



Statistics

**ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE EURO ZONE,
2005**

Euro Zone Countries	Rate of GDP Growth, % to Previous Quarter			
	Q I	Q II	Q III	Q IV
Germany	+0.6	+0.3	+0.6	±0.0
France	+0.3	±0.0	+0.7	+0.2
Italy	-0.5	+0.7	+0.3	/
Spain	+0.9	+0.8	+0.8	+0.9
Netherlands	-0.8	+1.2	+0.7	+1.0
Belgium	+0.1	+0.3	+0.4	/
Austria	+0.2	+0.5	+0.5	+0.7
Greece	+2.4	-0.3	+1.8	/
Finland	+0.2	-1.5	+2.9	/
Ireland	+0.6	+1.7	+0.3	/
Portugal	+0.2	+1.0	-0.9	/
Euro Zone	+0.3	+0.4	+0.6	+0.3

Source: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. – 2006. – 15. Februar.

**THE HIGHEST GROWTH DECADE
IN GERMAN DOMESTIC TRADE**

Years	German Domestic Trade (Bln. Euro)		
	Export	Import	Surplus, Export-Import
1996	403.4	353.0	+50.4
1997	454.3	394.8	+59.9
1998	488.4	423.5	+64.9
1999	510.0	444.8	+65.2
2000	597.4	538.3	+59.1
2001	638.3	542.2	+95.9
2002	651.3	518.5	+132.8
2003	664.5	534.5	+129.9
2004	731.5	574.4	+156.1
2005	786.1	625.6	+160.5

Source: Information compiled by the editorial staff.

EXPORT-IMPORT DEFICIT IN THE USA

Years	Deficit, \$ bln.
1995	-1.5
1996	-1.6
1997	-1.7
1998	-2.4
1999	-3.2
2000	-4.2
2001	-3.8
2002	-4.5
2003	-4.7
2004	-5.7
2005	-6.2

Source: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. – 2006. – 22. Februar.

ECONOMIC GROWTH IN MEXICO AND ARGENTINE

Years	Rate of GDP Growth (as against previous year, %)	
	Mexico	Argentina
1995	-6.2	-2.8
1996	5.2	5.5
1997	6.7	8.1
1998	4.9	3.8
1999	3.9	-3.4
2000	6.6	-0.8
2001	-0.2	-4.4
2002	0.8	-10.9
2003	1.4	8.8
2004	4.4	9.0
2005 (forecast)	3.0	9.1
2006 (forecast)	3.5	6.7

Source: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. – 2006. – 15. Februar.

STEEL

Global Steel Producers

Years	Steel Producers						
	mln. tons	Share in Regions, %					
		China	Japan	Eastern Europe and CIS	Oil ¹	EC-15	Others
2004	1060	25.8	10.7	13.7	12.5	16.0	21.3
1990	770	–	–	–	–	–	–
1970	595	–	–	–	–	–	–
1950	189	–	–	–	–	–	–

The World's Largest Steel Producers

No	Name of Company	Raw Steel Production, 2004 (mln. tons)	Raw Steel Production, 2004 (bln. Euro)
1	Mittal Steel (Netherlands. Great Britain)	59	25.1
2	Arcelor (Luxembourg. France. Spain)	53	30.2
3	Nippon Steel (Japan)	31	25.1
4	JFE (Japan)	31	20.7
5	Posco (South Korea)	31	18.6
6	Baoshan (China)	21	15.7
7	U.S. Steel (USA)	21	11.2
8	Corus (Great Britain. Netherlands)	20	13.8
9	Nucor (USA)	18	9.1
10	Thyssen-Krupp Steel (Germany)	18	14.1
11	Riva (Italy)	17	7.9
12	Gerdau (Brazil)	13	5.4
13	Sumitomo Metals (Japan)	13	9.2
14	Evrax Holding (Russia)	12	4.6
15	Sail (India)	12	5.6
	Biggest German Steel Producers		
	Salzgitter	7.0	5.9
	Dillinger Huttenwerke	2.7	1.5
	Saarstahl	2.5	1.4

¹ USA, Canada and Mexico.

