

Annual Budgeting 2025

Appeals Pack

Monday 12th May 2025, 2-4pm
Meeting Room 7, Union Building

Total appeals: 60

Arts & Entertainments Sector (400)	8
CGCU (City & Guilds College)	4
Community Sector (755)	2
Culture Sector (300)	3
ICSMSU (School of Medicine)	9
NAI (New Activities Incubator)	1
RCSU (Royal College of Science)	1
Recreation Sector (100)	12
RSM (Royal School of Mines)	1
Sports Sector (000)	19

*An additional 7 appeals were submitted with **no notes and no form submissions**. These have been discounted due to lack of evidence. An additional appeal was submitted by Silwood Park Exec – this appeal is due to a delay in their grant allocation by ABC and thus ABC recommends that their grant be instated as planned with the Silwood Exec. This will be considered in AOB.*

Panel

Cat Turhan (<i>Chair</i>)	Director of Membership Services
Christian Cooper	Deputy President (Clubs & Societies)
Stephanie Yeung	Deputy President (Finance & Services)
Robert Fenner	Activities Manager
Lucy Brown	Activities Manager

Agenda

1	<i>Welcome & overview</i>	14:00	5 mins
2	Arts & Entertainments Sector (400)	14:05	15 mins
3	CGCU (City & Guilds College)	14:20	5 mins
4	Community Sector (755)	14:25	5 mins
5	Culture Sector (300)	14:30	5 mins
6	ICSMSU (School of Medicine)	14:35	10 mins
7	NAI (New Activities Incubator)	14:45	5 mins
8	RCSU (Royal College of Science)	14:50	5 mins
s9	Recreation Sector (100)	14:55	20 mins
10	RSM (Royal School of Mines)	15:15	5 mins
11	Sports Sector (000)	15:20	30 mins
12	<i>Any other business</i>	15:50	10 mins

AED Dance (108)

Arts & Entertainments Sector (400)

Total Expenditure: £ 72,166.67

Grant Requested: £ 30,730.00

Amount Allocated: £ 10,563.48

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/844>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Hi, I would like to appeal items 13055, 13057 and 13058. Rationale has been provided in the supporting form. As a brief explanation, our salsa and bachata performance instructor is different to that which hosts our social classes. For the latter, DCL is the main competition for the entire salsa and bachata part of the club, the other three funded are for ballroom and latin. Allocation for DCL is integral for internal budgeting.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Good afternoon,

I want to appeal regarding items 13055, 13057, 13058.

13055 relates to "Salsa and Bachata - Performance Team Training". The current description may omit a crucial piece of information regarding the instructor. It is important to note that it is a different individual from the one providing the social classes. Given the rationale by the committee, we deemed it important to clarify this point.

13057 and 13058 relate to the DCL, the only competition that one half of the club (Salsa and Bachata) compete in. Salsa and Bachata comprise the majority of our members, and a large cohort of members attend this competition every year (going back well before my time at Imperial). As such, we would ask budget be allocated to this. Alternatively, could we please have information on why this was not funded, even though it was before two other competitions that were allocated a grant? We would ask for a grant to be allocated towards DCL before others e.g., Southern Universities Dance Competition, and Bath Winter Competition, as they are core for the club.

AED Dance Company (759)

Arts & Entertainments Sector (400)

Total Expenditure: £ 13,895.30

Grant Requested: £ 6,049.56

Amount Allocated: £ 1,852.50

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/973>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Our accommodation grant allocation of 12% (30% of the 40% max under 17(1)) is insufficient for our largest annual expense. This subsidy is crucial for our two yearly competitions - our society's main purpose. With this reduced grant, we risk being unable to attend. Additionally, no grant was given for our second competition, despite Dance Company historically attending two competitions annually. Both competitions are essential to our society's function and we require grant support for each.

MG Comments

For line 13736 (2 Nights Accommodation Competition 1) it seems like the allocation is 30% of the initially requested grant rather than 30% of the expense, which is what the updated guidelines state is fundable. It seems that this is a simple administrative error. For the second portion of the appeal regarding the lack of funding for their second competition, the reasoning given by ABC is that there is no explanation for how it is separate from the other cost. However, in the past two years of budgeting, the different lines in their budget were only distinguished by a different title (i.e. Competition 1 vs. Competition 2) and both were considered fundable, and the values in this budget are identical because of the fact that they have used the same competition as the basis of estimating costs, which is clearly stated in the descriptions of the accommodation and entrance fee lines. Therefore, I believe that the lines of the budget are clearly referring to separate competitions and therefore should be grant fundable.

AED Funkology (680)

Arts & Entertainments Sector (400)

Total Expenditure: £ 4,394.00
Grant Requested: £ 2,466.80
Amount Allocated: £ 1,466.97

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/963>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ADDITIONAL INFO

I am appealing regarding the decision made for transport fees. The reason provided by Union for not granting us funding for this was that "no breakdown was provided". I am unable to provide a detailed breakdown for this as the expenditure of 1300 was a single payment made to the coach hire company for transport to and from Nottingham for the GHGH 2025 competition. An initial deposit of 260 was paid, followed by the remaining amount of 1040.

