

Annual Budgeting 2025

Appeals Panel

Minutes

12th May Meeting, 2-4:30pm, held in Meeting Room 7, Beit Building, South Kensington

Appeals panel: Cat Turhan — Director of Membership Services (*chair*)
Christian Cooper — Deputy President (Clubs & Societies)
Stephanie Yeung — Deputy President (Finance & Services)
Robert Fenner — Activities Manager
Lucy Brown — Activities Manager

In attendance: Nathalie Tedfors-Lindell — Arts & Entertainments Chair (*minutes 3-10*)

1. *Note: for the purposes of record keeping, section titles in these minutes are formatted as "SECTOR PREFIX Committee (Centre) (Budget ID)", e.g. "REA Ferret Fanciers (170) (803)"*

Welcome

2. The Chair welcomed the panel and noted their thanks for the work of the committee on annual budgeting so far.
3. The panel noted that MG representatives were invited to attend and that they would be joined by the representative for Arts & Entertainments Sector. Written representations had been submitted by the Arts & Entertainments Sector and Sport Sector. Written submissions were included in the paper pack.

Arts & Entertainments Representation

4. Nathalie Tedfors-Lindell (NTL) presented a verbal summary of appeals on behalf of Arts & Entertainments Sector.
5. The appeals panel heard evidence in support of the appeals for Dance, K-Pop and Live Music, in addition to previously submitted written support of other appeals.
6. In relation to Dance society: The panel asked whether, in cases that the total grant cannot be increased for a given society, whether un-restricting grant for various uses would be an acceptable outcome for an appeal, to which NTL agreed.
7. In relation to K-Pop: NTL noted that K-Pop had been in touch with the team regarding an administrative error in scaling. The panel noted that this had been the case.
8. In relation to K-Pop: NTL noted that they supported the funding of props and dance outfits. The panel asked whether funding this for K-Pop would be un-equitable to other dance societies who were also denied this funding, to which NTL agreed.
9. In relation to Live Music: NTL expressed strong support for the appeal. The panel discussed the need to clarify how equipment for Arts & Entertainments CSPs should be funded in future years, noting that the principles were primarily modelled on sports clubs. The panel agreed to discuss this with CSPB for future years.

10. NTL noted that the timeframes for MG involvement in appeals were not sufficient. The panel acknowledged this and agreed that timeframes should be increased in future years, also noting that a full evaluation would take place, both as part of CSPB and staff-led reviews.
11. The panel thanked NTL for their written and verbal submissions.

Appeals Submitted Without Information

12. The panel noted that a total of 68 appeals had been received.
13. The panel noted that 7 appeals were submitted with no appeal information or additional submissions. **The panel resolved to reject the appeals of:**
 - ICSMSU Jiu Jitsu (Aiuchi) (665)
 - ICSMSU Muslim Medics (687)
 - KND Debating (225)
 - KNE Environmental (227)
 - KNE Sign Language (464)
 - NAI Nepali (N17)
 - SPF American Football (O59)**on the basis that no appeals information had been submitted.**
14. The panel noted that 1 appeal had been submitted by Arts & Entertainments Sector (400) as a test. **The panel resolved to reject this appeal on the basis that this was a system test, not a genuine appeal.**

General Discussion

15. The panel considered the importance of following the Annual Budgeting Principles as well as ways of ensuring fairness during appeals.
16. **The panel resolved to not make any decision that would retroactively decrease a CSP's grant allocation.** The panel agreed that decisions like these would be reserved for the Union's Board of Trustees and/or Finance, Audit & Risk Committee.
17. The panel noted that in all appeals, they must not allocate more than the upper limit of grant allocation set by CSPB.

AED Dance (108) (844)

18. The panel noted that CSP did not sufficiently differentiate their instructors, preventing the Annual Budgeting Committee from allocating grant effectively. Nevertheless, the panel noted the validity of the appeal in respect to lack of information provided by the committee.
19. The panel discussed Dance's grant allocation in the context of the wider ICU grant allocation, noting that the CSP has received 2.5% of ICU's total available CSP grant.
20. The committee agreed that whilst the appeal creates a case for re-distributing the CSPs grant allocation, the appeal does not provide sufficient evidence for increasing the CSPs total grant.
21. **The committee partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. The CSP will be permitted to use all competition-related grant for all competitions, at the CSP's discretion.
 - b. The CSP will not receive additional grant.

