

PROJECT PERIODIC REPORT

Grant Agreement number: 628170

Project acronym: USHP

Project title: Unity of Structured HyperPropositions

Funding Scheme: FP7-PEOPLE-2013-IEF

Date of latest version of Annex I against which the assessment will be made:

Periodic report: 1st ☒ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☐ 4th ☐

Period covered: from 01 SEPTEMBER 2014 to 31 AUGUST 2016

Name, title and organisation of the scientific representative of the project's coordinator¹:

Professor Manuel García-Carpintero, LOGOS, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Barcelona, Spain

Tel:

Fax:

E-mail: mgcarpintero@gmail.com

Project website² address: http://www.ub.edu/grc_logos/bj,
http://www.ub.edu/grc_logos/project_card.php?idProj=55

¹ Usually the contact person of the coordinator as specified in Art. 8.1. of the Grant Agreement.

² The home page of the website should contain the generic European flag and the FP7 logo which are available in electronic format at the Europa website (logo of the European flag: http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/embblem/index_en.htm logo of the 7th FP: http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/index_en.cfm?pg=logos). The area of activity of the project should also be mentioned.

Declaration by the scientific representative of the project coordinator

I, as scientific representative of the coordinator of this project and in line with the obligations as stated in Article II.2.3 of the Grant Agreement declare that:

- The attached periodic report represents an accurate description of the work carried out in this project for this reporting period;
- The project (tick as appropriate) ³:
 - ☐ has fully achieved its objectives and technical goals for the period;
 - ☒ has achieved most of its objectives and technical goals for the period with relatively minor deviations.
 - ☐ has failed to achieve critical objectives and/or is not at all on schedule.
- The public website, if applicable
 - ☐ is up to date
 - ☒ is not entirely up to date
- To my best knowledge, the financial statements which are being submitted as part of this report are in line with the actual work carried out and are consistent with the report on the resources used for the project (section 3.4) and if applicable with the certificate on financial statement.
- All beneficiaries, in particular non-profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs, have declared to have verified their legal status. Any changes have been reported under section 3.2.3 (Project Management) in accordance with Article II.3.f of the Grant Agreement.

³ If either of these boxes below is ticked, the report should reflect these and any remedial actions taken.

--

Name of scientific representative of the Coordinator:

Date: ...19...../10...../2016.....

For most of the projects, the signature of this declaration could be done directly via the IT reporting tool through an adapted IT mechanism and in that case, no signed paper form needs to be sent

3.1 *Publishable summary*

- *A summary description of project context and objectives.*

This project is a two-year Marie Curie Fellowship that is part of the *Horizon 2020* framework. It is being carried out at LOGOS, University of Barcelona, which is one of the foremost research institutions in analytic philosophy, including philosophical logic and philosophy of language, in the European Research Area. The LOGOS counterpart is Professor Manuel García-Carpintero.

The topic is the unity of the proposition. One version of the unity problem is the mereological, hence metaphysical question how multiple entities of different categories work together so as to form one unit, a proposition, which has properties that none of its constituents has. This is a common part/whole problem. Another version of the unity problem is the semantic question of how propositions succeed in being or having or yielding truth-conditions. Some theories dismiss one version at the expense of the other, while others see them as two sides of the same coin. I am all for the latter approach. The mereological unity problem arises as soon as propositions are claimed to be structures.

There are various reasons for advocating structured propositions, but one of the prevalent reasons is that the notion of structure may help one to a notion of fine-grained (so-called hyperintensional) propositions. Only recently has contemporary research into fine-grained propositions been brought explicitly in contact with research into the mereology of structured propositions. This involves reopening old debates concerning constituency, degrees of complexity, composition and decomposition, abstract versus concrete parts, etc. It also involves reopening the debate concerning what the unifiers of structured propositions are. Two standard constraints on any viable answer are that a structured proposition must be more than an enumeration or list of entities and that regress must be avoided.

