NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
ARLINGTON, VA 22230

Office of
Inspector General

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 30, 1995

FROM: [redacted] Special Agent

VIA: [redacted] Special Agent-in-Charge
Investigations Section

SUBJECT: Allegations of Receipt of Duplicate Funding by [redacted]

TO: Case No. I93080035

On August 13, 1993, we received an allegation of possible duplicate funding in the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program by [redacted] Inc.). Dr. [redacted] Program Manager in NSF's Division of Materials Research, told OIG he believed that NSF SBIR award no. [redacted] was funding the same research as that funded under the Office of Naval Research's (ONR) SBIR contract no. [redacted]. Prior to NSF's selecting the proposal for award, [redacted] in NSF's SBIR office had contacted [redacted] the principal investigator (PI) listed in the NSF proposal. Dr. [redacted] asked Ms. [redacted] to explain the differences, if any, between the already funded ONR research and the research proposed to NSF. Ms. [redacted] responded that the NSF research would explore other areas than the ONR-funded research, and explained the differences.

We obtained copies of the ONR proposal, contract, and final report, as well as the corresponding NSF documents (the submission of the NSF final report was pending at this time). At our request, Dr. [redacted] reviewed the ONR and NSF proposals. He found significant overlap between the two proposals, which was not identified by the company. Based on this finding, we reviewed seven other sets of SBIR proposals and final reports submitted by [redacted] to various government agencies, including NSF. We also reviewed proposals submitted by the principal investigator named in the original allegation, as well as proposals by other PIs employed by the company. We requested that several of these proposals and final reports also be reviewed by the appropriate NSF officials. This further review found that one other set of proposals contained significant overlap. However, the final reports which resulted from these awarded proposals showed that significantly different

research had in fact been carried out by the company under the two awards.

Upon receipt of the final report for award no. ___ __, we compared it with the final report submitted under ONR We found little or no overlap between these two reports, and thus no evidence to support the allegation of wrongdoing.

This case is closed.