AED Dance Company (759) (973)

22. The panel agreed that line 13736 was subject to administrative error, and that the allocation should have been made as a percent of total expenditure instead of as a percent of grant requested.
23. The panel disagreed with the appeal regarding the CSP's second competition on the basis that insufficient information was provided by the CSP in the budget, and that the exact same descriptions were used for both competitions.
24. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. Line 13736 will be updated to % of total expenditure.

AED Funkology (680) (963)

25. The panel discussed the appeal, noting that the comments by the Annual Budgeting Committee referenced "no breakdown provided".
26. The panel noted that the comments were intended to convey that no explanation regarding the expense, including the location and method of travel, were provided, but that the CSP had understood it to mean a per-unit breakdown.
27. The panel noted that the budget comments should be clarified in future, however they disagreed with the appeal on the basis that the CSP did not provide sufficient information in their budget.
28. The panel also noted the second query which formed the appeal, regarding instructor costs. The panel agreed that the revised maximum amount, of 50% of total expenditure, was allocated to the CSP therefore the panel had no power to further increase this.
29. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

AED K Pop (426) (1103)

30. The panel discussed the appeal, including the verbal submission from Arts & Entertainments Sector.
31. The panel agreed that the CSP had been subject to an administrative error regarding scaling.
32. The panel agreed that the CSP had been subject to an administrative error regarding instructor fees, although the panel disagreed with the proposed amount by the CSP.
33. The panel disagreed with funding the outfits on the basis that funding them would be unequitable to other dance groups subject to the same decision. The panel noted that this principle should be explicitly considered by CSPB next academic year.
34. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. The scale factor for the CSP's budget will be set to 1 (i.e. removed)
 - b. The instructor grant will be increased to £150.

AED Live Music (413) (917)

35. The panel discussed the appeal, including the verbal submission from Arts & Entertainments Sector.
36. The panel agreed that the policy points reference by the CSP do not explicitly prohibit this grant allocation, therefore the panel is to decide whether the decision made was unjust, rather than whether the policy itself prohibits it.

37. The panel agreed with the verbal evidence from Arts & Entertainments, that equipment grant was modelled around sports and that this principle needs updating to reflect Arts & Entertainment spending.
38. The panel considered that the CSP charge other CSPs for access and usage of their equipment.
39. The panel also considered the lack of breakdown provided by the CSP and noted the inherent variability of the expenses.
40. The panel noted that approximately £300 had been spent on maintenance and repairs by the CSP this academic year to date. The panel agreed that most spending was therefore new equipment purchase rather than repairs.
41. The panel agreed that, in the context of high variability and the fact that the CSP charges for use of their equipment, that funding this expense through grant does not constitute an effective use of ICU funds. The panel agreed that ad-hoc equipment should be funded through self-generated income and/or external funding sources (such as the Harlington Fund).
42. The panel noted that CSPB reserves the right to amend the principles to explicitly provide for Arts & Entertainments ad-hoc equipment in future.
43. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

AEMU Chamber Music (412) (916)

44. The panel noted that the CSP's grant allocation was not scaled and thus their appeal lacked basis.
45. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

AEMU Sinfonietta (402) (910)

46. The panel noted the comments provided by the Arts & Entertainments Sector, with which the panel agreed.
47. The panel agreed that music hire was subject to an administrative error.
48. The panel disagreed with the rest of the appeal on the basis that the CSP failed to provide sufficient information in their budget.
49. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. Music hire will be amended to a % of total expenditure allocation.

CGCU Motor Club (611) (931)

50. The panel noted that the comments provided by the Annual Budgeting Committee on the budget explained why the appealed line had not received an allocation.
51. The panel agreed that the CSP had not provided information in their appeal to dispute the comments by the committee.
52. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

CGCU Rail and Transport Society (282) (976)

53. The panel noted that the appeal provides evidence that the scaling applied by the Annual Budgeting Committee was unjust.
54. **The panel upheld the appeal.**

- a. The CSP will receive an allocation of 35% of the total expenditure for line 13512, in line with the modified maximum grant cap for travel expenditure.