The Marie Curie project in question pursues the twin idea that the procedure of predication holds the key to the unity of at least atomic propositions and that certain logical procedures can serve as propositional unifiers. The theory will be worked out within the framework of Transparent Intensional Logic. Predication, unlike instantiation, does not require that an object that has a property assigned to it actually does have that property. So predication, unlike instantiation, can handle the fail cases the same way it handles the success cases. Nor do I think of predication as a relation. It is common in the literature, including the most recent, to simply assume that a relation must obtain between the designated constituents of a proposition. This is far from being an innocuous assumption, for it saddles us with addressing Bradley's old problem of how to relate a relation to the entities it relates. A regress is looming on the horizon. Therefore, I construe predication not as a relation, but as an instance of the logical operation of applying a function to an argument. Predication is an instance of this operation. I suggest that the backbone of atomic propositions is predication. This is not an unusual view in itself, but what is novel is the idea that a proposition is to be identified with a procedure that embodies instructions to apply such-and-such operations to such-and-such entities in order to obtain such-and-such results, e.g. truth-conditions. The overall objective of the project is to investigate how satisfactory an account of structure, unity and individuation of propositions can be extracted from a procedural semantics, i.e. a theory of meaning that identifies meanings with procedures. Hence the title of the talk (in its various versions) that I have been giving at various universities as part of my visits as a Marie Curie Ambassador: "What can procedural semantics do for the unity of structured propositions? (A lot!)".

- *A description of the work performed since the beginning of the project and the main results achieved so far.*
 - Six **papers** (as well as an Introduction) have so far been accepted for publication, four of which have already appeared in print. (Furthermore some of the key papers of this project are currently being written up: see below.)
 - The **special issue** of *Synthese* on the unity of structured propositions that I am co-editing together with Manuel García-Carpintero is in full progress. So far papers by S. Soames, P. Hanks, J. Speaks, R. Gaskin, M. Eklund, G. Ostertag, F. Recanati, and P. Pagin have been accepted for publication. We expect to soon accept papers by J. King and B. Pickel. Four other papers, by M. Duží, Lorraine Keller, John Keller, and myself, have been promised by the authors and will soon be received and reviewed. The final issue will in all likelihood run to a dozen papers or more. García-Carpintero and I will co-author a lengthy Introduction to the issue.
 - Professor Manuel García-Carpintero and I co-organized a three-day **conference**, 22-24 June 2015, which involved twelve speakers (eight invited, four solicited) and which was held in Barcelona. The topic was the unity of structured propositions, and the conference was arranged as the *Barcelona Workshop on Reference 9 (BW9)*. The speakers were J. King, S. Soames, P. Hanks, P. Pagin, L. Keller, G. Ostertag, M. Duží, J. Keller, G. Georgi, I. Reiland, and myself.
 - I have given the following **tutorials**:
 - [4] Department of Philosophy, National University of Singapore, 18 September 2015: *Introduction to the unity of structured propositions.*
 - [3] Department of Philosophy, Stockholm University, 22 April 2014: *On the unity of the proposition that a is an F.*
 - [2] Department of Philosophy, UNAM, Mexico City, 10 March 2015: *On the unity of the proposition that a is an F.*
 - [1] Department of Logic and Philosophy of Science, UC Irvine, C-ALPHA, 4 March 2015: *On the unity of the proposition that a is an F.*
 - I have given the following invited lectures as a **Marie Curie Ambassador**:
 - [11] A critique of act theories of propositions and predication (joint work with M. García-Carpintero), Department of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences, University of Edinburgh, 22 May 2016.
 - [10] What can procedural semantics do for the unity of structured propositions? (A lot!), ILLC/University of Amsterdam, 18 May 2016.
 - [9] A critique of act theories of propositions and predication (joint work with M. García-Carpintero), ILLC/University of Amsterdam, *Discourse and Philosophy Seminar*, 13 May 2016.