As transport fees to major competitions outside of London are a significant expense for our society, we would be really grateful if Union would be able to support us in any capacity.

I have another query regarding the amount allocated for Instructors for Weekly Foundation Classes. In the justification provided, it is stated that Union would agree to fund us 60% of the requested amount. However, only 50% has been provided. I would just like to check if there is an error here.

Thank you!

MG Comments

I believe they make a strong case in their appeal.

AED K Pop (426)

Arts & Entertainments Sector (400)

Total Expenditure: £ 5,060.00
Grant Requested: £ 2,442.60
Amount Allocated: £ 797.86

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1103>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Appeal 1: We were informed of a calculation error in the expenditure cap by Christian Cooper; the overall scaling is invalid and should be removed. Appeal 2: Dance props and outfits are unique per theme and not reused; new ones need to be purchased for competition every year. Under Principle 13, they qualify as consumables eligible for up to 30%. Appeal 3: Instructor fees were miscalculated — 5 sessions at £36 each should total £180, not £150. For more detail please check Microsoft form.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Appeal 1: Removal of Overall Scaling Factor Due to Expenditure Cap

Following a thorough investigation by the DPCS, Christian Cooper, it was confirmed that there was a calculation error in the application of the expenditure cap. As a result, we have been informed that the scaling applied is invalid and should be removed.

Appeal 2: Dance Props, Accessories, and Outfits

Each year, we perform multiple dances for various occasions. The props and outfits are specifically tailored to the concept of each song — such as cowboy, EDM party, or beach themes. We have not reused any competition concept in the past five years. Therefore, the dance outfits and props should be considered consumables. According to Annual Budgeting Principle 13, these items should be eligible for up to 30% of their total cost.

Appeal 3: Error in Instructor Fee Calculation

Based on the comments provided, K-Pop Society is eligible for a £36 grant per session (1 hour and 30 minutes). We submitted a breakdown of 5 sessions as a series of workshops over 5 weeks. Therefore, we should be eligible for a total of £180, rather than the £150 originally allocated.

AEE Live Music (413)

Arts & Entertainments Sector (400)

Total Expenditure: £ 8,560.00
Grant Requested: £ 3,604.00
Amount Allocated: £ 231.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/917>

APPEAL MESSAGE

We would like to appeal the decision to allocate £0 grant funding for our 'Equipment Maintenance and Replacement' line. The AB principles state in section 12 (5,6) that maintenance and equipment costs are eligible for grant funding at 50% (since adjusted to 40), whilst large equipment purchases, which are excluded from funding, are defined in section 11 (a) as 'equipment purchases which exceed £10,000 per year' - double our annual projected equipment spend.

ADDITIONAL INFO

We would like to appeal the decision to allocate £0 grant funding for our 'Equipment Maintenance and Replacement' line, on the basis of an unjust process. The AB principles state in section 12 (5,6) that maintenance and equipment costs are eligible for grant funding at 50% (since adjusted to 40), whilst large equipment purchases, which are excluded from funding, are defined in section 11 (a) as 'equipment purchases which exceed £10,000 per year' - double our total projected equipment spend for next year. Following these principles, and as all of this equipment is required for our core activity, the whole line should be eligible for 40% funding which would be our ideal outcome.

We recognise that there is no fully detailed breakdown provided, this is mainly due to the unpredictable and diverse nature of our maintenance costs. As we support a large number of musicians and performance types, we have a wide range of equipment to maintain, a breakdown of a year spending would be extensive and wouldn't fit in the word limit given for the initial budgeting. As our costs vary (due to the inability to predict when and what music equipment will need replacing/maintenance) it is more useful to look at average annual costs across years of normal societal activities (non-covid) to predict our future expenditure. Last year we spent £5104.53 on equipment purchase replacement/maintenance, 22/23: £4832.88, 21/22: £5290.40, 20/21 (main covid year): £2870.34, 19/20: £5789.67, 18/19: £6116.52 all excluding VAT.

Receiving grant funding for this line, our largest and most essential category of expenditure, ensures we can continue to provide high-quality, functional, and accessible performance opportunities and practice space to our members, and support other societies that rely on our gear. This plays a crucial role in sustaining Imperial's vibrant live music scene allowing it to continue for many years to come.

Thank you for your time reading this appeal!

AEMU Chamber Music (412)

Arts & Entertainments Sector (400)

Total Expenditure: £ 1,670.00
Grant Requested: £ 812.00
Amount Allocated: £ 438.59

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/916>

APPEAL MESSAGE

1) current expenditure estimate is inaccurate Firstly, one major expenditure is still pending in the claim process, tied to one of our ad-hoc concert event that created revenue beyond our expectation. Other core activity, masterclass and concert are in Term 3. Thus, our expected expenditure for this entire academic year would be the current estimate + 571.28 (claim) + 300 (masterclass) + 150 (venue). Hence, our total expenditure this year is approximately £1000 higher than the current estimate

ADDITIONAL INFO

We are appealing against the currently allocated grants because of the following:

1) Budget scaled to reflect actual expenditure of CSP => current expenditure is inaccurate

Our expenditure current to date is inaccurate of our previous 2-term spending, because one major expenditure (£571.28) is still pending in the claim process, tied to the Ghibli concert event. This expenditure is a result of the popular Ghibli concert created revenue beyond our expectation.