CGCU Space Society (629) (985)

55. The panel discussed the appeal, which contained numerous independent aspects.
56. The panel agreed that line 14852 should be funded, in line with the appeal.
57. The panel considered that the appeal references the unfairness of 1/3 scaling on the 3 major projects. The panel considered the view of the Annual Budgeting Committee that without the 1/3 factor, a theoretically unlimited number of projects would be fundable, and that the factor referenced the committee's wish to fund all projects but to spread the funding equitably.
58. The panel noted that the general scaling factor applied to the CSP was correctly calculated and that the CSP's budgeted expenditure exceeded current and historic expenditure. The panel noted that should the CSP wish to expand operations they may apply for ADF funding.
59. On balance, the panel agreed that the scaling applied by the Annual Budgeting Committee was proportionate and fair.
60. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. The CSP will receive transport funding at 30% of the total cost for line 14852.

CGCU VVMC (614) (933)

61. The panel discussed the argument presented by the CSP that stock material in the context of the vintage vehicles constitutes maintenance and repair as opposed to a consumable. The panel agreed with the argument presented by the CSP.
62. The panel noted that, at the time of allocation, the Annual Budgeting Committee understood that the vintage vehicles were covered under Imperial College's insurance policies, but that the appeal provides sufficient grounds to reconsider this assumption. The panel agreed that the requested, additional insurance policy should be funded, subject to confirmation that the "cherished salvage" clause could not be included in the current Imperial-wide policy.
63. **The panel upheld the appeal.**
 - a. Lines 16356 and 16357 are to be increased to 40% of total expenditure (for equipment).
 - b. The insurance policy is to be funded at 100% (under mandatory insurance) subject to confirmation of the existing Imperial insurance policy.

CFCO Mindfulness (495) (1134)

64. The panel noted that the CSP is requesting grant be provided for food and drink, with the justification that this is required for the core activity of the CSP.
65. The panel disagreed with the assertion that food and drink are core for Mindfulness society and agreed with the original decision of the Annual Budgeting Committee.
66. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

CFF Jain Society (451) (1092)

67. The panel noted that the CSP does not have sufficient expenditure to warrant removing the scale factor applied by the Annual Budgeting Committee and that the scaling factor was proportionate.

68. The panel acknowledged that the CSP is intending on expanding and noted that ADF funding exists explicitly to support this. The panel encourages the CSP to apply for ADF funding to support their expansion next academic year.
69. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

CTM Iran (310) (1082)

70. The panel noted that the evidence provided by the CSP supported their appeal.
71. The panel also noted that the CSP appears to have been subjected to an administrative error where grant was allocated as a percent of grant requested rather than as a percent of total expenditure.
72. **The panel upheld the appeal.**
 - a. The scale factor will be amended to 100% (i.e. no scaling)

CTN Bulgarian (345) (1037)

73. The panel considered the argument presented by the CSP that members have historically covered expenditure outside of the Union. The panel rejected this argument on the basis that without expenditure running through the Union, the committee cannot determine the validity of the budget, and that the CSP can apply for ADF funding to expand activity next year.
74. The panel also considered the argument presented by the CSP that food is core to their activity. Whilst the panel acknowledged the argument presented by the CSP; the panel rejected this argument on the basis that the CSP had failed to demonstrate the explicit significance of food to the cultural experience and that the CSP can conduct cultural celebrations and community events without funded food.
75. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

CTN Romanian (343) (1027)

76. The panel considered the argument presented by the CSP regarding total scaling. The panel rejected this argument on the basis that the CSP over-reported expenditure.
77. The panel also considered the argument presented by the CSP that food is core to their activity. Whilst the panel acknowledged the argument presented by the CSP; the panel rejected this argument on the basis that the CSP had failed to demonstrate the explicit significance of food to the cultural experience and that the CSP can conduct cultural celebrations and community events without funded food.
78. The panel considered the argument presented by the CSP regarding ice skating and bowling events. Whilst the panel acknowledged the argument presented by the CSP; the panel rejected this argument on the basis that these events are not core to the existence of a Romanian society and rather beneficial community events which should be funded by members.
79. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

ICSMSU Coding Society (747) (1089)

80. The panel noted that the CSP has provided no evidence in their appeal to support the appeal. The panel also noted that following a period of inactivity the CSP can apply for ADF

funding to expand their activity, but that grant funding must be allocated based upon historic spending and data to support the budget.