[8] What can procedural semantics do for the unity of structured propositions? (A lot!), Department of Philosophy, Groningen University, *GroLog*, 12 May 2016.

[7] A critique of act theories of propositions and predication (joint work with M. García-Carpintero), Yonsei University, Underwood International College, Seoul, 29 April 2016.

[6] What can procedural semantics do for the unity of structured propositions? (A lot!), Department of Philosophy, Lingnan University, Hong Kong, 30 September 2015.

[5] What can procedural semantics do for the unity of structured propositions? (A lot!), Department of Philosophy, National University of Singapore, 23 September 2015.

[4] What can procedural semantics do for the unity of structured propositions? (A lot!), Department of Philosophy, Stockholm University, *Logic, Language and Mind Colloquium*, 24 April 2015.

[3] Property conjunction for complex predicates, Department of Philosophy, Uppsala University, 23 April 2015.

[2] What can procedural semantics do for the unity of structured propositions? (A lot!), Department of Philosophy, UNAM, Mexico City, 11 March 2015.

[1] What can procedural semantics do for the unity of structured propositions? (A lot!), Department of Logic and Philosophy of Science, UC Irvine, *LPS Colloquium*, 6 March 2015.

▪ I have given the following **invited talks**:

[4] Iterated privation, *How to say 'Yes' or 'No': Logical Approaches to Modes of Assertion and Denial*, Università del Salento, Lecce, 21-22 January 2016.

[3] The unity of the proposition that *a* is an *F*, *Research Seminar*, LOGOS, Barcelona, 18 February 2015.

[2] Property conjunction for complex predicates, *Logic Café*, Department of Computer Science, TU Ostrava, 29-30 January 2015.

[1] Modal fatigue and hyperintensional knowledge: variations on themes from Nolan and Needham, *Modal Epistemology and Metaphysics*, University of Belgrade, 18-20 September 2014.

▪ I have given the following **solicited talks** (both reviewed):

[2] Towards a mereology of structured propositions, *Fifth Italian Conference in Analytic Ontology*, University of Padua, 27-29 June 2016.

[1] Ode to the proliferation of propositions, *ENFA VI*, Ponta Delgada, 10-12 September 2015.

- I have taught the following **seminars**:

[2] Autumn Term 2015: *Philosophical Logic: Propositions*, MA/postgrad students, Department of Logic, History and Philosophy of Science, University of Barcelona.

[1] Spring Term 2015: *The Nature of Language*, MA/postgrad students, Department of Logic, History and Philosophy of Science, University of Barcelona (co-taught with M. García-Carpintero)

- I have carried out the following **services to the profession**:

[8] Joining the Advisory Board of the ERC Consolidator project, *The Logic of Conceivability: Modelling Rational Imagination with Non-Normal Modal Logics*, F. Berto (PI), ILLC/University of Amsterdam.

[7] Joining the search committee for the postdoc of the above ERC project together with F. Berto, H. Wansing, G. Priest.

[6] Becoming a judge on the Philosophy Panel of *Undergraduate Awards 2016*.

[5] Acting twice as an evaluator for SASPRO, the mobility program of the Slovak Academy of Sciences as part of FP7-Marie-Curie-Actions-COFUND.

[4] Reviewer for *SLMFCE VIII*, 7-10 July 2015, Barcelona.

[3] Joining the scientific committee of *XVII Taller d'Investigació en Filosofia (XVII Research Workshop in Philosophy)*, Universitat Autònoma, Barcelona, January 2015.

[2] Member of the scientific committee of *Modal Epistemology and Metaphysics*, University of Belgrade, 18-20 September 2014.

[1] Refereeing for *Mind*, *Cambridge University Press* (book proposal), *dialectica*, *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, *Logica Universalis*, *Grazer Philosophische Studien*, *Disputatio*, *Theoria* (Stockholm).