**Comparisons:
Steel and Other Raw Materials**

Years	Steel	Synthetic Materials	Aluminium	Magnesium
	mln. tons			
1975	595	27	13	0.2
2003	1060 ²	202	36	0.5

Source: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. – 2006. – 31. Januar.

BIODIESEL IN GERMANY

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Production (thou. tons)	220	227	450	750	980	1450
Sales ³ (thou. tons)	340	450	550	810	1180	1975

Source: Frankfurter Rundschau online, 4.02.2003.

POST-RETIREMENT LIFE EXPECTANCY

(Estimated Post-65 Life Expectancy in the Old Lands of Germany)

Year of Retirement	Estimated Life Expectancy	
	Men	Women
2000	15.79	19.51
2010	17.07	20.8
2020	17.78	21.9
2030	18.40	22.58
2040	18.96	23.17

Source: F.A.Z., 12. Februar 2006.

² 2004.

³ Imports included.

SURVEY OF MIDDLE BUSINESS:

«Which Processes Do You Find Being Slow or Complicated in Germany?»

	Question	Answers in % (multiple answers possible)
1	Dismissing Employees	79
2	Guaranteeing State Credits	77
3	Fixing Taxes	72
4	Setting up an Enterprise	70
5	Declaring Income	57
6	Registering Production	52
7	Registering Property in Land	52
8	Liquidating an Enterprise	42

Source: Frankfurter Rundschau online, 4.02.2003.

TRANSFORMATION INDEX -2006: INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS OF POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE DEVELOPING AND TRANSITION COUNTRIES

The economic and political press of Ukraine has recently paid much attention to the question of Ukraine's integration into the European economic area. This problem aggravated during the Presidential elections and the Parliamentary elections. As these election campaigns come to an end, one is expected to need a sober assessment of our place in the modern world.

In view of this, the Editorial staff deems it reasonable to acquaint our readers with the political and economic development ranking of countries in transition.

International political and economic development ranking is one of 150 projects run by the Bertelsmann Stiftung, the largest foundation in Germany founded in 1977 by Reinhard Mohn as an independent non-profit organization. The foundation's analysts assert that the world faces a favourable moment today to turn to more democracy and market economy. At the same time, 48 countries including the countries of CIS (Belarus, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan) are obstinately retaining their authoritarian regimes. Only 18 out of 119 countries analyzed revealed significant changes for the better. However, the overall progress is going slower than in 1990-s.

Special attention was paid by the Bertelsmann Stiftung to Ukraine, which went 8 positions up (from 40th to 32nd position) compared with 2003. Ukraine achieved the most noticeable results in building the jural state, ensuring freedom of speech and guaranteeing the right to demonstrations. Recent Presidential elections were more democratic. However, German experts avoid giving integral assessment of the new regime, since the research data were collected in February 2005. Even though the Transformation Index is published every two years, it is obvious that Ukraine will make an exception – its interim results will be drawn already in a year.

Table 1.

Status Index (State of Transformation to Market-Based Democracy)

Result Political Transformation	Trend in Democratic Development (2001–2005)	Result Economic Transformation	Trend in Economic Development (2001–2005)	Status Index	Countries	Ranking 2006	Ranking 2003	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
9.55	■	9.36	▲	9.45	Market-based democracies, consolidated or in the process of consolidation	Slovenia	1	2
9.40	■	9.18	▲	9.29		Estonia	2	6
9.45	▲	9.00	▲	9.23		Czech Republic	3	2
9.35	■	9.00	▲	9.18		Taiwan	4	8
9.40	■	8.93	▲	9.16		Hungary	5	1
9.20	▲	8.93	▲	9.06		Slovakia	6	2
9.25	■	8.79	▲	9.02		Lithuania	7	2
8.90	▲	9.07	▲	8.99		South Korea	8	8
9.20	■	8.61	▲	8.90		Poland	9	7
9.10	■	8.61	■	8.85		Chile	10	8
9.10	▲	8.32	▲	8.71		Croatia	11	15
9.40	■	8.00	■	8.70		Costa Rica	12	11
9.90	■	7.43	▲	8.66		Uruguay	13	13
8.30	■	8.11	▲	8.20		Latvia	14	12
8.58	■	7.75	■	8.17		Mauritius	15	–
8.45	■	7.50	■	7.98		Botswana	16	14
8.45	■	7.50	■	7.98		Bulgaria	16	18
8.70	■	7.25	■	7.98		South Africa	16	16