Also, due to hosting an extra major event early in Term 1, we have moved our other core activity (masterclass) to Term 3. Our planned flagship concert at external venue was also cancelled due to unavailability of venue (Holy Trinity Church) last term, and had to be moved to term 3.

Thus, our expected expenditure for this entire academic year would be the current estimate + 571.28 (claim) + 300 (masterclass) + 150 (concert venue). Hence, our total expenditure this year is approximately £1000 higher than the current estimate. Even without considering the claim from ad-hoc event, as a rapidly growing society, our expenditure this year would still be around £500 higher than the current estimate.

2) Justification for higher expenditure next year due to renovations projects at the college

We have explained this problem in the rationale of our original budget. The Blyth Centre has confirmed that the Read Lecture Theatre is unavailable from now on and remain unavailable throughout the next academic year. ICCMS normally stages four on-campus concerts there at zero cost. We now have to secure off-campus venues that:

- seat \geq 100,
- have access to tuned grand pianos
- accessible location to Imperial students

The most economic option we have is the Holy Trinity Church.

In the past few years, the chamber music society has aimed to run at least 3 concerts per year. (Excluding additional ad-hoc concert) Our concert usually lasts 2-3 hours including interval and set up time. Our quote this year for using the Holy Trinity Church is £75/hour, translating to £150-225 per concert. Please note that we may also have to resort to other venues depending on the church's availability, which is expected to lead to even higher costs.

In previous years, we usually have £0 venue cost for Winter and Summer Term, as Read Lecture Theatre was free of charge, and only pays the external venue fee in Spring Term; the additional venue cost is therefore an unavoidable new cost directly resulting from College renovations and outside the control of the society. We request that our situation can be considered as an exceptional circumstance, and require more than 40% to be covered by the grant, as it directly affects our most core activities.

MG Comments

With the method of calculating the upper limit of grant request, I believe that the greatest value would place their upper limit above their current grant request, and they should therefore not be subject to scaling.

AEMU Sinfonietta (402)*Arts & Entertainments Sector (400)*

Total Expenditure: £ 10,551.16

Grant Requested: £ 3,890.00

Amount Allocated: £ 2,251.92

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/910>

APPEAL MESSAGE

- Line ID 13170 Conductor Fees for Weekly Rehearsals: Sorry for not including hourly breakdown ! Weekly rehearsals are 2.5hrs long (18:30-21:00), so we would like to appeal for $2.5 * £40 * 25 * 60\% = £1,500$. - Line 13184 Music hire and printing: The comments say 'valid up to 50% under 12(5)', however the appeal amount is 40% of our 60%, working out to just 24% of the cost. We would like to appeal for 50% of £1050, so £525.

MG Comments

Instructor-related appeal I understand can not be upheld since they are appealing on the basis of having submitted incomplete information in initial budget. For music hire, I believe there has been a similar administrative error as for Dance Company, whereby 40% of grant request rather than 40% of cost has been taken as the fundable amount.

CGCU Motor Club (611)

CGCU (City & Guilds College)

Total Expenditure: £ 21,250.00

Grant Requested: £ 11,178.50

Amount Allocated: £ 6,645.21

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/931>

APPEAL MESSAGE

We made requests completely in line with annual budgeting principles, why have we been given 0% for the 24 hour race (ID16073)? It is the biggest event of the season and one that definitely comes under our core activity. Please revise this to be in line with the annual budgeting principles that we followed in our initial request.

CGCU Rail and Transport Society (282)

CGCU (City & Guilds College)

Total Expenditure: £ 2,058.00

Grant Requested: £ 682.50

Amount Allocated: £ 98.60

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/976>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Unjust process - 13512 Train Tickets. We do not see the logic in further downscaling of grant by (14/60). The activity is open to all 60 members on a first come first served basis. The amount requested is at a rate based on the cost of 14 train tickets, so effectively it has already been downscaled once over the cost of 60 train tickets. It is unfair to exponentially decrease subsidy by $(14/60)^2$ just because we are expecting to recruit more members.

CGCU Space Society (629)

CGCU (City & Guilds College)

Total Expenditure: £ 9,587.03

Grant Requested: £ 4,089.09

Amount Allocated: £ 748.82

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/985>

APPEAL MESSAGE

We wish to appeal to the allocated grant provided. Additional documentation detailing where we feel that this was unreasonable has been attached to the Appeals - Additional Information form.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Please view the attached file for further information.

UPLOADED FILE

CGCU VVMC (614)

CGCU (City & Guilds College)

Total Expenditure: £ 2,830.04

Grant Requested: £ 1,858.76

Amount Allocated: £ 808.19

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/933>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Appealing budget lines #16356, #16357, #16363 and #16375, see submitted appeals form for full details

ADDITIONAL INFO

As referenced in Appeals message, budget ID lines to be appealed are: #16356, #16357, #16363 and #16375.

