

DAIMLERCHRYSLER

Extension of the Agenda *
of the 8th Annual Meeting
of DaimlerChrysler AG
on Wednesday, April 12, 2006

Dear shareholders,

In addition to the Agenda of the Annual Meeting of DaimlerChrysler AG to be held on April 12, 2006, which was published in the electronic version of the Federal Gazette on March 6, 2006, pursuant to Section 122, Subsection 2 of the German Stock Corporation Act the shareholder Richard Mayer of Grellstrasse 40, 81735 München has requested the publication of the following items to be decided upon by that Annual Meeting:

9. Appointment of special auditors pursuant to Section 142, Subsection 1 of the German Stock Corporation Act to audit occurrences in the management of the corporation with regard to the (direct or indirect) activities of the corporation in the business of developing, producing and selling products (surface vehicles) of the “smart” brand and the provision of services in this field of business

(1) Description of the occurrences to be audited

The purpose of the special audit is to be the appointment of special auditors pursuant to Section 142, Subsection 1 of the German Stock Corporation Act to audit occurrences in the management of the corporation with regard to the (direct or indirect) activities of the corporation in the business of developing, producing and selling products of the “smart” brand and the provision of services in this field of business.

Since the middle of the nineteen-nineties, the corporation has developed (direct or indirect) activities under the “smart” brand and in this respect has established a new business unit. Before this business was established in what was a new market segment for the corporation, the Board of Management Chairman at that time, Schrempp, stated in May 1995: “We will create a market, and we have no doubts at all that such a market will definitely come into being.” However, only losses have been incurred since the corporation started operating in this business unit and no turnaround is in sight. Therefore, in the general public this business is often, and rightly, spoken of as a “smart” disaster.

(2) Questions to be answered with regard to the “smart” business

The special audit is to address the following particular questions:

- a) How did the “smart” business come into being? Who provided the initiative for this business? Was it based on an autonomous decision of the Board of Management and the Supervisory Board or was some other influence exerted on the establishment and development of this business? If so, by whom? In what way? Does this influence fulfill the conditions of Sections 117 and 317 of the German Stock Corporation Act or other liability standards?

- b) Were the decisions to establish and develop the business made with due consideration of the criteria of Section 93 of the German Stock Corporation Act? In particular: Was the decision made on the basis of appropriate information (Section 93, Subsection 1, Sentence 2 of the German Stock Corporation Act, New Version)? In particular: Did the Board of Management refer to objective grounds for its decisions, in particular the results of market research and feasibility studies, and use them as criteria for its decision? Was the Board of Management able to reasonably assume with respect to these decisions that it was acting on the basis of appropriate information for the benefit of the corporation (Section 93 Subsection 1, Sentence 2 of the German Stock Corporation Act, New Version)?
- c) Were the measures taken by the Board of Management with regard to the “smart” business in conformance with reasonable commercial judgement? Did the members of the Board of Management and the Supervisory Board exercise the care of a reasonable and conscientious manager with regard to this business and its execution, approval and monitoring? Did the Board of Management and the Supervisory Board fulfill their duties of care and attention according to the Stock Corporation Act in the preparation, execution and monitoring of the aforementioned measures? Did they inform the shareholders and investors in an appropriate and correct manner?
- d) Which members of the corporation’s Board of Management and Supervisory Board can possibly be held liable and to what extent to compensate for the damage that the corporation and its shareholders have suffered from the aforementioned measures and/or are still suffering and/or may suffer in the future?
- e) Were careful examinations of the feasibility and sense of the investment and related decisions and actions carried out before the entrepreneurial decisions regarding the “smart” business? If not, why not, and who might be held liable for this omission?
- f) Did the corporation apply sufficient risk management in each phase of the “smart” business?
- g) The reasons for and the development of the ongoing loss situation of the “smart” business are to be determined in detail. In particular, it is necessary to ascertain: What is the total volume of the costs of the “smart” business since it began (including development and other initial costs) and the overall profits or losses in the period until the decision on the special audit?
- h) Furthermore, it is necessary to determine (1) the operating result and capital expenditure excluding capital costs and (2) the operating result and capital expenditure including all capital costs and (3) the individual results of the “smart” business for the years 2003, 2004 and 2005, in each case both with and without capital costs.
- i) Are there any appropriate business plans for the “smart” business? What periods do they cover? Do they conform with reasonable commercial judgement? When do they indicate that profits should be made – and as a result of which further investments? Such investigations are to be carried out both with and without the sunk costs. As an alternative to the business plan, has a calculation been made of what the immediate closure of the “smart” business unit would cost? What is the volume of such costs? Does the calculation conform with reasonable commercial judgement (Section 93 of the German Stock Corporation Act)? If this calculation has not been made, these costs are to be determined as a part of the special audit and compared with the profit projections of the business plan.

