

**Question for written answer E-003561/2017
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL)

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

In its answer of 7 March 2017 to Question E-009450/2016 of 15 December 2017, the Commission confirmed that a representative of the Directorate-General for Competition had attended a meeting with officials from the Rostock Public Prosecutors' Office organised by the European Anti-Fraud Office on 25 January 2011 and explained the 1998 and 2002 multisectoral regional aid framework provisions for large investment projects.

Was it also made clear to the Public Prosecutor's Office that:

- Aside from the merits of each individual case, an SME supplement of 15%, that is to say total funding of up to 50%, could, in principle be accorded for large investment projects carried out by SMEs, as defined in connection with the 1998 multisectoral regional aid framework? (This clarification was presumably necessary in view of the mistaken assumption contained in the written opinion submitted by the Public Prosecutor's Office in preparation for the meeting to the effect that, for an investment of EUR 50 million or more, the maximum funding level was no more than 35%, since the SME supplement would no longer be payable.)
- A maximum funding level of 50% was possible, regardless of the number of applicants, which meant that the owner of two companies could, in principle, receive funding of 50% for each of them? (This clarification was presumably necessary in view of the mistaken assumption contained in the written opinion submitted by the Public Prosecutor's Office in preparation for the meeting to the effect that increased funding could only be secured by splitting the project between two companies.)