81. The panel noted that the budget was scaled, but that this cannot be repealed on the basis provided.
82. The panel agreed with the Annual Budgeting Committee that website costs and Canva purchase were not core activity.
83. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

ICSMSU Exec (655) (947)

84. The panel considered the appeal notes regarding equitability and the intent of CSPB's policy decisions. The panel accepted the argument that the policy in its current form failed to consider the difference in sizes of the CU's, however the panel determined that this was outside the scope of their decision-making power, and that CSPB reserves the right to amend the policy.
85. The panel reviewed the individual requests in the ICSMSU Exec budget, noting that, of the lines that requested funding but didn't receive any, only two were not for drinking events or prizes. These two lines were 16006 (puppy therapy) and 16174 (freshers' fortnight non-drinking event), who's total cost summed to £1550 — less than the community funding allocated to the CU.
86. Additionally, the panel considered line 16227 (fresher bursary). The panel agreed that, whilst this is a positive initiative, ICU grant cannot be used to fund this as it contributes primarily to alcohol-related events.
87. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

ICSMSU Football (656) (948)

88. The panel accepted the argument provided by the CSP with respect to the higher than usual costs for instructors provided by IC Football, however the panel agreed that IC Football provided justification for the costs and that the role of the appeals panel was not to retroactively decrease grant allocations.
89. The panel rejected the LUSL referees on the basis that all sports clubs were provided 1 entry fee per team, and that additional entry fees are deemed as optional, despite being core to the club.
90. The panel agreed with the costs stated for transport.
91. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. The CSP will receive transport funding at 35% of the total cost for line 15972.

ICSMSU Hockey (664) (952)

92. The panel considered the appeal based on the CSP not being able to provide a breakdown at the point of submitting the budget.
93. The panel agreed that whilst the CSP couldn't give a full breakdown, an indicative summary could have been provided.
94. The panel noted that neither ICSM Women's Hockey nor IC Hockey had keeper kit funded, and that it would be unequitable to fund kit for ICSM Men's Hockey.
95. The panel agreed that the CSP would have a case for a Harlington application and agreed to recommend this to the CSP.

96. The panel also noted that they will investigate the ADF response/recommendation, and update guidance accordingly.
97. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

ICSMSU Music (679) (962)

98. The panel accepted that the comparison between ICSM Music and other music societies was incompatible, however the panel rejected that the grant allocation itself was unjust.
99. The panel agreed that the appeal and original budget did not provide sufficient justification as to why the CSP requires separate concerts for each ensemble, given that the same venue is requested for all.
100. The panel agreed, however, that the CSP should be permitted to choose which groups they fund within their grant allocation.
101. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. The panel agreed to allow the CSP to utilise funding for any groups, but not to increase the total amount of funding.

ICSMSU Prosthetics (718) (1135)

102. The panel agreed that the budget appears to have been subject to an administrative error, and that the intent of the Annual Budgeting Committee was to fund the requested lines as consumables.
103. **The panel upheld the appeal.**
 - a. All requests will be funded at 30% for consumables, up to £231.49 (the request).

ICSMSU Rugby (671) (958)

104. The panel noted the submission provided by the CSP. The panel agreed that the CSP failed to provide sufficient justification at the budget-creation stage regarding the high ground hire fees. The panel agreed with the decision of the Annual Budgeting Committee to allocate an equitable amount of funding compared to IC Rugby.
105. The panel rejected the appeals for lines 16044 and 16049 on the basis that the maximum amount was received.
106. The panel rejected the appeal for line 16052 on the basis that the use of Ubers is not justified sufficiently, and that other modes of transport can be used for members who cannot fit within a minibus.
107. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

ICSMSU Tennis (669) (956)

108. The panel agreed that an administrative error had led to the decreased allocation, as the line was coded as equipment purchase by the CSP but allocated in line with consumables.
109. The panel agreed that as a mandatory consumable this was eligible for 40% funding.
110. **The panel upheld the appeal.**
 - a. Line 15979 will be funded at 40% of the total cost.

ICSMSU Weights & Fitness (689) (968)

111. The panel noted that the original decision by the committee appears to have been subject to an administrative error.

- 112. The panel, however, noted that the Charing Cross gym has been closed and the equipment cannot currently be used and therefore the panel agreed to uphold the decision of the committee.
- 113. The panel noted that the CSP should be contacted by the Activities Team to assess their activity and current situation without access to the gym.
- 114. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

NAI Karate (015) (818)

- 115. The panel noted that the CSP, at the time of budget submission, did not have over 20 members and therefore is not eligible for grant funding.
- 116. The panel noted that the CSP is new and therefore will be eligible for ADF funding next academic year to kick-start their activity, before receiving annual grant next year.
- 117. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

RCSU RCS Motor (640) (940)

- 118. The panel agreed with the appeal on the basis that machining stock constitutes equipment purchase in the context of a vintage vehicle.
- 119. **The panel upheld the appeal.**
 - a. Line 13062 will be funded in line with equipment purchase.

