A. THE EXTERNAL ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

1. THE WORLD ECONOMY

Global Trends in Outputs and Prices

In 2000, the global output of the world economy increased on a year-on-year basis (by 4.8%) in line with the forecasts of major international financial institutions. The favourable economic environment made it possible for world trade to grow at a substantially faster rate, with its volume increasing by 12.4% in 2000 (compared with 5.3% in 1999).

The rate of growth in global output was accelerated by increases in the dynamics of growth in all groups of countries, particularly in newly industrialised Asian countries, developing and transition economies. The dynamics of advanced industrial countries (including the European Union) remained below the rate of growth in global output. The economy of Japan showed some unconvincing signs of revival. The driving force of the world economy in 2000 was the continued growth in the US economy, which again accelerated on a year-on-year basis. However, in the second half of the year, it recorded a marked slowdown. This led to a fall in the level of global economic activity at the end of the year.

Countries that were most hit by the financial crisis of 1998, managed to restore their macroeconomic stability by means of appropriate economic measures and to gradually increase the level of confidence in the area of external relations. The adoption of adequate macroeconomic policy in major developing countries also contributed to the restoration of international confidence vis-à-vis emerging markets. In contrast with the overall favourable development on new markets, the economies of Argentina and Turkey were hit by local crises in 2000.

The steep increase in output in transition economies, which exceeded the average growth in global output, was due primarily to a marked acceleration in the rate of growth in Russia and other countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (6.8%). A more modest year-on-year increase in the level of economic activity was recorded in Central and Eastern European countries. However, the increase achieved exceeded the growth in output in the EU. This, for 2000, was a sign of catching-up in real terms a vital

Global output in 2000 (year-on-year increases in %)

	1999	2000	2001 (forecast)
Global output	3.5	4.8	3.2
Advanced economies	3.4	4.1	1.9
USA	4.2	5.0	1.5
Japan	0.8	1.7	0.6
European Union	2.6	3.4	2.4
Euro area	2.6[1/]	3.4[2/]	2.4
Newly industrialised Asian countries	7.9	8.2	3.8
Transition economies	2.6	5.8	4.0
Central and Eastern Europe[3/]	1.8	3.8	3.9
Russia	3.2	7.5	4.0
Developing countries	3.8	5.8	5.0
China	7.1	8.0	7.0
Brazil	0.8	4.2	4.5

Source: World Economic Outlook, April 2001.
1/ According to the European Central Bank: 2.5% (figure for Euro 12).
2/ Figure for Euro 12.
3/ Excluding Russia and Belarus.

criterion for the completion of the accession process to the EU.

Global price development in 2000 was affected by two factors; one of which was the high level of economic activity and/or the fact that the pace of growth in numerous advanced economies fluctuated at (or above) the level of potential output. Under conditions of fiscal discipline, there was enough room for the central banks of these countries to take effective monetary-policy measures to suppress the risk of inflation. The other factor was the higher than expected rise in oil prices on the world market, caused by restrictions imposed on supply by oil producers (OPEC) and the high level of global demand. Though oil prices fell in June in response to the announcement of increase in supply from OPEC countries, they began to rise again sharply in August. The upward trend went into reverse as late as December, apparently in connection with the downturn in economic activity in the USA and the expected slowdown in global growth. The volatile development in oil prices in 2000 resulted in a year-on-year increase of 57% (to USD 28.21 per barrel, i.e. USD 10 more than in 1999). The world prices of non-energy raw materials remained virtually unchanged in 2000 (in USD, they rose by 1.8%), which could be seen as a sign of stabilisation of conditions for exporting, chiefly in developing countries, in comparison with the fall in previous years.

Despite the uncertain trend of development in oil prices, consumer prices remained under control of monetary-policy interventions by central banks in 2000. The rise in energy prices, coupled with inflationary pressures induced by the top phase of the business cycle, led to a certain increase in the annual rate of inflation in numerous countries; however, the level of inflation remained low in the majority of advanced industrial countries. The year-on-year increase in consumer prices (CPI) in advanced economies reached 2.3% (compared with 1.4% in 1999). In developing countries, the rate of inflation reached 6.1% (a year-on-year fall of 0.6 percentage points), whilst in transition economies inflation fell to 20.1% (from 43.9% in 1999). In the group of 12 candidate countries awaiting EU membership, the average annual rate of inflation was 13.1%.