#16356 - Machining Stock.

Reasoning:

ABC found Machining stock to be a consumable as once used to make a component it cannot be reused. The club is arguing that given the almost exclusive use of machining stock to create long term parts, the purpose of the stock - whilst consumable - is for the creation of long term repairs and part replacement which would otherwise be unfeasibly expensive to make. An example of a recent part is a T-bolt used to secure the water system, making this required some steel plate - which was consumed, but that part should last 10-20 years given adequate maintenance.

#16357 - Replacement Hardware.

Reasoning:

ABC found Replacement hardware to be a consumable. In the budget description, single-use copper crush washers are mentioned, presumably leading to this confusion. However the crush washer itself is not consumed and may last for far longer than a year, it is a mechanical part of Bo and must simply be replaced due when the relevant maintenance is done. Many other replacement hardware parts like bolts may last up to a decade or more, this budget line is for purchasing bulk quantities of these parts (ie. 250 crush washers) which lasts far longer than a year.

#16363 - Misc Consumables

Reasoning:

ABC capped Misc consumables to £30 in line with other budgets. For an inherently variable club like Team Bo, this hard cap for £30 for misc consumables is extremely limiting and doesn't adequately reflect the needs of the society. This line was perhaps badly named and should be called 'General Purpose consumables', as it was evidenced in claims that we spent the requested amount in various consumables, whilst it is possible to write down maybe specific examples, we felt that streamlining to reduce the amount of budget lines was beneficial to understanding and transparency in variable spending habits.

#16375 - Hagerty Insurance

Reasoning:

ABC found that the college vintage insurance would provide the necessary cover for Boanerges to drive. A poorly explained but crucial detail about the Hagerty insurance is the existence of a 'cherished salvage' clause, this essentially guarantees the rights of the 'scraps' for a vehicle written off by insurance, whereas normally the written-off vehicles scraps are owned by the insurer and able to be sold for a small profit, a 'cherished salvage' clause entitles the policy holder to their vehicles scraps so that they are able to be built up and driven on the road again after required repairs. This is crucial for a vehicle so unique as Bo, as the only remaining 1902 James and Browne, and potentially the only running (of two) remaining James and Browne's in the world, safeguarding

the uniqueness of this student vehicle is paramount to the club as there is no viable replacement (which would easily cost upwards of £150-200k if possible). We are therefore appealing this line as being required as it is not sensible to drive Bo without this. The Team Bo committee would be interested in collaborating with the Union to introduce a cherished salvage clause to the college's vintage insurance (which would also benefit RCS motor club and RSM motor club, though is less required due to their far sturdier nature, a 4 ton fire truck (Jez) and a 750kg steel and wood car (Bo) don't have the same impact resistance.) and allow for easier student access to driving and interacting with Bo, it was decided however that this policy change would likely not be in place in time for the 2025 November Brighton Run, Team Bo's 'flagship' event.

CFCO Mindfulness (495)*Community Sector (755)*

Total Expenditure: £ 191.67

Grant Requested: £ 191.67

Amount Allocated: £ 0.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1134>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Our budget was rejected with the reason "Food and drink is non core for mindfulness society". We don't feel this is accurate. Our core offering is weekly mindfulness sessions (~1hr) followed by tea and snacks (~30 mins). Since we've started offering tea and snacks, more people have stayed for the whole duration. The 30 minutes after the session is the time where we've fostered a sense of community. We'd appreciate some modest support for this.

CFF Jain Society (451)

Community Sector (755)

Total Expenditure: £ 2,846.75

Grant Requested: £ 975.00

Amount Allocated: £ 349.39

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1092>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ADDITIONAL INFO

Hi there, I by mistake clicked "Appeal", but didn't see the box to add my message below, apologies!

Thank you for your update regarding the annual budgeting grant allocation for Imperial Jain Society (CSP 451). We really do appreciate the effort your committee has made to review historical data and apply a consistent framework across societies.

We can understand the reasoning behind the 0.5 scaling factor - particularly the importance of aligning budgeted expenditure with historical spend. However, we'd be really grateful if you could kindly reconsider our case as a special exception, and below is our reasoning for the appeal. The historical figures, while accurate, do not reflect the transformation our society has undergone this year, nor the upward trajectory we are now on.

Over the past year, our committee has worked tirelessly to revive and grow the Imperial Jain Society from a small, inactive group into a vibrant and active community. Previous years understandably show low or no expenditure, but this was because Jain Society had unfortunately become dormant, and many students assumed there was no real presence. In fact, many Jain students told us they felt they had no choice but to join Hindu Society or others for cultural connection, simply because they believed Jain Society lacked the capacity to support them.

This year, we've changed that narrative. Through consistent planning - across each of the holiday periods too - and deep community engagement, we've increased membership by over 200%, organised regular impactful events, and secured strong ties with national bodies like the Jain Student Forum (JSF) UK and prominent Jain community leaders, such as Dr Sanghrajka MBE or the Institute of Jainology (IoJ). All our events welcome students of all backgrounds - including Buddhists, atheists, and others - who resonate with Jain values of peace, non-violence, and service. This makes our events so much more open and accessible, and any support you give will go a long way in our unique events.

