

CLOSEOUT FOR A01070027

On July 16, 2001, we received an allegation that a PI¹ (1) failed to declare all pending proposals and anticipated submissions on the *Current and Pending Support* forms for two proposals (Proposal-1² and Proposal-2³), and (2) failed to notify NSF of an award by a Foundation (Proposal-3⁴). Proposal-1 was declined and Proposal-2 was funded by NSF.

Allegation 1. Subject allegedly submitted inaccurate *Current and Pending Support* forms in two NSF proposals, each of which failed to mention the other. On Proposal-2, OIG determined that Subject followed NSF guidelines for *Current and Pending Support*: the Grant Proposal Guide (NSF 01-2, II.C.7) states that projects should be listed when they require a portion of the PI's time, and the FastLane Frequently Asked Questions webpage directs applicants not to fill out the form for projects on which they have no time commitment. Subject had no time commitment on Proposal-1. On Proposal-1, OIG determined that Subject's *Current and Pending Support* form should have listed Proposal-2 as a planned submission. However, failure to do so was plausibly an oversight. No pattern of inaccuracy was found on Subject's previous NSF proposals. OIG concluded that this matter did not rise to the level which would warrant a formal request for explanation.

Allegation 2. Subject allegedly failed to notify NSF of an award on Proposal-3, which was funded while Proposal-1 and Proposal-2 were under review by NSF. OIG determined that no such notification requirement is stated in the Grant Proposal Guide, the standard award letter, or the Grant General Conditions. However, if the possibility of duplicative funding should arise, it would be incumbent upon a PI to notify NSF and to discuss appropriate revisions in project scope. We determined that the PI on Proposal-1 notified the cognizant Program Officer of the award on Proposal-3. There was some overlap between these two proposals. With respect to Proposal-2, the PI (Subject) listed Proposal-3 under 'Current Grant Support' in an e-mail to the Program Officer prior to the PO's funding recommendation. This arguably constituted notification, which in any case is not required. OIG concluded that there was no substance to the allegation that Subject failed to inform NSF of an award.

This inquiry is closed and no further action will be taken.

cc: Investigations, IG

¹ [redacted]

² [redacted]

³ [redacted]

⁴ [redacted]