Developments on international foreign exchange markets in 2000 were marked by the continued appreciation of the US dollar. The exchange rate of the euro against the dollar fell from USD/EUR 1.04 at the beginning of January (well below the initial rate of 1 January 1999, i.e. USD/EUR 1.17) to USD/EUR 0.82 on 22 October, despite conjoint intervention by the central banks of G7 countries in favour of the euro in September. By the end of the year, the exchange rate of the euro had strengthened to USD/EUR 0.93, as a result of the intervention of the ECB and national central banks within the Eurosystem, and a marked fall in the level of economic activity in the USA. On a year-on-year basis, the exchange rate of the euro to the US dollar weakened by 7.8%. In 2000, the USD/EUR rate reacted relatively sensitively to the current results of macroeconomic development in the USA and the euro area, but its year-end value was generally regarded as inconsistent with the medium-term economic fundamentals of the euro area. In October, the exchange rate of the euro began to weaken in relation to the Japanese yen as well, then rose to JPY/EUR 106.92 at the end of the year, representing a year-on-year appreciation of 4% in the euro. The strong US dollar was also confirmed by its position vis-à-vis the Japanese yen, which weakened in relation to the dollar (by 13% year-on-year), as well as to the currencies of America's major trading partners such as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

Share prices on major international stock markets showed increased volatility over the course of 2000, with a tendency to fall during the second half of the year. On a year-on-year basis, US Standard & Poor's index fell by 9%; Japan's Nikkei 225 index by 27%; and the value of Dow Jones EURO STOXX index for the euro area fell by 6%. With regard to the steep increase in share prices during the past few years, the aforementioned decline only modified the previous course of development. The main factor in the global development of share prices in 2000 was the situation in the US economy. The slowdown in its growth dynamics had a negative effect on the long-term business expectations of investors, mainly in respect of corporate shares in the sector of the so-called 'new economy'. For that reason, the price of shares in high-tech companies recorded more significant falls: US combined Nasdaq index fell year-on-year by 37%; share prices in telecommunication and information technologies in Japan fell by as much as 53%; and the telecommunication component in the EURO STOXX index fell by 43%.

Development in the Major Centres of the World Economy: USA, Japan, Euro Area

Economic growth in the USA underwent a substantial change in 2000. During the first half of the year, the rate of GDP growth exceeded the most optimistic forecasts and reached 5.25% on a year-on-year basis. This period had already seen the first signals of deceleration in the rate of growth in domestic demand, especially in the area of consumption. During the second half of the year, the rate of year-on-year growth slowed, to 1% in the 4th quarter, due to a steep increase in energy prices, the tightening of financial conditions, fall in the price of shares in high-tech companies (Nasdaq index), and to the appreciation of the dollar. The annual growth in GDP again reached a high level (5%), but business and consumer confidence had fallen significantly by the end of the year.

In 2000, the annual rate of consumer-price inflation (CPI) rose to 3.4% (from 2.2% in 1999), due mainly to a higher than expected increase in oil prices. On the other hand, favourable development was recorded in labour costs, which increased by only 0.7% (compared with 1.8% in 1999). The positive trend of development on the labour market continued, with the rate of unemployment falling to 4.0% (from 4.2% in 1999).

The high rate of growth in domestic demand, which has exceeded the growth in output over the last three years, led to a marked increase in the current account deficit of the USA, reaching a record level of 4.4% of GDP in 2000 (compared with 3.7% in 1999). As the position of the financial sector showed a tendency to improve on a year-on-year basis, the increase in the current account deficit was due to a growing deficit in net savings of the private sector caused by high level of investment activity and a sharp fall in household savings, which reached an all time low in 2000. On the other hand, the large volume of capital inflows into the US economy, attracted mainly by the growth in labour productivity and the generally favourable conditions in the so-called 'new economy', added to the appreciation of the dollar, and thus contributed to an increase in the size of the current account deficit.