Crucially, relying on this year's foundation, we're super happy to have built a strong committee for next year to continue this momentum. We've also built meaningful connections with multiple Jain temples and community groups to make sure our events are well-attended, sustainable, and inclusive. We have secured contacts at the V&A museum, at leading restaurants like Saravana Bhavan and representation with national organisations like Jain Student Association and Jain Student Forum UK.

The original scaled grant of £698.76 (before the 50% cap) is essential for us to maintain this growth. We genuinely believe this is a unique turning point for Imperial Jain Society - and just an additional £300-£400 would be really powerful. For a smaller society like ours, this funding makes the difference between running one or two good events versus maintaining a thriving and representative faith-based student community. Unlike larger, more established societies that may have access to multiple funding streams, we rely on this core grant to function, as much as we try to bring in sponsorships too.

We fully acknowledge and respect that your team has to work with data and fairness in mind, but we hope you can also see that this is a special situation - not one of over-inflation, but of passionate revival of Jain Society. We're excited that this year is not business as usual. It marks the first year in which Jain students at Imperial have had a space to celebrate their unique identity and faith on campus.

If possible, we would be incredibly grateful if the committee could kindly consider waiving the 50% scaling cap, and we would be more than happy to provide any further information or speak directly if needed to explain our case in more detail.

Thank you once again for your time and understanding you offer student societies.

Best wishes,

Imperial Jain Society Committee 2024–25

jainsociety@imperial.ac.uk

yash.r.shah23@imperial.ac.uk

CTM Iran (310)*Culture Sector (300)*

Total Expenditure: £ 4,188.65

Grant Requested: £ 610.75

Amount Allocated: £ 256.26

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1082>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Our society became an incubator following COVID. It only achieved full status last year. We request that those years be discounted from expenditure, as it is unjust to consider the time we were not a full society, as we could not spend anything. The current expenditure is not inflated; we are awaiting approval of PO #5047766 for £2400. We have liaised with finance regarding the delay (we presume annual budgeting season is the cause), which would bring expenditure up to the stated budget amount.

CTN Bulgarian (345)*Culture Sector (300)*

Total Expenditure: £ 833.33

Grant Requested: £ 250.00

Amount Allocated: £ 5.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1037>

APPEAL MESSAGE

We respectfully believe the budget reduction is unfair, as our low recorded spending reflects the lack of prior grant funding. Committee members have often covered costs personally, and members self-fund cultural outings. Celebrating our national day and cultural food are core to our society, as our constitution's sole aim is to promote Bulgarian culture and traditions. A £5 budget offers no meaningful support.

CTN Romanian (343)*Culture Sector (300)*

Total Expenditure: £ 1,603.33

Grant Requested: £ 500.16

Amount Allocated: £ 5.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1027>

APPEAL MESSAGE**ADDITIONAL INFO**

We would like to appeal the rejection of funding for our ice skating, bowling, and cultural food events, as well as the subsequent scaling down of our overall grant. These activities directly support our constitution's aims: to promote Romanian culture and create inclusive spaces for members to connect. Ice skating and bowling socials have been well-received in previous years, and cultural food plays a key role in engaging with Romanian traditions. Denying funding on the grounds that these are not "core activities" overlooks how clearly they align with our stated objectives. More concerningly, not only were these applications rejected, but we were further penalised through a scale-down — despite having no prior grant funding and relying on members to self-fund events. The resulting £5 grant allocation does not meaningfully support us in running any events, and effectively discourages us from applying for relevant, constitution-aligned activities.

ICSMSU Coding Society (747)*ICSMSU (School of Medicine)*

Total Expenditure: £ 1,280.68

Grant Requested: £ 473.34

Amount Allocated: £ 4.38

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1089>

APPEAL MESSAGE

During and following covid, we had a period of inactivity so it would be unjust to hold that against us and use as a marker or historic spending. Expenditure and costs have risen. This year was an outlier for low expenditure due to reduced pricing available through a Costco membership – budget shouldn't be viewed as inflated. Equipment purchase would be durable and have minimal running costs, expected to last over 3 years. Teaching to code is a core activity – platform is needed to achieve th

ICSMSU Exec (655)*ICSMSU (School of Medicine)*

Total Expenditure: £ 102,516.21
Grant Requested: £ 15,962.18
Amount Allocated: £ 2,119.67

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/947>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Unjust process - The 'equitability' mentioned in the policy served more as 'equality'. It fails to capture and take into account the difference in the sizes of the CUs, the respective proportion of students engaging with them and the CU's activeness and scale of events over the year. With the 'community fund' scaling, it has disadvantaged ICSMSU Exec the most, as we are one of the smaller CUs but one of the most active ones which engage their students the most through events and elections.