REA Alternative Music (205) (861)

- 120. The panel noted that the Annual Budgeting Principles do not provide funding for attending gigs/shows, and that the amendment of such principles is reserved for CSPB.
- 121. The panel rejected the appeal on the basis that attending a gig/show does not provide a unique aspect of the student experience as this can be done by an individual not part of the society.
- 122. Additionally, the panel noted that the CSP should be able to receive group, educational or charity discounts to events which can support their activity.
- 123. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

REA AnimeSoc (207) (862)

- 124. The panel considered whether performance as a band was core the CSP. The panel noted that, whilst the CSP has a band, this is not core as the CSP is a recreation appreciation society, not a performance group.
- 125. The panel agreed that line 15027 was valid as equipment purchase.
- 126. The panel rejected the appeal for MCM ComicCon as the principles do not provide funding for attending an event such as this.
- 127. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. Line 15027 will receive funding under equipment purchase.

REA ArtSoc (209) (863)

- 128. The panel noted that the Annual Budgeting Principles do not provide funding for attending shows/musicals, and that the amendment of such principles is reserved for CSPB.

- 129. The panel rejected the appeal on the basis that attending a show/musical does not provide a unique aspect of the student experience as this can be done by an individual not part of the society.
- 130. Additionally, the panel noted that the CSP should be able to receive group, educational or charity discounts to events which can support their activity.
- 131. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

REA Rock and Metal (265) (876)

- 132. The panel noted that the Annual Budgeting Principles do not provide funding for attending gigs/shows, and that the amendment of such principles is reserved for CSPB.
- 133. The panel rejected the appeal on the basis that attending a gig/show does not provide a unique aspect of the student experience as this can be done by an individual not part of the society.
- 134. Additionally, the panel noted that the CSP should be able to receive group, educational or charity discounts to events which can support their activity.
- 135. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

REA SCC Film (232) (979)

- 136. The panel noted that the Annual Budgeting Principles do not provide funding for attending films, and that the amendment of such principles is reserved for CSPB.
- 137. The panel rejected the appeal on the basis that attending a film does not provide a unique aspect of the student experience as this can be done by an individual not part of the society.
- 138. Additionally, the panel noted that the CSP should be able to receive group, educational or charity discounts to events which can support their activity.
- 139. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

REE Canoe (105) (841)

- 140. The panel rejected the appeal for fuel, agreeing that the costs were representative.
- 141. The panel accepted the appeal for kayaks and related equipment (12904, 12906, 12911) on the basis that the appeal justified why these were a yearly cost.
- 142. The panel discussed the health & safety implications of repairing canoes, noting that the CSP have been informed they should not be doing this. The panel also considered the implication of purchasing second hand kayaks vs new.
- 143. The panel agreed that the CSP should purchase new equipment, on the basis of safety, unless they provide sufficient justification/evidence from their NGB as to the efficacy of second-hand equipment.
- 144. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. 12904, 12906, 12911 are to be funded under equipment purchase.

REE Gliding (112) (846)

- 145. The panel agreed that there was an administrative error for line 14749, that a comment was not provided.
- 146. The panel considered the validity and impact of this line on the budget.

147. The panel agreed that, whilst the line was valid under the CSPB principles, the implications of the total cost on the CSP grant budget, within the wider context of all CSPs, was too high to justify the cost. As such, the panel agreed that members will need to pay this cost.
148. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

REE Skydiving (117) (848)

149. The panel rejected the appeal for increasing equipment funding on the basis that the maximum funding was provided by the Annual Budgeting Committee, and that CSPB reserve the right to amend the principles.
150. The panel rejected the appeal for the annual trip on the basis that no international trips can be funded through grant, and that this must be covered by members, as it does not constitute an effective use of ICU funds to fund international trips. The panel noted that external funding sources such as the “Trips Fund” exist to support this activity.
151. The panel also noted concerns regarding the ownership of parachutes by the CSP and that this will be followed up by the Activities Team.
152. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

REE Surfing (685) (965)