The pace of economic growth in Japan accelerated to 1.8% in 2000, but revival remained unconvincing. During the first half of the year, GDP grew year-on-year by 4% and fixed corporate investments increased as a result of an improvement in business prospects, which gave rise to optimistic expectations in respect of the possibility of achieving sustainable growth in the economy on the basis of private demand. As in previous years, the result achieved was of a temporary nature, backed by a package of public investments. After the effects of public expenditure had been exhausted, the economy began to stagnate again, so the Japanese government approved, at the end of the year, an additional package of fiscal stimuli for supporting economic growth. In Japan, the persistent stagnation of economic activity in the private entrepreneurial sector and the low level of consumer confidence, persisted throughout 2000. The situation on the labour market also remained unchanged: the rate of unemployment remained at the level of 4.7% (high by Japanese standards). The deflationary pressure on price levels also continued: CPI fell by 0.6% during the year, more than in 1999 (0.3%). Part of these negative price effects was probable connected with the ongoing structural changes in the Japanese economy. Due to the limited room for monetary policy manoeuvre and the persistent fragility of the financial and corporate sectors, the Japanese economy remained vulnerable to additional shocks.

Economic activity in the euro area in 2000 followed the rapid dynamics of growth from the second half of 1999. GDP grew by 3.4% in 2000, representing the highest increase since 1990. The steep increases in the first two quarters (3.5 and 3.7% on a year-on-year basis) were followed by a slowdown in the rate of growth during the second half of the year (3.2% quarterly and 3.0% year-on-year), as a result of negative external factors (the steep increase in oil prices).

The main factor of economic growth in the euro area was the growth in domestic demand – both private consumption and investment. Private consumption grew by 2.6%, due to an increase in employment and connected growth in household incomes, supported by the high level of consumer confidence throughout the year. The growth in disposable incomes was also supported by cuts in direct taxes. In 2000, capital formation increased by 4.6%, due to the high level of economic activity in the euro area as well as abroad, and to the confidence in the business sector, which increased strongly during the first half of the year. Investment projects were also stimulated by a high level of capacity utilisation, the increased profitability of companies, the favourable conditions for their financing, and the ever increasing use of information and communication technologies.

Industrial production in the euro area recorded an annual increase of 5.4% (the highest since 1985, i.e. the first year covered by official euro area statistics), with the rate of growth accelerating during the first half of the year and slackening during the second half. The conditions of development in the individual sectors were unevenly affected by contradictory effects of growing input costs, caused by the rise in energy prices and depreciation of the euro, and, on the other hand, by the increase in the competitiveness of exporters of manufactured goods. Extraordinary high dynamic of growth was recorded in electronics, information technology, and communications, where the volume of production grew by roughly 20% in 2000.

In 2000, price development in the euro area followed a moderately upward trend, supported by external price pressures, especially by effect of rising oil prices and depreciation of the euro. Domestic pressures on prices were negligible due to a moderate wage policy, domestic costs (unit labour costs) were only slightly affected by external price factors. Average inflation in the euro area, expressed in terms of the harmonised consumer-price index (HICP), rose year-on-year to 2.3% (1.1% in 1999). The increase in energy prices contributed more than 1 percentage point to overall inflation. The rise in import prices, caused by external price factors, was reflected in the prices of industrial producers in the euro area, which increased by an average of 5.4% (in 1999, they fell by 0.4%).

Despite the high rate of convergence achieved in inflation in euro area countries, the differences between the rates of inflation in individual countries increased in 2000. This was due to differences in the effects of external price pressures upon the differing production structures of individual economies, differences in wage development and pace of legal reforms in national labour markets, to changes in regulated prices, as well as, in some countries, by the catching-up process in the standards of living, and to differences in the business cycle positions of individual member states. The general features are, however, only insignificant changes in price differences in the tradeable sector, which apparently reflect the competition-related effects of the single market and the single currency in particular.

The year 2000 saw a favourable trend of development in the labour market. The high level of economic activity led to the creation of new jobs and thus the level of employment in the euro area rose by 2%. The growth in employment was also supported by a moderate wage policy. The new job opportunities led to a further fall in the rate of unemployment. At the end of the year, the standardised rate of unemployment stood at 8.7% (compared with 9.6% in 1999).

In 2000, the current account of the euro area resulted in a deficit of EUR 28.3 billion (compared with EUR 5.8 billion in 1999). The year-on-year increase in the size of the current account deficit was due mainly to a fall in the positive balance of trade, which was caused by a faster rate of growth in imports than exports. The growth in exports was positively affected by the high level of demand abroad and the favourable trend of development in the price-based competitiveness of the euro area. Fluctuations in the other components of the current account offset each other, approximately.