- *The expected final results and their potential impact and use (including the socio-economic impact and the wider societal implications of the project so far).*

What is emerging is a worked-out theory (rather than a program or project) that accounts for the unity and structure of hyperpropositions by means of a theory based on procedural semantics. This makes for a major contribution to current philosophical logic and philosophy of language. Furthermore, my procedural theory provides the formal-semantic and logical underpinnings of the notion of unity and structure (and derivatively also of individuation or granularity) that is part and parcel of the theory Transparent Intensional Logic, which has been developed into a code language for computers, known as TIL-Script, at the Department of Computer Science, TU Ostrava, Czech Republic, headed by Professor Duží.

- *The address of the project public website, if applicable.*

<http://www.ub.edu/logosbw/bw9/program.html>

3.2 Core of the report for the period: Project objectives, work progress and achievements, project management

3.2.1 Project objectives for the period

As stated in the grant agreement, the objectives were to train myself in those portions of contemporary analytic philosophy of language and metaphysics that treat of semantic content and structured meaning. I have been particularly interested in how different theories view the relationship between sentential and propositional structure. The objectives were to become proficient in various formal theories of propositional structure and to modify Transparent Intensional Logic in the light of my insights.

- *Please include a summary of the recommendations from the previous reviews (if any) and indicate how these have been taken into account.*

Not applicable.

3.2.2 Work progress and achievements during the period

- *A summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task.*

The work packages concern my growth as a thinker during the course of the Fellowship. Two insights stand out. One concerns the bifurcation of the unity problem into a mereological (hence metaphysical) and a truth-conditional (hence semantic) problem. Traditionally, it seems, the unity problem was exclusively or predominantly taken to be the former. Currently, it is rather the other way around. I have seen convincing arguments to the effect that the semantic and the mereological problem are intertwined and demand one common solution. The one common problem, then, is how structured propositions are united (i.e. how their constituents are unified into a whole) in such a way that they represent truth-conditions. This will be my approach, anyway. The other insight is that the current act-theoretic approaches take themselves to be consistent with semantic realism while being vehemently opposed to Platonism. I seem to detect, however, an unintended idealist undercurrent (in that language-using agents must perform various acts that underpin the unity of propositions) which is liable to challenge the assumed objectivity of propositions.

- *Highlight clearly significant results.*

My **published output** so far as part of this Marie Curie Fellowship is the following:

[7] ‘Left subsectivity: how to infer that a round peg is round’, *dialectica*, *accepted for publication (refereed)*.

[6] ‘Is predication an act or an operation?’, in: *Topics in Predication Theory*, vol. 2: *Philosophy of Language and Logic*, P. Stalmaszczyk (ed.), *Studies in Philosophy of Language and Linguistics*, Peter Lang GmbH (*commissioned*), *forthcoming*.

[5] ‘Should propositions proliferate?’, *Thought*, vol. 4 (2015), 243-51.

DOI: 10.1002/tht3.184 (*refereed*).

[4] ‘Qualifying quantifying-in’, in: *Quantifiers, Quantifiers, and Quantifiers*, A. Torza (ed.), *Synthese Library*, vol. 373 (2015), 241-69. **DOI** 10.1007/978-3-319-18362-6 (*commissioned*).

[3] ‘Introduction’ (with M. Duží), *Synthese*, vol. 192 (2015), 525-34. **DOI** 10.1007/s11229-015-0665-9 (*commissioned*).

[2] ‘Transparent quantification into hyperintensional objectual attitudes’ (with M. Duží), *Synthese*, vol. 192 (2015), 635-77. **DOI** 10.1007/s11229-014-0578-z (*refereed*).

[1] ‘Structured lexical concepts, property modifiers, and Transparent Intensional Logic’, *Philosophical Studies*, vol. 172 (2015), 321-45. **DOI** 10.1007/s11098-014-0305-0 (*refereed*).

The following manuscripts are currently being written up for **submission** and will, when published, be attributed to the project:

[6'] ‘Anatomy of a proposition (previously: ‘Unities of the proposition’), 18,000 words, version read at BW9, ready for submission to the special issue on unity.