ADDITIONAL INFO

ICSMSU Exec appreciates that the community fund was awarded correctly and in-line with the policy 23.1.a+b. However, given the nature of our CU being smaller when compared to the other CUs, this proportional allocation to number of student impacts us the most out of all the other CU's. We are a CU that runs many more events and engages our students much more and this is true even with elections - the flat amount per head does not reflect/account for the levels of engagement of the CUs. Our engagement extends even beyond Medics/BioMeds - there are more and more 'non-medics' who take part in our events. So with the current community funding (£1593, a third of what we usually receive), it almost feels like the Annual Budgeting Committee/Policy is pushing ICSMSU Exec to reduce the amount of events that we do, and in turn, reduce engagement with our students. We are sure that cannot be the intention of the Budgeting Committee as that would actively go against the principles of ICU/ICSMSU. We fear this new funding policy has its unintended consequences and negative implications on our community. It would pain us to see that ICSMSU has to cut out current events/engagement with our students and regress to a time when our CU was less active and less representative of our student body due to financial constraints/unpolished nature of the new policy. However, we do appreciate that the policy is still in its infancy and it was bound to reveal unintended consequences through this annual budgeting season and it might take a few more cycles of budgeting to refine it - we hope the Annual Budgeting Committee would take this into account as feedback and award us some extra funding to bring us at least somewhat closer to what we had been awarded last year (£4.7k).

ICSMSU Football (656)

ICSMSU (School of Medicine)

Total Expenditure: £ 17,928.90

Grant Requested: £ 9,682.72

Amount Allocated: £ 2,742.28

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/948>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Disproportionate Total Grant Allocation (see evidence). BUCS Away Transport – 15972. LUSL Referees: 1s – 15393, 2s – 15543.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Uploaded in the Word Document.

UPLOADED FILE

ICSMSU Hockey (664)

ICSMSU (School of Medicine)

Total Expenditure: £ 8,142.04

Grant Requested: £ 4,599.59

Amount Allocated: £ 3,183.55

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/952>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Appeal for ID 14304: This year when part of our goal keeper equipment broke we applied to ADF but were rejected. We were told "wear and tear and should have been included in the annual budget". In this annual budget our request for funding for keeper kit maintenance was rejected due to "no breakdown of cost provided". How are we supposed to give a breakdown of the cost of things which haven't yet broken? I have supplied a breakdown of this year's expenses in the additional information form.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Appeal for ID 14304: This year when part of our goal keeper equipment broke we applied to ADF but were rejected. We were told "wear and tear and should have been included in the annual budget". In this annual budget our request for funding for keeper kit maintenance was rejected due to "no breakdown of cost provided". How are we supposed to give a breakdown of the cost of things which haven't yet broken?

Break down of expenses for things that need replacing before next:

kicker buckles replacement - £15

hand buckles replacement - £8

groin guard replacement - £60

obo keeper helmet interior padding replacement - £56

Total: £139

There are three keeper kits in the club which require maintenance. To be honest £100 for an average year is a conservative estimate given the expensive nature and the quantity of keeper kit that we need to maintain. Keeping the keeper kits in a high standard of function is vital to ensure the safety of our members. As things break they ideally need replacing as soon as possible. Moving functional items between kits is possible however it means we don't have three full keeper kits. This causes issues when we have three games on the same day and it means not all the keepers are able to train simultaneously. This results in the third team keeper being excluded from training. I am unsure how best to go about prospectively giving you a breakdown of what the costs will be next year, given that we are unable to predict which items or parts of items will need replacing.

When we applied to ADF we were told that the annual budget was where we should receive funding for this. If the annual budget is not the right place to apply for funding for this then where should we apply for funding?

ICSMSU Music (679)

ICSMSU (School of Medicine)

Total Expenditure: £ 3,451.76

Grant Requested: £ 1,599.60

Amount Allocated: £ 798.60

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/962>

APPEAL MESSAGE

The 2 allocations that we would like to appeal are 14001 and 14276. The grounds for our appeal are that the allocation is 'unjust' and the comparison between our society and other music groups is not valid. We further argue that this does not fall into the category of 'lack of information initially provided' as there was no expectation for other music groups to provide similar justification regarding the need for a concert. This is explained in much greater detail within our appeal document.

ADDITIONAL INFO

ICSM Music Society is placed in a unique situation wherein it functionally operates as 5 separate ensembles (main choir, chamber choir, orchestra, jazz band, band). The ICSMSU management group does not contain a separate ensemble for a choir, an orchestra, a jazz band etc but are all contained within a singular society.

Although we function as a singular community and share socials, each ensemble has a separate rehearsal throughout the week with its own conductors and managers. Across our 5 ensembles, our total weekly rehearsal length (9.25 hours) is equal to the combined rehearsal length of Imperial College Choir, Sinfonietta, Wind Band and String Ensemble (9.25 hours combined). As a result, we have a high music output which is reflected through our concerts.

The end goal of any music ensemble is a concert and there is no ensemble at Imperial that won't put on a performance in one way or another. It is the evidence of the hard work that goes into the rehearsals and into the individual practices of members. Without that performance, musicians have nothing to show for their work and therefore it goes without saying that a concert is a necessary aspect of any ensemble. Just as much as AEMU Sinfonietta requires a concert, our ICSM Orchestra requires a concert. Just as much as AEMU Choir requires a concert, our ICSM Choir requires a concert. The scale of work and output of these ensembles cannot be contained in a joint termly concert. The amount of preparation we do would result in a concert of an unreasonable length, likely exceeding 5 hours, and therefore we have established 5 annual concerts which form our cornerstone events.