In 2000, the capital account of the euro area resulted in a net outflow of direct and portfolio investments in the amount of EUR 143.4 billion, compared with EUR 162.3 billion in 1999. The fall was due primarily to a lesser net outflow of direct investments and a higher net inflow of debt instruments, which more than offset the substantial increase in the net outflow of shares. The changes in individual items differed considerably from the trend of development in 1999. Net inflow of debt instruments reached EUR 145.6 billion (EUR 7.7 billion in 1999), and was stimulated due mainly to the gradual elimination of interest-rate differentials between the euro area and the United States, which motivated foreign investors to invest in debentures and bonds in the euro area. The net outflow of direct investments slowed as a result of a marked increase in direct investments (EUR 303.1 billion) in the euro area (compared with EUR 166.2 billion in 1999). On the other hand, the net outflow of portfolio investments grew significantly, to EUR 266 billion (compared with EUR 49.4 billion in 1999).

As concerns economic developments in the individual euro area countries in 2000, the rate of GDP growth accelerated significantly in Germany and Italy (to 3.0 and 2.9% respectively, from 1.6% in both countries in 1999), and a relatively high rate of growth (3.2%) was maintained in France. In the major economies, inflation ranged from 1.8% (France) to 2.6% (Italy). Among the smaller economies of the euro area, the fastest rate of GDP growth was again achieved in Ireland (10.7%), the country with the highest rate of inflation (5.3%), as well. Dynamic growth was also recorded in Finland (5.7%), and the average rate of growth in the euro area was exceeded by Spain, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Higher than average inflation was recorded in Spain, Belgium, Finland, and Portugal (2.8 to 3.4%). On a year-on-year basis, the rate of unemployment fell in all member states of the euro area. The most significant fall took place in France (from 11.3% in 1999 to 9.7% in 2000), due to shorter working week, and in Spain (from 15.9% to 14.1%), which, however, remained the country with the highest rate of unemployment in the euro area.

In the remaining four EU countries, the rate of GDP growth accelerated in Greece (to 4.1%), the United Kingdom (to 3.0%), and Denmark (to 2.5%); whereas the figure for Sweden slowed to 3.6% in 2000. In all these countries, the rate of growth was marked by a certain slowdown in the second half of the year. Inflation (in terms of HICP) was kept at a very low level in the United Kingdom and Sweden (0.8 and 1.3% respectively), and was only a little higher in Denmark (2.6%) and Greece (2.9%). The rate of unemployment fell in all four countries, to a level ranging from 4.7% (Denmark) to 5.9% (Sweden), while Greece recorded a two-digit figure (11.3%).

Monetary Conditions and Fiscal Policies

With regard to the historically unique 10-year period of economic boom in the USA, the rate of growth has been expected to slow for a long time. The Federal Reserve System (FRS) has oriented its policy accordingly since 1999, when it began to raise key interest rates in order to shield the US economy from the possible unfavourable effects of a ‘hard landing’. The European Central Bank (ECB) has also focused its monetary policy on eliminating potential pressures on price level in the euro area. The long awaited economic revival in Japan was still in abeyance in 2000, with a persistent deflationary trend in price development, and the economic policy applied required different measures than in the USA and Western Europe.

The Federal Open Market Committee (FOMC) of FRS responded to the growing risk of inflationary pressures arising from the continued dynamic growth in the US economy during the first half of 2000, by increasing the overnight rate of interest on federal funds, which reached 6.5% at the end of 2000, i.e. 1 percentage point more than at the end of 1999. The marked slowdown in the pace of economic growth in the second half of the year led

FOMC to re-assess, at its last meeting in December 2000, the risks inherent in future development: the risk of inflation was replaced by the risk of excessive slowdown in economic growth. Based on this assessment, FOMC again lowered the limit rate for federal funds to 5.5%. In 2000, the fiscal sector in America generated a surplus of 1.7% of GDP (compared with 0.7% in 1999).

In August, the Japanese central bank ended its policy of 'zero interest rates', which had been applied for 18 months, and raised its overnight rate to 0.25%. As the market had waited for this step for a long time, short and long-term market rates rose only very moderately. With regard to the fiscal deficit which again increased to 8.2% of GDP in 2000 (compared with 7.0% in 1999) and the high level of public debt, the need for fiscal consolidation remained a topical question in Japan.

