

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20550



Office of
Inspector General

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 23, 1993 [REDACTED]
FROM: [REDACTED] SAC, Investigations Section
THRU: [REDACTED] Assistant Counsel to the IG
SUBJECT: Closeout Memorandum
TO: Case No. I92060015

In June 1992, we received anonymous allegations involving the possible misuse of NSF funds; specifically, NSF grant money for [REDACTED] being diverted from [REDACTED] Department to [REDACTED]. In addition, there were questions about the improper commingling of research funds because of conflicts of interest involving the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was alleged to have charged [REDACTED] inflated prices for a piece of [REDACTED] called [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was developed by a [REDACTED] Department Professor, [REDACTED], then refined and marketed by [REDACTED] and other [REDACTED] professors, consulted for [REDACTED].

By reviewing NSF funding history for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] we determined that NSF might have duplicately funded work relating to [REDACTED]. We also found that [REDACTED] had received SBIR awards from NSF and [REDACTED] related to [REDACTED]. During a technical review of the proposals submitted by both [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] department, we concluded that, while the proposals deal with one parallel programming language, each proposal deals with a different aspect of the application of [REDACTED] to a specific programming language.

¹Grant No. [REDACTED] " and [REDACTED]

²Grant No. [REDACTED]

³ [REDACTED]

Therefore, there was no duplication of funding by NSF and [REDACTED]. We have determined that Dr. [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] Department may have violated [REDACTED] policy dealing with outside employment.

During the course of our review, we determined that there is a very close relationship between [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] department. However, we have been unable to identify any misuse of NSF grant money. At our request, [REDACTED] conducted an inventory review of the [REDACTED] Department [REDACTED] equipment and the Department was able to account for all NSF funded equipment. [REDACTED] also sent copies of all licensing agreements between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. We concluded that the specific allegations, dealing with the illegal transfer of NSF grant money to [REDACTED] and the location of [REDACTED] workstations at [REDACTED], probably related to the exchange by [REDACTED] of computer equipment for software licenses.

A [REDACTED] panel considered potential conflicts of interest between [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] department in relation to an exchange of software licenses for [REDACTED]. The panel determined that a [REDACTED] policy was necessary to ensure the careful negotiation and independent review of complex transactions. However, the panel drew no conclusions regarding the propriety of the transaction because it was unable to clearly determine the value of the items exchanged.

I see no basis for further review. This case is hereby closed.