

**Question for written answer E-009450/2016  
to the Commission**  
Rule 130  
**Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL)**

Subject: The 'Hohe Düne' case, Rostock-Warnemünde

Is it true that during a meeting with German public officials (from the Rostock Public Prosecutor's Office) on 25 January 2011 as part of OLAF coordination case OF/2010/0881

1. an assessment was made by the representative of the Directorate-General for Competition regarding state aid legislation in a specific case (the 'Hohe Düne' case), as alleged by the German authorities (cf. the response of the Mecklenburg-Vorpommern Land Government from 11 August 2016 in printed document 6/5860), specifically to the effect that by dividing the project into two separate projects more funding became available, namely 50 % of the project value instead of just 35 %, and that a funding level of 50 % would not have been possible per se for large investment projects (as the term is used in the 1998 multisectoral framework on regional aid (MSF)),
2. or alternatively that statements were made to the effect that an SME supplement of 15 %, and therefore a total funding rate of up to 50 %, would have been possible even for large investment projects (as the term is used in the 1998 MSF) and moreover that this would not depend on the number of applicants?
3. Is it also true that the corresponding preliminary investigation procedure SA 33200(CP/2011), which had been running since 2011, was closed in the meantime?