With regard to the current trend in price development in the euro area, resulting mostly from the rise in oil prices and the depreciation of the euro, and the rate of growth in the M3 money supply exceeding the reference value of 4.5%, the ECB raised its key interest rates 6 times over the course of the year with a view to maintaining the prospects of price stability in the euro area in the medium term. The risks to price stability in the euro area were considerably reduced, and the rate of growth in M3 began to decelerate, from levels above 6% (with a maximum of 6.7% in April). The average rate of year-on-year growth in M3 reached 5.7%, i.e. the same level as in 1999; however, the three-month moving average of the year-on-year growth in M3 reached only 5.1% during the last quarter of 2000. All rates of ECB rose by 175 base points, to a level of 3.75% (overnight deposit rate); 4.75% (two-week rate for the main refinancing operations of ECB); and 5.75% (overnight refinancing rate) at the end of 2000.

The position of the fiscal sector in the euro area improved in 2000, due mainly to favourable business conditions and, in many countries, to the sale of UMTS licences. In the euro area, the budget of general government resulted in a surplus of 0.3% of GDP on average or, if we leave the sale of UMTS licences out of account, a deficit of 0.8% of GDP (compared with a shortfall of 1.2% in 1999). Improvement was recorded in all countries of the euro area, but with marked differences. Excluding the effects of UMTS licences, the highest budget surpluses were recorded in Finland and Ireland (6.7 and 4.5% of GDP), five countries reported a deficit above 0.5% of GDP, while the least progress in fiscal consolidation was achieved in Portugal, Austria, and Italy which ended the year with a budget deficits of 1.5 to 1.7% of GDP. The debt position of the euro area also improved in the year 2000. The ratio of debt to GDP fell on euro-area average by 2.3 percentage points, to 69.7%. The sharpest fall in the debt ratio (more than 4 points) was recorded in the Netherlands, Ireland, Belgium, and Italy. In the latter two countries, the debt ratio remained above 100% of GDP.

The development of interest rates on the money markets of the United States and the euro area followed an upward trend, in response to the gradual increase in the key rates of central banks. The 3-month EURIBOR rate rose by an average of 144 base points during the year, to 4.93% in December. In the USA, the 3-month money market rate rose year-on-year by an average of 111 points, to 6.54% in December 2000. On the Japanese money market, interest rates remained low and recorded only marginal changes in 2000. The 3-month rate increased year-on-year by 6 points, to 0.62% in December 2000.

Over the course of the year, long-term interest rates (on 10-year government bonds) fluctuated in the euro area around 5.5%, and closed the year at a level just above 5.0%. Their relative stability can be ascribed to the persistence of low-inflation expectations among investors and general confidence in the ability of ECB to ensure price stability in the euro area in the medium term. In the USA, long-term interest rates were significantly affected by changes in the expectations of market participants in respect of the future level of economic activity in the country, which caused a year-on-year fall of roughly 130 base points in their level, to 5.2% at the end of the year. In 2000, the difference between yields from long-term bonds in the euro area and the USA decreased by roughly 85 base points, to a level of 16 points at the end of the year, which was the smallest difference since 1996. On a year-on-year basis, the level of long-term rates in the euro area rose from 4.66% in 1999 to 5.44% in 2000, and in the United States from 5.64% to 6.03%. In Japan, interest rates on 10-year government bonds remained at the level of 1.7% in 2000, except in August when they rose slightly in response to the announcement of Japan's central bank that it was ending its policy of 'zero interest rates'. On a year-on-year basis, the average level of these rates remained unchanged (1.75%).