[5'] ‘A critique of act-theoretic theories of predication and propositions’, with M. García-Carpintero, 10,000 words currently, version read at Edinburgh.

[4'] ‘Non-extensional, yet well-founded mereology for structured propositions’, 5,200 words currently, versions read at Padova and Ostrava.

[3'] ‘Property conjunction for complex predicates’, 11,700 words currently, version read at Uppsala.

[2'] 'Transparent quantification into hyperpropositional contexts de dicto', with M.Duží, revise and resubmit, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, revisions in progress, submission before the end of 2016.

[1'] 'Iterated privation and positive predication', with M. Duží and M. Carrara, version read at Lecce, for a special issue of *Journal of Applied Logic* on negation and denial, near completion, deadline November 2016.

3.2.3 Project management during the period

Please use this section to summarise management of the consortium activities during the period. Management tasks are indicated in Articles II.2.3 and Article II.16.5 of the Grant Agreement.

Amongst others, this section should include the following:

- *Consortium management tasks and achievements;*
- *Problems which have occurred and how they were solved or envisaged solutions;*

Not applicable.

- *Changes in the consortium, if any; Not applicable.*
- *List of project meetings, dates and venues;*

For organized conference, tutorials and presentations, see above.

- Justification of real costs (management costs);
- Other

3.3 Deliverables and milestones tables

Deliverables

The deliverables due in this reporting period, as indicated in Annex I to the Grant Agreement have to be uploaded by the responsible participants (as indicated in Annex I), and then approved and submitted by the Coordinator. Deliverables are of a nature other than periodic or final

reports (ex: "prototypes", "demonstrators" or "others"). **The periodic reports and the final report have NOT to be considered as deliverables.** If the deliverables are not well explained in the periodic and/or final reports, then, a short descriptive report should be submitted, so that the Commission has a record of their existence.

If a deliverable has been cancelled or regrouped with another one, please indicate this in the column "Comments".
If a new deliverable is proposed, please indicate this in the column "Comments".

The number of persons/month for each deliverable has been defined in Annex I of the Grant Agreement and cannot be changed. In SESAM, this number is automatically transferred from NEF and is not editable. If there is a deviation from the Annex I, then this should be clearly explained in the comments column.

This table is cumulative, that is, it should always show all deliverables from the beginning of the project

TABLE 1. DELIVERABLES										
Del. No	'Left subsectivity: how to infer that a round peg is round', <i>dialectica</i> ,	Versi on	WP no.	Lead beneficiar y	Nature	Dissemination level ⁴	Delivery date from Annex I (proj month)	Actual / Forec ast delive ry date Dd/m m/yyyy	Status Accepte d for publicati on	Comments still no DOI assigned; awaiting galley proofs.

	‘Is predication an act or an operation?’, <i>Studies in Philosophy of Language and Linguistics</i>								Accepted for publication	Still no DOI assigned; awaiting galley proofs
	‘Should propositions proliferate?’, <i>Thought</i>								published	DOI 10.1007/s11229-015-0665-9
	‘Qualifying quantifying-in’, in: <i>Quantifiers, Quantifiers, and Quantifiers</i> , A. Torza (ed.), <i>Synthese Library</i>								published	DOI 10.1007/s11229-014-0578-z

	‘Introduction’ (with M. Duží), <i>Synthese</i>								published	DOI 10.1007/s112 29-015-0665- 9
	‘Transparent quantification into hyperintensional objectual attitudes’ (with M. Duží), <i>Synthese</i> .									DOI 10.1007/s112 29-014-0578- z

	‘Structured lexical concepts, property modifiers, and Transparent Intensional Logic’, <i>Philosophical Studies</i>								publishe d	DOI 10.1007/s110 98-014-0305- 0
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------	---

Milestones

Please complete this table if milestones are specified in Annex I to the Grant Agreement. Milestones will be assessed against the specific criteria and performance indicators as defined in Annex I.