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
8.20	■	7.57	▲	7.89		Romania	19	21
7.90	■	7.79	■	7.84		Brazil	20	22
8.70	■	6.46	■	7.58		Jamaica	21	17
5.35	■	9.21	■	7.28		Singapore	22	19
6.85	▲	7.68	▲	7.26		Thailand	23	23
7.85	■	6.57	■	7.21		Argentina	24	25
7.95	■	6.46	▲	7.21		India	24	29
7.70	■	6.61	■	7.15		Namibia	26	20
7.55	■	6.71	■	7.13		Mexico	27	24
7.55	■	6.64	■	7.10		Panama	28	–
7.55	■	6.61	■	7.08		Macedonia	29	34
7.35	■	6.64	■	7.00		El Salvador	30	25
7.90	▲	6.07	■	6.99		Ghana	31	59
7.10	▲	6.82	▲	6.96		Ukraine	32	44
7.40	■	6.50	▲	6.95	Good prospects for consolidation of market-based democracy	Serbia and Montenegro	33	29
7.05	▲	6.79	■	6.92		Turkey	34	25
7.75	▲	5.54	■	6.64		Senegal	35	35
6.00	▲	7.25	▲	6.63		Sri Lanka	36	37
7.25	▲	5.96	▲	6.61		Albania	37	38
6.80	▲	6.43	▲	6.61		Bosnia-Herzegovina	37	50
6.85	▲	6.29	■	6.57		Peru	39	38
7.50	▲	5.39	▲	6.45		Madagascar	40	50
6.95	■	5.86	■	6.40		Philippines	41	46
7.30	■	5.43	■	6.36		Dominican Republic	42	25
7.05	■	5.54	■	6.29		Mongolia	43	29
6.10	■	6.43	▲	6.26		Armenia	44	46
7.60	■	4.93	■	6.26		Benin	44	41
4.92	▲	7.50	▲	6.21		Bahrain	46	50
5.70	■	6.57	▲	6.14		Russia	47	41
5.85	■	6.36	■	6.10	Deficiencies in terms of market-based democracy	Colombia	48	46
7.35	▲	4.86	■	6.10		Mali	48	29
5.07	■	7.11	■	6.09		Malaysia	50	29
6.75	▲	5.39	■	6.07		Bolivia	51	35
6.50	■	5.64	■	6.07		Zambia	51	50
6.80	■	5.29	■	6.04		Honduras	53	41
6.30	■	5.79	▲	6.04		Indonesia	53	46
6.55	■	5.46	▲	6.01		Bangladesh	55	45
6.95	■	5.07	▲	6.01		Mozambique	55	54
6.65	■	5.11	■	5.88		Nicaragua	57	54
6.60	■	5.11	■	5.85		Paraguay	58	54

