

Steuerberater

Dipi.-Kfm.K. Claßen, Stb. · 50170 Kerpen

RWE Aktiengesellschaft legal Altenessener Str. 35

45141 Essen

18 April 2019

Annual General Meeting of RWE Aktiengesellschaft on 3 May 2019 Countermotion to agenda item 3: Approval of the Acts of the Executive Board for fiscal 2018

Dear Sir/Madam,

I attach a deposit statement from my bank as proof of my status as an RWE AG shareholder. I hereby submit and ask you to publish the following countermotion to agenda item 3 of the AGM of 3 May 2019:

The AGM is requested not to approve the acts of the RWE AG Executive Board for fiscal 2018.

Reasoning:

The results and profit calculated for RWE AG in 2018 are incorrect. The impending losses from backfilling the open pits at the Hambach and Garzweiler opencast mines using solid material rather than water have not been provisioned in the amount required by law. The results and profit calculated for RWE AG in 2018 need to be corrected.

The recultivation of excavated fields, meadows and woods stipulated by the German Federal Mining Act is not possible on the opencast of the planned pit lakes, which are therefore not permissible under said Federal Mining Act.

The total costs of backfilling the open pits at the Hambach and Garzweiler opencast mines have been estimated at approximately EUR 32.2 bn and EUR 16.1 bn respectively. Provisions adequate to cover these amounts have not been made in the 2018 RWE AG financial statements.

The volume of the Hambach lake is taken to be 4 bn cubic metres. It is also assumed that a raw gravel substrate will be used to backfill the open pit at Hambach, at a net cost of EUR 5.20/metric ton. Filling a volume of 4 bn cubic metres will require approximately 6.2 bn metric tons of this material. The purchase price of 6.2 bn metric tons of filler gravel can be calculated as follows: 6.2 bn metric tons filler gravel x EUR 5.20/metric ton = EUR 32.2 bn.

The cost of backfilling the Garzweiler lake (water volume approx. 2 bn cubic metres) has been calculated in the same way, giving a total cost of around EUR 16.1 bn. Garzweiler is half the size of Hambach (2 bn cubic metres vs 4 bn), therefore $50\% \times EUR 32.2$ bn = EUR 16.1 bn.

The cost of transporting the filler material (raw gravel or natural sand) by ship from its site of extraction (e.g. the North Sea, the Rhine, nearby gravel pits) to a landing area on the Rhine near the Hambach mine has not yet been considered.

The cost of transporting the filler material from the landing stage on the Rhine onward to the pit lakes at Hambach and Garzweiler has not been factored in. This onward transport could involve building a conveyor system, which is a solution already used and known from the opencast mines in the Rhineland mining district. The construction and operation costs of such a conveyor system would be approximately the same as the construction and operation costs of the pipeline which is presently planned to carry water from the Rhine to the pit lakes.

An alternative solution would be to transport earth from the opencast mine at Bergheim or from the Sophienhöhe artificial hill to Hambach and Garzweiler.

The plans for the Hambach pit lake are not yet legally enforceable; moreover, these plans remain pending both before the courts in the case brought by myself against the Third Hambach General Operating Plan for 2020-2030 and the Hambach Main Operating Plan for the period from April 2018 to December 2020, as well as in extrajudicial administrative proceedings against the appropriation of my meadow in Hambach Forest.

Yours faithfully,