153. The panel rejected the appeal for the international tour on the basis that no international trips can be funded through grant, and that this must be covered by members, as it does not constitute an effective use of ICU funds to fund international trips. The panel noted that external funding sources such as the “Trips Fund” exist to support this activity.
154. The panel rejected the appeal for the BUCS fuel money on the basis that the CSP failed to provide sufficient information at the budgeting stage, and this is not an unjust process or error on the part of the committee.
155. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

REE Underwater (126) (853)

156. The panel accepted that there was an administrative error regarding the description on line 16116, however the panel agreed with the Annual Budgeting Committee’s decision on the allocation.
157. The panel discussed the benefits of contributing to the boat and compressor funds. The panel agreed that, whilst the line was valid under the CSPB principles, the implications of the total cost on the CSP grant budget, within the wider context of all CSPs, was too high to justify the cost. As such, the panel agreed that members will need to pay this cost.
158. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

REE Wakeboarding (137) (857)

159. The panel rejected the appeal for the scaling factor on the basis that it is not an acceptable justification for funds to be run outside of the Union, and that all funds must run through the Union.
160. The panel rejected the appeal regarding ABCEX scaling on the basis that the apparent miscalculation was a result of grant caps that were introduced during the budgeting meetings, applied to all CSPs equally.

161. The panel agreed with the appeal regarding transport costs and agreed to increase the allocation for the minibus only.
162. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. Increase minibus funding in line with other CSPs.

REG Skate (124) (851)

163. The panel rejected the appeal on the basis that the error was on the part of the CSP, not the budgeting committee.
164. The panel agreed to allow the CSP to use grant funding for all budgeted activities, in effect un-ringfencing it.
165. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. Funding can be used for all budgeted core activity, but no increase to overall funding.

RSM Football (651) (945)

166. The panel rejected the appeal for line 15760 on the basis that justification was provided in the notes by the Annual Budgeting Committee, and that this justification was applied in line with all sports clubs.
167. The panel rejected the appeal for line 15841 on the basis that the maximum funding possible was allocated in line with updated grant caps.
168. The panel rejected the appeal for line 15825 on the basis that the lack of justification was a CSP error, not an error by the committee.
169. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPC ACC Netball (018) (821)

170. The panel rejected the appeal on the basis that all sports clubs were subject to the same rules regarding 1 team entry per team, and that LUSL is an extra entry that is optional for the club.
171. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPC ACC Volleyball (031) (830)

172. The panel discussed the appeal and noted that the total amount of funding received by the CSP was high.
173. The panel agreed that whilst the appeal provided justification for an external venue, the CSP already received funding for Ethos and that any additional facilities (due to high membership) should be covered by these members.
174. The panel agreed that, in the context of the wider ICU grant pot for CSPs, the CSP had received a generous allocation and that it did not constitute an effective use of resources to allocate further funding.
175. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPC Dodgeball (063) (1018)

176. The panel noted the appeal, and rejected the allegation against SPC Squash, on the basis that whilst the entries were funded in 1 line, only 1 of each of BUCS or LUSL is attended by any individual player. The panel noted that this is consistent with the rules applied to all sports clubs.

177. The panel rejected the appeal on the basis that the principles were applied equally to all sports clubs.

178. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPC Handball (060) (1008)

179. The panel rejected the appeal on the basis that the appeal justification was CSP error.

180. The panel also noted that resin was a consumable, in line with the original committee decision.

181. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPC Ice Hockey (134) (856)

182. The panel rejected the appeal for lines 13603 and 13614 on the basis that the maximum of 30% (under the revised principles) was already allocated.

183. The panel rejected the appeal for Varsity noting that, whilst they understand the positive impact of this event, this is non-core with regards to grant allocation. The panel noted that this principle had been applied to all sports clubs.

184. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPC Squash (027) (827)

185. The panel considered the appeal information provided and noted that most lines were allocated the maximum available under the revised principles.

186. The panel rejected the appeal on the basis that there was no evidence presented for an unjust process or error, and that the principles were applied in line with other sports clubs.

187. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPF ACC Womens Rugby (022) (824)

188. The panel considered the appeal for line 13993. The panel agreed with the appeal and the MG comments, that this appeared to be an administrative error.

189. **The panel upheld the appeal.**

a. Line 13993 will be funded in line with equipment.

SPF Cricket (007) (810)

190. The panel rejected with the appeals for ground hire on the basis that the maximum possible (30% of total expenditure) was allocated, in line with updated principles which were applied to all sports clubs equally.

191. The panel agreed with the appeal for match balls, noting that this is a required expense.

192. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**

a. Line 13275 to be funded at 40% in line with equipment.