In June 2000, the Summit of ECOFIN acknowledged that Greece had fulfilled the vital conditions for the introduction of the single European currency, with effect from 1 January 2001. Greece was accepted on this date, on the basis of convergence reports elaborated by the European Central Bank and the European Commission, as the 12th member of the European Monetary Union (EMU). At the same time, it was approved that the conversion rate between the Greek drachma and the euro would be GDR/EUR 340.750, equal to the central rate of the drachma against the euro within ERM II. Apart from the favourable results of economic development, Greece also made progress in fiscal consolidation and in the indicators of monetary convergence in 2000. The budget deficit diminished to 0.9% of GDP (1.8% in 1999), and the ratio of government debt to GDP fell from 104.6% in 1999 to 103.9% in 2000, representing a modest improvement. The Greek central bank focused its monetary policy on price stability and the creation of conditions for the introduction of the euro by lowering its key interest rates step by step. With the latest cut in the main refinancing rate in December (to 4.75%), the rate fell to the level of the minimum bid rate for the main refinancing operations of ECB. The measures of the central bank resulted in a subsequent fall in short-term interest rates, to the level of similar rates in the euro area. During the year, the gap in the level of long-term interest rates (on 10-year government bonds) between Greece and the euro area narrowed considerably, from 164 points in 1999 to 66 points in 2000 on average.

In a referendum held on 28 September 2000, the people of Denmark rejected the country's entry into the monetary union and the introduction of the euro. However, Denmark has remained a member of ERM II and the Danish central bank continued to focus its monetary policy on the harmonisation of the domestic monetary environment with that of the euro area. At the same time, the Danish government announced that it will be prepared to tighten its fiscal policy if necessary.

2. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN TRANSITION ECONOMIES

In 2000, the rate of growth in transition economies increased by 5.8%, which was twice the figure recorded a year earlier. This result can be attributed

Macroeconomic results of CEFTA countries (year-on-year changes in %)

		Slovakia	CR	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Rumania
GDP growth	1998	4.4	-2.2	5.1	4.8	3.9	-5.4
	1999	1.9	-0.8	4.5	4.1	5.2	-3.2
	2000	2.2	3.1	5.3	4.1	5.8	1.6
Inflation rate	1998	6.7	10.7	14.3	11.8	7.9	59.1
	1999	10.6	2.1	10.0	7.3	6.2	45.8
	2000	12.0	3.9	9.8	10.1	8.3	45.7
Unemployment rate	1998	13.8	6.0	7.8	10.0	14.5	9.2
(annual average)	1999	17.5	8.6	7.1	12.0	13.6	11.3
	2000	18.5	9.0	6.4	13.9	12.2	10.9
BoP on current account / GDP	1998	-10.0	-2.4	-4.8	-4.2	-0.8	-7.2
	1999	-5.0	-3.0	-4.5	-7.6	-3.9	-3.8
	2000	-3.7	-4.7	-3.8	-7.1	-3.2	-3.9

Source: National statistics

to the favourable trend of development in Russia, with GDP growing by 7.5%. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe recorded a growth of 3.8% on average. The accelerated growth in EU countries helped the associated countries to maintain the dynamics of exports as well as the pace of economic growth in 2000.

An important impetus for the integration of associated countries into the EU was the Summit in Nice, which removed the last institutional obstacles that had existed on the part of the EU. Accession talks with countries which are adequately prepared for admission, are expected to be completed in 2002, and these countries will probably be eligible to vote in the elections of the European Parliament in 2004.

In the group of CEFTA countries, the dynamics of economic growth increased in 2000. A growth rate above 5% was achieved by Slovenia and Hungary, while Poland maintained a GDP growth of 4%. After the difficult period of mitigating the effects of internal and external imbalances, Slovakia recorded a moderate increase in the pace of economic growth. Recession in the Czech Republic and Rumania took a turn for the better, though the current revival in the Rumanian economy is still very fragile.

While the rate of inflation in 1999 was, in general, lower than expected, the year 2000 saw a steeper increase in consumer prices due to a rise in oil and food prices.

The rate of unemployment continued to increase in Slovakia, the Czech Republic, and Poland. Slovenia, Hungary, and Rumania recorded a certain improvement in the development of this indicator.

With regard to the current account of the balance of payments, external imbalances were mitigated successfully in all countries with the exception of the Czech Republic and Rumania.

The indicators of economic development in CEFTA countries in the areas of output, labour market, price stability, and the current account balance in 2000, illustrated in the chart below, show that the most balanced development was recorded in Slovenia and Hungary. The Czech Republic and Rumania achieved a certain improvement in the area of output, but Rumania 'loses' one of the peaks of the quadrangle owing to the high rate of inflation. Slovakia continues to show disproportion in the area of unemployment.

Development of basic macroeconomic indicators in 2000