When assessing this appeal, we request that the Union consider our unique circumstances which distinguish us from other music groups and appreciate the necessity of a termly concert for each of our ensembles. Just like other ensembles however, grant is what makes our concerts feasible and accessible. Receiving grant support for ground hire and equipment transport (Allocation ID 14001 & 14276) is of particular importance in making these happen.

In the comments of allocation 14001, the following was explained: "No justification provided as to why each ensemble needs it's [sic] own event. In line with other music groups we have funded 1 per term".

The specific grounds for our appeal are that the allocation is 'unjust' and the comparison between our society and other music groups is not valid. We further argue that this does not fall into the category of 'lack of information initially provided' as there was no expectation for other music groups to provide justification for why they need a termly concert. To expect us to explain why a choir and an orchestra need a separate concert is unreasonable as the necessity of a performance is the basic prerequisite of any music group.

Therefore, we firmly believe that our explanation that we function as 5 separate ensembles was sufficient in itself to justify the need for multiple concerts, especially as it has always been sufficient in the past.

The evidence attached alongside this serves not to provide any additional justification which our initial grant request lacked, but to clarify, what we believe to be, the unjust mischaracterisation of ICSM Music Society. Ultimately, it would have been impossible and unnecessary to have listed in full, the exact nature of our society within a text box that was already at full capacity. This is simply how we operate and should not be penalised as such.

[Additional evidence is provided in the form of graphs on pages 3 & 4 of the attached document]

UPLOADED FILE

ICSMSU Prosthetics (718)

ICSMSU (School of Medicine)

Total Expenditure: £ 771.67
Grant Requested: £ 231.49
Amount Allocated: £ 0.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1135>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Please see appeals form for message

ADDITIONAL INFO

Dear Union Director,

The Prosthetics Society requested £231 in grant, of which no money was allocated without explanation. We ask that this decision is reviewed as some funding is essential to our core activity and the running of our society.

We requested grant for several consumables up to the amount eligible for funding, however we were not provided with any specific reason regarding why we received no grant which makes it difficult to understand the context behind this decision and can be considered unjust process. As a prototyping based society, we require this type of funding, especially since we are a recently established than most societies.

Receiving no grant will also have a negative impact on new committee members, who are all eager to further establish the club. It would be demoralising to the team to start the new by informing them that we had received no grant and would make it more difficult to firmly establish the society so that we can more sustainable in future years.

I hope that you can reconsider the initial decision made as well as provide us with context on why we were initially provided with no funding.

We look forward to hearing from you.

UPLOADED FILE

ICSMSU Rugby (671)

ICSMSU (School of Medicine)

Total Expenditure: £ 7,991.70

Grant Requested: £ 4,557.32

Amount Allocated: £ 2,439.88

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/958>

APPEAL MESSAGE

· Lines 16033 and 16035 (training venue hire) o Under 20(1c) 40% of the venue cost is eligible for grant funding as opposed to the 14% that was allocated for each line. We have submitted results of a Qualtrics survey detailing the members' experiences with the training venue, justifying its continued use and value for money.

ADDITIONAL INFO

This is a resubmission with sub 500 characters (please disregard my previous submission for this budget).

16033-35: 20(1c) 40% eligible, not 14%. Please see Qualtrics survey results attached below.

16044: 21(2ai) coaching should be 60%. Out of Mon, Wed and Sat, Monday coaching is the only day we are requesting grant funding - we feel 60% is fair instead of 50%.

16049: Calculates a total of £332 in funding (fair), but only £277 allocated?

16052: Used group voucher codes for Ubers to matches. Couldn't play otherwise (fully booked minibuses). Cheapest cost per head w/ UberXL, kit wouldn't fit on public transport. Entire team could do core activity = 60% 15(1-3).

Attached are the results of a Qualtrics survey, reaching greater than 50% member input, on their opinions on Latymer Upper School Playing Fields and whether it is worth its price. We have submitted a formal appeal through eactivities as well.

UPLOADED FILE

ICSMSU Tennis (669)*ICSMSU (School of Medicine)*

Total Expenditure: £ 13,870.62

Grant Requested: £ 4,058.60

Amount Allocated: £ 3,124.80

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/956>

APPEAL MESSAGE

UNJUST PROCESS: Line 15979 (tennis balls for matches) has been allocated much less than it should've. Budgeting principle 13(3) states "Consumables which are mandatory for participation in Core Activity (e.g. BUCS sports) shall be funded in line with equipment purchase." Competing in LUSL is a core activity for us, and the upper limit for grant for equipment is now 40%, yet we have only been allocated 26% for this line without a reason. May the correct amount please be allocated for this line.