SPF Football (001) (805)

193. The panel noted the appeal, and the MG comments provided.

194. The panel agreed with the MG comments, in full. The panel rejected all line appeals other than for line 13440.

195. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**

- a. Line 13440 to be funded at £95 in line with MG comments.

SPF Ultimate Frisbee (035) (832)

- 196. The panel noted the appeal and their empathy towards the high cost and financial viability of the sport.
- 197. The panel agreed that, unfortunately, insufficient evidence was provided to support these grant appeals and that allocations were made in line with other sports clubs.
- 198. The panel noted that they would recommend to CSPB to amend the principles to include provision for competitions like this CSP, however they noted that this is at CSPB's discretion.
- 199. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPF Womens Football (002) (806)

- 200. The panel rejected the appeal on the basis that no Futsal team was included in the core risk assessment and therefore funding cannot be provided.
- 201. The panel noted that ADF can be applied for next academic year to continue this activity, but the CSP's risk assessment and constitution must be updated fully before grant can be allocated.
- 202. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPF Yacht (034) (831)

- 203. The panel discussed the training courses. The panel agreed that the courses are a very high cost which constitute a large personal gain to the students that take part in them, however the restrictiveness of the course means that this is not accessible to a majority of members, and thus cannot be funded.
- 204. The panel noted that funding high-cost courses for a small number of students results in small reach of grant funding and does not constitute an effective use of resources in the wider context of the total CSP grant pot.
- 205. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

ACC Table Tennis (029) (829)

- 206. The panel rejected the appeal for equipment on the basis that insufficient information was provided by the CSP, and this was not an error on the part of the committee.
- 207. The panel rejected the appeal for funding of the international tour as no international trips are funded based on need and reach, and that this principle was applied consistently to all sports clubs.
- 208. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPI Archery (046) (836)

- 209. The panel agreed with the appeal for line 14637 based on administrative error.
- 210. The panel rejected the appeals for line 14631 due to not being able to fund one-off purchases, and line 14642 on the basis that no cost breakdown was provided.
- 211. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. Line 14637 to be funded in line with comments.

SPI Boat (006) (809)

- 212. The panel discussed the grant allocation for accommodation in the context of need and the wider context of the CSP grant pot.
- 213. The panel discussed the transport to Dorney Lake, and agreed that whilst this was a core activity, in the wider context of the grant allocation that the club received this should be funded by club income.
- 214. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPI Fencing (010) (813)

- 215. The panel discussed the accommodation and transport requests. The panel agreed that the reach of this funding and the need (in the context of the wider grant pot) was not sufficiently justified.
- 216. The panel rejected the equipment appeal on the basis that the lack of justification was an error on the part of the CSP not the committee.
- 217. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPI Pole & Aerial (165) (1035)

- 218. The panel rejected the appeal for line 14308 on the basis that similar platforms for classes are not funded for other sports clubs.
- 219. The panel rejected the appeal for line 14311 on the basis that the club received Harlington funding for new poles recently, and that the replacement of these is not a regular expense. The panel noted the MG comments and agreed that the examples of goalie kit for sports clubs were also not funded, in line with this.
- 220. The panel accepted the appeals for lines 14279 and 14319, agreeing with the MG comments.
- 221. **The panel partially upheld the appeal.**
 - a. Lines 14279 and 14319 to be funded in line with MG comments.

SPI Snowsports (025) (826)

- 222. The panel rejected the appeal for training weekends and travel on the basis that these were funded in line with other sports clubs, noting that weekends away are not fundable.
- 223. The panel rejected the appeal for instructors on the basis that the maximum was allocated (50% under the revised maximums).
- 224. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

SPM Ju-Jitsu (013) (816)

- 225. The panel considered the appeal information provided and agreed with the decision of the Annual Budgeting Committee.
- 226. No funding can be provided for training or courses for external instructors.
- 227. The panel noted that the CSP may pay the instructors per session for their service, but not fund their training and qualifications.
- 228. **The panel rejected the appeal.**

Any other business

- 229. The panel noted that the Silwood Exec budget was not input onto the system, but that the budget was agreed with the CU. The panel agreed to fund the CU in line with the agreed budget.

230. The panel noted that outcomes would be sent to CSPs via the budgeting tool on eActivities and the minutes of the meeting would be circulated with CSPB.

231. The chair thanked the panel for their time and contributions.

End of meeting.