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
5.85	■	5.79	▲	5.82		Uganda	59	61
6.45	■	5.11	■	5.78		Kenya	60	68
6.10	▲	5.36	▲	5.73		Georgia	61	79
5.60	■	5.82	■	5.71		Lebanon	62	61
6.20	▲	5.11	■	5.65		Ecuador	63	38
6.45	■	4.86	▲	5.65		Tanzania	63	61
6.20	■	4.89	■	5.55		Venezuela	65	59
4.18	■	6.79	▲	5.48		Kazakhstan	66	61
6.05	■	4.71	■	5.38		Nigeria	67	90
6.53	▲	4.18	▲	5.36		Niger	68	74
6.12	■	4.57	■	5.34		Burkina Faso	69	66
5.65	■	4.89	■	5.27		Guatemala	70	54
6.15	▲	4.39	■	5.27		Sierra Leone	70	105
3.83	■	6.50	▲	5.17		Tunisia	72	67
6.00	■	4.29	■	5.14		Papua New Guinea	73	58
4.10	■	6.14	▲	5.12		Jordan	74	69
5.40	▲	4.71	■	5.06		Moldova	75	79
3.20	■	6.86	▲	5.03		United Arab Emirates	76	–
6.25	■	3.54	■	4.89	Unfavourable pre-conditions for market-based democracy	Malawi	77	84
4.08	■	5.43	■	4.76		Kyrgyzstan	78	69
4.48	■	4.75	■	4.62		Morocco	79	61
4.23	▲	4.96	▲	4.60		Rwanda	80	85
3.70	▲	5.39	■	4.55		Nepal	81	79
3.80	■	5.21	▲	4.51		Azerbaijan	82	72
3.97	■	4.96	■	4.47		Belarus	83	85
3.58	▲	5.29	■	4.43		Pakistan	84	69
4.23	■	4.61	■	4.42		Algeria	85	85
3.05	■	5.79	▲	4.42		China	85	77
4.10	■	4.57	■	4.34		Cambodia	87	74
3.10	■	5.57	▲	4.34		Vietnam	87	88
4.08	■	4.54	■	4.31		Cameroon	89	74
4.12	■	4.46	■	4.29		Egypt	90	72
4.28	■	4.11	■	4.20		Guinea	91	91
4.17	■	4.21	■	4.19		Ethiopia	92	108
3.00	■	5.00	▲	4.00		Libya	93	88
2.57	■	5.43	▲	4.00		Saudi Arabia	93	79
3.75	▲	4.21	■	3.98		Iran	95	77
3.37	■	4.50	■	3.93		Cuba	96	91
3.53	■	4.18	■	3.86		Chad	97	93
4.07	■	3.57	■	3.82		Togo	98	96
3.72	■	3.93	■	3.82		Yemen	98	105

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
3.00	■	4.25	■	3.63		Syria	100	96
3.63	■	3.54	■	3.58		Burundi	101	100
3.60	■	3.39	▲	3.50		Tajikistan	102	100
3.13	▲	3.79	▲	3.46		Uzbekistan	103	93
3.38	■	3.43	■	3.41		Angola	104	105
3.97	▲	2.79	▲	3.38		Zimbabwe	105	108
2.83	■	3.86	■	3.35		Laos	106	111
3.35	▲	3.21	▲	3.28		Haiti	107	93
3.32	▲	3.14	■	3.23		Central African Republic	108	103
2.58	■	3.82	■	3.20	Serious obstacles to market-based democracy	Turkmenistan	109	96
2.30	■	4.04	■	3.17		Sudan	110	96
2.85	▲	3.43	▲	3.14		Côte d'Ivoire	111	79
2.97	▲	3.07	▲	3.02		Afghanistan	112	115
3.32	▲	2.57	▲	2.94		Eritrea	113	103
2.68	■	2.89	■	2.79		Iraq	114	108
3.18	▲	2.39	■	2.79		Liberia	114	115
2.70	■	2.64	■	2.67		North Korea	116	100
2.60	■	2.64	■	2.62		Congo, DR	117	114
1.65	■	2.11	■	1.88		Myanmar	118	112
1.58	■	1.14	■	1.36		Somalia	119	113

Notes:

- The Status Index overall result represents mean value of scores for «Political Transformation» and «Economic Transformation». The mean value was calculated using the exact, unrounded values for both these dimensions, which in turn were derived from the ratings for the five political criteria (based on 18 indicators) and seven economic criteria (based on 14 indicators). The table shows rounded scores for political and economic transformation, as well as Status Index overall result. In some cases, the overall result differs slightly from the mean value.
- The score for «Political Transformation» is obtained by calculating the mean value of scores for the following criteria: Stateness; Political Participation; Rule of Law; Stability of Democratic Institutions; Political and Social Integration.
- The score for «Economic Transformation» is obtained by calculating the mean value of the scores for the following criteria: Level of Socio-Economic Development; Organization of Market and Competition; Currency and Price Stability; Private Property; Welfare Regime; Economic Performance; Sustainability.
- Trend-Indicator (2001–2005):
 - ▲ progress being made towards market-based democracy;
 - no significant changes;
 - ▼ regress being made from market-based democracy.