This table is cumulative, which means that it should always show all milestones from the beginning of the project.

What still needs to be achieved in order to complete the project is to convert the manuscripts [6’] ‘Anatomy of a proposition’, [5’] ‘A critique of act-theoretic theories of predication and propositions’, [4’] ‘Non-extensional, yet well-founded mereology for structured propositions’ into publications. [6’] is the exposition and justification of my own theory. [5’] is a critical assessment of the currently most popular theory of structure and unity, which happens to share some of my own points of departure, in particular that propositions have a procedural character, but which also have fundamental shortcomings, especially as regards the balance between semantics and pragmatics, content and force. [4’] is the paper on mereology I have promised. The idea of the paper is to make explicit the implicit mereology of Transparent Intensional Logic and compare it against a couple of other mereological theories that also reject extensionality (as any theory of fine-grained compounds must), but also reject the standard notions of parthood and proper parthood and thus become non-well-founded.

TABLE 2. MILESTONES							
Milestone no.	Milestone name	Work package no	Lead beneficiary	Delivery date from Annex I dd/mm/yyyy	Achieved Yes/No	Actual / Forecast achievement date dd/mm/yyyy	Comments
		1			In progress	Within the following 12 months	
		2			In progress	Within the following 12 months	

3.4 Explanation of the use of the resources and financial statements

The financial statements have to be provided within the Forms C for each beneficiary (if Special Clause 10 applies to your Grant Agreement, a separate financial statement is provided for each third party as well) together with a summary financial report which consolidates the claimed Community contribution of all the beneficiaries in an aggregate form, based on the information provided in Form C (Annex VI of the Grant Agreement) by each beneficiary.

The "Explanation of use of resources" requested in the Grant Agreement for personnel costs, subcontracting, any major costs (ex: purchase of important equipment, travel costs, large consumable items) and indirect costs, have now to be done within the Forms (user guides are accessible within the Participant Portal)⁵.

When applicable, certificates on financial statements shall be submitted by the concerned beneficiaries according to Article II.4.4 of the Grant Agreement.

Besides the electronic submission, Forms C as well as certificates (if applicable), have to be signed and sent in parallel by post.

The following table is required only for the funding schemes for Research for the benefit of SMEs

THE TRANSACTION

Please provide a list of the actual cost incurred by the RTD performers during the performance of the work subcontracted to them. These costs refer only to the agreed '**Transaction**'.

Name of RTD Performer	Number of person months	Personnel Costs (€)	Durable equipment	Consumables	Computing	Overhead Costs (€)	Other Costs (€)	Total by RTD performer
TOTAL								

⁵ In the past, the explanation of use of resources requested in the Grant Agreement was done within a table in this section. The merge of this table within the Forms C was a measure of simplification aimed at avoiding duplication and/or potential discrepancies between the data provided in the table 'Explanation of use of resources' and the data provided in the Forms C.

IMPORTANT:

Form C varies with the funding scheme used. Please make sure that you use the correct form corresponding to your project (Templates for Forms C are provided in Annex VI to the Grant Agreement). An example for collaborative projects is enclosed hereafter.

A Web-based online tool for completing and submitting forms C is accessible via the Participant Portal: <http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal>, (except for projects managed by DG MOVE and ENER).

If some beneficiaries in security research have two different rates of funding (part of the funding may reach 75%⁶) then two separate financial statements should be filled by the concerned beneficiaries and two lines should be entered for these beneficiaries in the summary financial report.

⁶ Article 33.1 of the EC FP7 rules for participation - REGULATION (EC) No 1906/2006.

