

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION  
ARLINGTON, VA 22230



Office of  
Inspector General

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 11, 1994

FROM: \_\_\_\_\_, Special Agent

VIA: \_\_\_\_\_, Special Agent-in-Charge  
Investigations Section

SUBJECT: Possible Duplicate Funding to

TO: Case No. I93110045

The Audit Section of the National Science Foundation (NSF) Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducted a Financial and Compliance Examination of \_\_\_\_\_ Among the questioned costs found in the Examination were salary costs that had transferred from a National Institute for \_\_\_\_\_ contract to NSF award ATM- \_\_\_\_\_ because of cost overruns. The Audit Section requested that the Investigations Section conduct a review of \_\_\_\_\_ because many of their awards seemed similar in nature.

The following proposals<sup>1</sup> were reviewed:

	Agency	Date	Amount	Title
	NASA	██████████ 9	\$ ██████████	
ATM-	NSF	██████████	\$ 50,000	

<sup>1</sup>NSF jackets were returned to the appropriate office. Copies of all other reviewed proposals are in the file.

	ARPA	[REDACTED]	\$ 50,000
ATM-	NSF	[REDACTED]	\$ 50,000
	NASA	[REDACTED] 1	Decline
ATM-	NSF	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] 8
ISI-	NSF	[REDACTED]	\$220,000
	NASA	[REDACTED]	
III-1	NSF	[REDACTED]	\$250,000
III-1	NSF	[REDACTED]	Withdraw
III-1	NSF	[REDACTED]	Decline
	NASA	[REDACTED]	
III-1	NSF	[REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]

Our review found that the proposals, while being similar, are not duplicative. For the most part, they are complimentary proposals which build upon previous research. Only two funded proposals could be considered somewhat equivalent. They are NASA contract for [REDACTED] awarded

in [REDACTED] and the ARPA contract for [REDACTED] awarded in [REDACTED]. The ARPA proposal lists the NASA contract under Pending Support and includes a project summary of the NASA contract. As ARPA was aware of the NASA contract

and its contents, we must assume that the proposals were determined to be nonduplicative.

As we found no indication of duplicate funding and the inappropriate transfer of funds is being handled by the Audit Section, further investigation is not warranted at this time.

This case is closed.