Table 2.

Management Index: the Quality of Political Management

Result Management Performance	Level of Difficulty	Management Index	Countries	Ranking 2006	Ranking 2003
1	2	3	4	5	6
8.7	4.3	7.57	Mauritius	1	–
8.9	3.1	7.51	Chile	2	3
8.6	3.9	7.44	Botswana	3	4
9.2	1.2	7.41	Slovenia	4	10
8.9	2.4	7.37	Taiwan	5	11
9.0	1.4	7.32	Slovakia	6	6
8.9	1.9	7.29	Estonia	7	1
8.8	2.1	7.25	South Korea	8	8
8.5	1.9	7.00	Lithuania	9	2
8.6	1.3	6.95	Czech Republic	10	12
8.0	3.8	6.93	South Africa	11	14
8.3	2.5	6.88	Croatia	12	14
8.0	3.5	6.86	Brazil	13	14
8.3	2.2	6.85	Uruguay	14	6
8.4	1.4	6.81	Hungary	15	12
8.1	2.6	6.78	Latvia	16	21
7.4	6.3	6.77	Senegal	17	31
7.4	6.2	6.76	Ghana	18	23
8.0	2.3	6.63	Costa Rica	19	8
7.3	5.0	6.52	Turkey	20	22
7.7	3.1	6.51	Bulgaria	21	20
7.0	6.4	6.44	Mali	22	4
7.8	1.9	6.36	Poland	23	14
7.3	3.8	6.33	Romania	24	25
6.8	6.5	6.31	Madagascar	25	60
7.0	5.3	6.31	Mongolia	25	19
7.0	4.8	6.24	El Salvador	27	37
6.4	7.9	6.13	Niger	28	55
6.5	6.8	6.05	Mozambique	29	43
7.0	4.0	6.03	Mexico	30	31
7.0	3.6	6.02	Jamaica	31	25
6.6	5.9	5.98	India	32	43

1	2	3	4	5	6
6.8	4.6	5.98	Namibia	32	47
6.4	6.7	5.92	Tanzania	34	30
6.5	5.9	5.91	Georgia	35	95
7.0	2.3	5.78	Singapore	36	37
6.0	7.6	5.73	Sierra Leone	37	84
6.2	6.4	5.68	Benin	38	25
6.5	4.3	5.65	Panama	39	–
6.4	4.2	5.56	Malaysia	40	35
6.0	6.3	5.55	Uganda	41	43
6.3	4.6	5.54	Macedonia	42	39
6.1	5.8	5.52	Zambia	43	51
6.3	3.4	5.41	Argentina	44	51
5.6	7.9	5.33	Nigeria	45	55
6.0	4.9	5.32	Albania	46	35
5.9	5.7	5.32	Sri Lanka	46	24
6.0	4.5	5.31	Serbia and Montenegro	48	14
5.9	5.5	5.29	Bolivia	49	31
6.0	4.3	5.28	Dominican Republic	50	25
6.0	4.8	5.28	Peru	50	39
5.8	6.0	5.25	Colombia	52	63
6.0	4.5	5.24	Thailand	53	25
5.7	5.4	5.13	Honduras	54	48
5.6	5.8	5.10	Nicaragua	55	63
5.8	4.4	5.08	Armenia	56	39
5.5	6.0	5.01	Guatemala	57	67
5.6	4.9	4.95	Paraguay	58	73
5.7	3.6	4.86	Bahrain	59	66
5.3	5.8	4.84	Indonesia	60	46
4.8	9.6	4.79	Afghanistan	61	98
5.2	6.5	4.77	Morocco	62	51
5.0	7.2	4.73	Bangladesh	63	51
5.1	6.5	4.73	Malawi	63	88
5.3	4.9	4.69	Bosnia-Herzegovina	65	63
5.4	3.9	4.69	Ukraine**	65	39
5.3	5.1	4.68	Jordan	67	60
5.3	5.1	4.68	Philippines	67	60
5.0	6.1	4.53	Kenya	69	92
5.0	5.6	4.48	China	70	55
4.8	7.4	4.48	Tajikistan	70	76
4.6	8.1	4.44	Rwanda	72	79
4.8	6.8	4.42	Burkina Faso	73	67
5.0	4.8	4.42	Tunisia	73	58
4.8	6.1	4.35	Vietnam	75	48