FP7 - Grant Agreement - Annex VI - Collaborative Project

Form C - Financial Statement (to be filled in by each beneficiary)

Project nr	nnnnnn	Funding scheme	Collaborative Project
Project Acronym	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx		
Period from	dd/mm/aa	Is this an adjustment to a previous statement ?	Yes/No
To	dd/mm/aa		
Legal Name		Participant Identity Code	nn
Organisation short Name		Beneficiary nr	nn
Funding % for RTD activities (A)		If flat rate for indirect costs, specify %	%

1- Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rate/scale of unit (in €)

	Type of Activity				TOTAL (A+B+C+D)
	RTD (A)	Demonstration (B)	Management (C)	Other (D)	
Personnel costs					
Subcontracting					
Other direct costs					
Indirect costs					
Lump sums/flat-rate/scale of unit declared					
Total					
Maximum EC contribution					
Requested EC contribution					

2- Declaration of receipts

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement ?
If yes, please mention the amount (in €)

Yes/No

3- Declaration of interest yielded by the pre-financing (to be completed only by the coordinator)

Did the pre-financing you received generate any interest according to Art. II.19 ?
If yes, please mention the amount (in €)

Yes/No

4. Certificate on the methodology

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art. II.14.1 ?

Yes/No

Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art. II.4.4 ?

Yes/No

Name of the auditor		Cost of the certificate (in €), if charged under this project	
----------------------------	--	--	--

5- Certificate on the financial statements

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4 ?

Yes/No

Name of the auditor		Cost of the certificate (in €)	
----------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--

6- Beneficiary's declaration on its honour

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art. II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art. II.19 of the grant agreement ;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

Beneficiary's Stamp	Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement
	Date & signature

FP7 - Grant Agreement - Annex VI - Collaborative Project

Form C - Financial Statement (to be filled in by Third Party) Only applicable if special clause nr 10 is used

Project nr	nnnnnn	Funding scheme	Collaborative Project
Project Acronym	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx		
Period from	dd/mm/aa	Is this an adjustment to a previous statement ?	Yes/No
To	dd/mm/aa		
3rd party legal Name			
3rd party Organisation short Name		Working for beneficiary nr	nn
Funding % for RTD activities (A)		If flat rate for indirect costs, specify %	%

1- Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rate/scale of unit (in €)

	Type of Activity				TOTAL (A+B+C+D)
	RTD (A)	Demonstration (B)	Management (C)	Other (D)	
Personnel costs					
Subcontracting					
Other direct costs					
Indirect costs					
Lump sums/flat-rate/scale of unit declared					
Total					
Maximum EC contribution					
Requested EC contribution					

2- Declaration of receipts

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement ?

Yes/No

If yes, please mention the amount (in €)

3- Declaration of interest yielded by the pre-financing (to be completed only by the coordinator)

Did the pre-financing you received generate any interest according to Art. II.19 ?

Yes/No

If yes, please mention the amount (in €)

4. Certificate on the methodology

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art. II.14.1 ?

Yes/No

Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art. II.4.4 ?

Yes/No

Name of the auditor		Cost of the certificate (in €), if charged under this project	
----------------------------	--	--	--

5- Certificate on the financial statements

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4 ?

Yes/No

Name of the auditor		Cost of the certificate (in €)	
----------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--

6- Beneficiary's declaration on its honour

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;

- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art. II.17 of the grant agreement;

- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art. II.19 of the grant agreement ;

- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

Beneficiary's Stamp	Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement
	Date & signature

FP7 - Grant Agreement - Annex VI - Collaborative Project

Summary Financial Report - Collaborative Project- to be filled in by the coordinator													
Project acronym		xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx			Project nr		nnnnnn		Reporting period from		dd/mm/aa	to:	dd/mm/aa
Funding scheme		CP			Type of activity								
Beneficiary n°	If 3rd Party, linked to beneficiary	Adjustment (Yes/No)	Organisation Short Name	RTD (A)		Demonstration (B)		Management (C)		Other (D)			
				Total	Max EC Contribution	Total	Max EC Contribution	Total	Max EC Contribution	Total	Max EC Contribution		
1													
2													
3													
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													
21													
22													
23													
24													
25													
TOTAL													
Requested EC contribution for the reporting period (in €)													