

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES – ANTI-DUMPING MEASURE  
ON FARMED SALMON FROM NORWAY**

*Report of the Panel*

Corrigendum

Please note the following corrections to the above-referenced report – deleted text is in ~~striketrough~~, added text is underlined:

English version only:

1. Item VII.J. in the Table of Contents should read as follows:

"J. Alleged Inconsistency of the EC's Conduct of the Proceedings with Articles 6.2, 6.4, 6.9, 12.2 and 12.2.2 of the AD Agreement".

English, French and Spanish versions:

2. Following paragraph 7.479, heading (ii) (Whether the NRCs at issue were appropriately counted as costs of production) should be re-designated heading (i).

3. Following paragraph 7.488, heading (iii) (Whether the investigating authority was entitled to calculate the NRC adjustments for [[XXX]] and [[XXX]] on the basis of a three-year average) should be re-designated heading (ii).

English version only:

4. Para. 7.504, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence should read as follows:

"Our assessment of the facts that were before the investigating authority and that the parties have submitted for our review indicates that [[XXX]] did not report the "weighted average cost of production for all salmon generations that were harvested during the investigation period".

English, French and Spanish versions:

5. Following paragraph 7.529, heading (ii) (*Facts*) should be re-designated heading (i).
6. Following paragraph 7.533, heading (iii) (*Whether the investigating authority was entitled to calculate finance costs on the basis of a three-year average*) should be re-designated heading (ii).

English version only:

7. Para. 7.539, final sentence should read as follows:

"Once again, we find that the evidence presented in the Definitive Disclosure supports the conclusion that: (i) [[XXX]] did not report its per kilogram costs of production on the basis of project accounting, but rather on the basis of ~~all~~ all costs relating to its salmon farming activities over the period of investigation; and (ii) that the investigating authority calculated all but three of the costs used for the purpose of arriving at [[XXX]] per kilogram cost of production on the basis of information from the period of investigation."

8. Para. 7.610, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence should read as follows:

"Second, Norway argues that the EC violated Articles 3.1~~7~~ and 3.2, and consequently, Article 3.5, because it failed to adequately examine the existence of price undercutting."

9. Para. 7.622, first sentence following quotation should read as follows:

"Thus, Article 3.1~~7~~ requires consideration of the volume, price, and consequent impact of **dumped** imports on the domestic industry."

10. Para. 7.642, 4<sup>th</sup> sentence should read as follows:

"While in a particular case, this might be possible, if all domestic producers operate in the same currency, that possibility does not justify the conclusion that such analysis is required."

English, French and Spanish versions:

11. Para. 7.711, 4<sup>th</sup> sentence should read as follows:

"Thus, to the extent that we may find any flaw in the investigating authority's calculation of the "non-dumped" MIPs that could potentially have caused them to be overstated, we believe that the factual basis for the investigating authority's conclusion that the "non-injurious" MIPs were lower than the "non-dumped" MIPs must also be flawed, rendering the imposition of the former on the investigated parties inconsistent with the obligation under Article 9.2 to collect anti-dumping duties in the "appropriate amounts"."

---