rooms) 61.13%	2 stars (no.) 46.71% 2 stars (rooms) 51.42%	3 stars (no.) 53.69% 3 stars (rooms) 50.89%	10-49 rooms (no.) 35.29%	10-49 rooms (no.) 42.43%

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Appendix 7: The structure by population of Romania's municipalities and towns

Population	2005	2016
> 300,000 people	6 (county residences)	6 (county residences)
Between 200,000 and 299,999 people	4 (county residences)	5 (county residences)
Between 100,000 and 199,999 people	14 (county residences)	12 (county residences)
Between 50,000 and 99,999 people	21 (15 county residences, 6 other municipalities)	22 (16 county residences, 6 other municipalities)
Between 20,000 and 49,999 people	62 (1 county residence, 46 other municipalities, 15 towns)	63 (1 county residence, 59 other municipalities, 13 towns)
Between 10,000 and 19,999 people	94 (10 municipalities, 84 towns)	95 (7 municipalities, 88 towns)
Between 5,000 and 9,999 people	97 (towns)	99 (towns)
Between 1,000 and 4,999 people	21 (towns)	17 (towns)

Note 1: All the county residences have also the status of municipalities.

Note 2: While Law no. 351/2001 established the lower limit for a municipality population to 25,000 people and the lower limit for a town population to 5,000 people, there are still urban

localities which do not reached the respective limits due to various reasons. The same situation was recognized by the Law 351/2001 in 2001. Once the status of municipality or town was granted, there was no demotion.

Source: authors' calculations based on the NIS data via Tempo Online for 2005 and 2016

Appendix 8: The map representing the counties and the regions of Romania

(Source: <https://gandeste.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/regiuni-de-dezvoltare-si-judete-300x212.jpg>)