- j) What is the value of the “smart” business unit on the date of the Annual Meeting?
- k) Were there any binding agreements or other commitments not to discontinue the “smart” business by the Board of Management of this corporation towards employees and/or subsidiaries? If so, what are the contents of these commitments? Are they rescindable? If such commitments were made, are they legal? If not, who made the commitments and who might be held liable for making them? If no such commitments were made, what does Jürgen Grässlin’s book “The Daimler Disaster” refer to on page 97 quoting the corporation’s letter to the employees and the circumstances whereby “smart” manager Ulrich Walker allayed the fears of the employees by saying “smart is still not making any money, that’s right. But our existence is not jeopardized.” To give more weight to this statement, Walker apparently quoted the blessings given at the highest level, writing in that employee letter: “Jürgen Schrempp and Eckhard Cordes emphasized this to me in personal discussions.” What are the full contents of this employee letter? Can it offer any basis for liability actions, if so, what kind of actions?

(3) Appointment of special auditors

The special auditor to be appointed is Mr. Michael Wahlscheidt, certified public accountant and tax accountant, c/o Stuetzgen Haeb AG, Benrather Schlossallee 85-87, 40597 Düsseldorf. The special auditor can draw on the support of specially qualified personnel, in particular persons with knowledge of the automotive industry.

10. Appointment of special auditors pursuant to Section 142, Subsection 1 of the German Stock Corporation Act to audit occurrences in the management of the corporation with regard to the (direct or indirect) activities of the corporation in the business of developing, producing and selling products (surface vehicles) of the “MAYBACH” brand and the provision of services in this field of business

(1) Description of the occurrences to be audited

The purpose of the special audit is to be the appointment of special auditors pursuant to Section 142, Subsection 1 of the German Stock Corporation Act to audit occurrences in the management of the corporation with regard to the (direct or indirect) activities of the corporation in the business of developing, producing and selling products of the “MAYBACH” brand and the provision of services in this field of business.

Since the end of the nineteen-nineties, the corporation has developed (direct or indirect) activities under the “MAYBACH” brand and in this respect has established a new business unit. Before this business was established in what was a new market segment for the corporation, the Board of Management Chairman at that time, Schrempp, stated in the year 1998: “If we want to enter this segment (top luxury segment of the Rolls-Royce class), and I have no doubt that we do, then we don’t need Rolls-Royce to do so, we can do it on our own,” continuing that the top luxury segment “will be defined by an automobile bearing the star. And of course,

we will only offer this automobile if we make money with it.” At the time of the market launch of the MAYBACH at the end of 2002, Jürgen Hubbert of the Board of Management stated that profits would be made by the MAYBACH business unit already in the first year after the launch.

However, only losses have been incurred since the corporation started operating in this business unit and no turnaround is in sight. Therefore, in the general public this business is often, and rightly, spoken of as a “MAYBACH” disaster.

(2) Questions to be answered with regard to the “MAYBACH” business

The special audit is to address the following particular questions:

- a) How did the “MAYBACH” business come into being? Who provided the initiative for this business? Was it based on an autonomous decision of the Board of Management and the Supervisory Board or was some other influence exerted on the establishment and development of this business? If so, by whom? In what way? Does this influence fulfill the conditions of Sections 117 and 317 of the German Stock Corporation Act or other liability standards?
- b) Were the decisions to establish and develop the business made with due consideration of the criterion of Section 93 of the German Stock Corporation Act? In particular: Was the decision made on the basis of appropriate information (Section 93 Subsection 1, Sentence 2 of the German Stock Corporation Act, New Version)? In particular: Did the Board of Management refer to objective grounds for its decisions and use these as criteria for its decision, in particular the results of market research and feasibility studies? Was the Board of Management able to reasonably assume with respect to these decisions that it was acting on the basis of appropriate information for the benefit of the corporation (Section 93, Subsection 1, Sentence 2 of the German Stock Corporation Act, New Version)?
- c) Were the measures taken by the Board of Management with regard to the “MAYBACH” business in conformance with reasonable commercial judgement? Did the members of the Board of Management and the Supervisory Board exercise the care of a reasonable and conscientious manager with regard to this business and its execution, approval and monitoring? Did the Board of Management and the Supervisory Board fulfill their duties of care and attention according to the Stock Corporation Act in the preparation, execution and monitoring of the aforementioned measures? Did they inform the shareholders and investors in an appropriate and correct manner?
- d) Which members of the corporation’s Board of Management and Supervisory Board can possibly be held liable and to what extent to compensate for the damage that the corporation and its shareholders have suffered from the aforementioned measures and/or are still suffering and/or may suffer in the future?
- e) Were careful examinations of the feasibility and sense of the investment and related decisions and actions carried out before the entrepreneurial decisions regarding the “MAYBACH” business? If not, why not, and who might be held liable for this omission?
- f) Did the corporation apply sufficient risk management in each phase of the “MAYBACH” business?

- g) The reasons for and the development of the ongoing loss situation of the “MAYBACH” business are to be determined in detail. In particular, it is necessary to ascertain: What is the total volume of the costs of the “MAYBACH” business since it began (including development and other initial costs) and the overall profits or losses in the period until the decision on the special audit?
- h) Furthermore, it is necessary to determine (1) the operating result and capital expenditure excluding capital costs and (2) the operating result and capital expenditure including all capital costs and (3) the individual results of the “MAYBACH” business for the years 2003, 2004 and 2005, in each case both with and without capital costs.
- i) Are there any appropriate business plans for the “MAYBACH” business? What periods do they cover? Do they conform with reasonable commercial judgement? When do they indicate that profits should be made – and as a result of which further investments? Such investigations are to be carried out both with and without the sunk costs. As an alternative to the business plan, has a calculation been made of what the immediate closure of the “MAYBACH” business unit would cost? What is the volume of such costs? Does the calculation conform with reasonable commercial judgement (Section 93 of the German Stock Corporation Act)? If this calculation has not been made, these costs are to be determined as a part of the special audit and compared with the profit projections of the business plan.
- j) What is the value of the “MAYBACH” business unit on the date of the Annual Meeting?

(3) Appointment of the special auditors

The special auditor to be appointed is Mr. Michael Wahlscheidt, certified public accountant and tax accountant, c/o Stuetzgen Haeb AG, Benrather Schlossallee 85-87, 40597 Düsseldorf. The special auditor can draw on the support of specially qualified personnel, in particular persons with knowledge of the automotive industry.

Reasons

The reasons and justification for my demands follow directly from the above remarks. I would like to make the following additional comments:

1. The reason for demanding these additions to the Agenda is the disaster that has now been dragging on for nearly a decade concerning the “MAYBACH” and “smart” business units. The immediate termination of the corporation’s activities in these business units, which have been making sustained losses for a long time now, can be effected by closure or possibly by sale and is urgently required for the success of the consolidation course initiated by new Board of Management Chairman Dr. Zetsche.
2. The authority, in accordance with Items 9 and 10 and pursuant to Section 122 of the German Stock Corporation Act, to place a special audit on the Agenda and to propose such audit also follows clearly from applicable law (Section 142, Subsection 1 of the German Stock Corporation Act).

Position of the management on the motion to appoint special auditors

The Supervisory Board proposes that the motions under Items 9 and 10 of the Agenda be rejected.

There is no reason for the special audit proposed under Items 9 and 10 of the Agenda. With regard to the decision to develop and produce the smart and with regard to the decision to develop and produce the Maybach, there are no indications of any improper influence being exerted, nor of any irregularities or violations of the duty to exercise due care and diligence. In fact, all decisions taken in this context were based on well-founded and careful considerations by the Board of Management and the Supervisory Board. Certain market risks are inherent in entrepreneurial activities and even the most thorough basis of information does not guarantee a risk-free investment. However, in no case does this justify the appointment of special auditors.

Stuttgart, March 16, 2006

DaimlerChrysler AG
The Board of Management