1	2	3		4	5	6
4.5	7.9	4.33		Pakistan	76	58
4.7	5.1	4.20		Lebanon	77	73
4.8	4.8	4.20		United Arab Emirates	77	–
4.5	6.9	4.18		Papua New Guinea	79	67
4.6	5.6	4.17		Kyrgyzstan	80	75
4.3	8.9	4.15		Nepal	81	67
4.7	4.5	4.13		Kazakhstan	82	76
4.3	8.1	4.12		Ethiopia	83	90
4.0	8.4	3.90		Central African Republic	84	108
4.2	6.3	3.88		Egypt	85	67
4.0	8.0	3.87		Yemen	86	82
4.1	6.9	3.84		Guinea	87	103
4.4	4.1	3.84		Russia	87	31
4.1	5.1	3.68		Ecuador	89	48
4.1	5.3	3.65		Saudi Arabia	90	95
4.0	6.2	3.63		Algeria	91	81
3.7	8.9	3.62		Liberia	92	110
3.7	8.2	3.57		Angola	93	84
3.8	7.3	3.53		Cambodia	94	67
3.9	5.6	3.50		Azerbaijan	95	79
3.8	6.1	3.50		Moldova	95	76
3.7	7.0	3.47		Laos	97	84
3.5	9.0	3.43		Sudan	98	101
3.5	7.3	3.26		Cameroon	99	82
3.3	8.6	3.24		Chad	100	90
3.5	5.8	3.17		Iran	101	84
3.6	4.8	3.14		Libya	102	100
3.5	4.1	3.03		Venezuela	103	88
3.1	6.5	2.85		Syria	104	95
3.0	8.2	2.84		Haiti	105	101
2.8	9.0	2.77		Burundi	106	92
3.1	4.4	2.74		Belarus	107	98
2.9	5.3	2.62		Cuba	108	104
2.5	9.3	2.47		Congo, DR	109	107
2.5	6.8	2.28		Togo	110	110
2.3	7.1	2.18		Eritrea	111	104
2.4	6.1	2.17		Uzbekistan	112	104
2.1	8.1	2.04		Myanmar	113	108
2.2	5.8	2.00		Zimbabwe	114	110
2.1	6.8	1.98		North Korea	115	110
1.9	8.0	1.83		Côte d'Ivoire	116	92
2.0	5.4	1.83		Turkmenistan	116	110
1.6	9.1	1.55		Somalia	118	110

Management with little success

Failed or non-existent management

1	2	3	4	5	6
			Iraq*		

Notes:

1. This Index evaluates the quality of management performed by political decision-makers with consideration for the difficulty level. The Management Index overall result is calculated by multiplying the intermediate result by the factor derived from the level of difficulty evaluation.
2. The intermediate result is obtained by calculating the mean value of the scores for the following criteria: Steering Capability; Resource Efficiency; Consensus-Building; International Cooperation.
3. The level of difficulty evaluation takes into account structural constraints on political management. It is obtained by calculating six indicators that evaluate a country's structural conditions, traditions of civil society, intensity of conflicts, level of education, economic performance, and institutional capacity.
4. *Iraq was not included in the Management Index because of the extremely limited nature of the local political elite's capabilities for independent action and decision-making during the time period examined.
5. ** The Management Index limits its assessment to political management of the Kuchma government, as Victor Yushchenko only took office at the end of the time period examined (January 23, 2005). Therefore, a meaningful assessment of the new government's political management was not yet possible.