ICSMSU Weights & Fitness (689)

ICSMSU (School of Medicine)

Total Expenditure: £ 562.50

Grant Requested: £ 281.25

Amount Allocated: £ 0.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/968>

APPEAL MESSAGE

- Line 16135 allocation comment says “Valid under 12(5)”, however £0.00 allocated. o Maintenance should come under 12(6) instead, and should be funded ‘up to 50% of total cost’.
-

NAI Karate (015)

NAI (New Activities Incubator)

Total Expenditure: £ 6,550.63

Grant Requested: £ 4,024.67

Amount Allocated: £ 0.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/818>

APPEAL MESSAGE

All IDs: 12394, 15743, 15808, 15820, 15827, 15833, 15838, 15844 seem to have £0 grant allocated, unsure why.
Might be unjust process/admin error

RCSU RCS Motor (640)

RCSU (Royal College of Science)

Total Expenditure: £ 3,341.65

Grant Requested: £ 1,547.94

Amount Allocated: £ 1,230.46

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/940>

APPEAL MESSAGE

#13062 - Machining Stock. Reasoning given via form.

ADDITIONAL INFO

#13062 - Machining Stock.

Reasoning:

ABC found Machining stock to be a consumable as once used to make a component it cannot be reused. The club is arguing that given the almost exclusive use of machining stock to create long term parts, the purpose of the stock - whilst consumable - is for the creation of long term repairs and part replacement which would otherwise be unfeasibly expensive to make. One example would be the recent purchasing of stock for Jezebel's rear Ladder mounts which will be machined and fitted to the fire engine in Summer. Once machined, these parts will become a part of the vehicle and are expected to remain there for decades. In other cases stock is used to make custom tooling to perform engineering tasks which can not be performed by us using off-the-shelf tools, or are prohibitively expensive to pay someone to do. A recent example is the use of aluminium stock to create a threaded clamp to allow for the machining Jezebel's Valve Caps. These tools are kept in the garage in storage and labelled to ensure that future students can continue to use them for years to come.

REA Alternative Music (205)*Recreation Sector (100)*

Total Expenditure: £ 683.33

Grant Requested: £ 180.00

Amount Allocated: £ 0.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/861>

APPEAL MESSAGE**ADDITIONAL INFO**

I accidentally clicked appeal before writing my message so I'll put it here: We were declined grant funding for concert ticket subsidies on the grounds that this is 'not grant fundable in line with principles'. However, we would argue that this is in line with both the 'Need' and 'Merit' aspects of the budgeting principles. It is a need as it is directly funding a core activity. This is a core activity as it is directly following aim 2.2 of our constitution - organising trips to gigs and events around London. These events can be expensive and we want them to be available to as many people as possible, which is why grant funding is needed to be able to subsidise the tickets to these events so members who may not otherwise have been able to afford them can go. This links as well to the 'Merit' budgeting principle which states it is 'providing a unique aspect of the student experience'. For many people, especially students, the tickets to these events would often be prohibitively expensive without the subsidy AMS provides and so through the provision of subsidies for gig tickets, AMS allows a whole group of students to be able to access a part of student life and life in London that they otherwise may not be able to afford.

REA AnimeSoc (207)*Recreation Sector (100)*

Total Expenditure: £ 5,755.83

Grant Requested: £ 1,157.50

Amount Allocated: £ 0.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/862>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Administrative error due to DPFS oversight which led to budget not being reviewed and allocated appropriately.
All lines to be appealed.

REA ArtSoc (209)*Recreation Sector (100)*

Total Expenditure: £ 37,800.00
Grant Requested: £ 11,340.00
Amount Allocated: £ 0.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/863>

APPEAL MESSAGE

For line 14011, even though the policies do not explicitly state ticket purchases should be funded, I believe our society should still receive funding, as it is our core activity and necessary for our society's functioning, reaches many students (we have over 300 members, one of the largest societies and growing), provides a unique student experience of theatre in London, and is a positive initiative to spread culture and foster a community of theatre-goers. I hope to receive grant as requested.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Regarding line 14011, even though the policies do not explicitly state ticket purchases should be funded, I believe our society should still receive funding.

Theatre shows is our core activity, and it has a growing reach among Imperial. With over 300 members, we are one of the largest recreation and hobby societies and growing. We provide a unique student experience of theatre in London, and is a positive initiative to spread culture and foster a community of theatre-goers. We have built up a close-knit community of theatre lovers, and our members have bonded over seeing their favourite shows and appreciating the vibrant theatre scene of London. Our subsidies of tickets make theatre more accessible to Imperial students, and is a worthwhile and beneficial use of grant money.

Just this year, we have more than doubled our number of tickets sold from ~400 last year to over 1000 this year. Often we have exceptional demand for shows, with over 100 tickets wanted for popular shows. Grant funding would be crucial to expanding our ticket procurement and ensuring everyone gets a chance to see their favourite shows, and diversifying and increasing the number of shows we go to.

I understand that this was not explicitly mentioned in the grant funding principles, but just because it was not put into the relevant document does not mean that this is not a worthy cause to put grant funding towards. Perhaps contingencies or failsafe clauses should have been included in the funding document to account for cases such as our society, where our grant request does not fall into any of the categories mentioned.

In any case, I do strongly hope that this appeal is approved, and we get grant funding to support our society and its functions. Without the grant, we would be unable to meet our demand and disappoint many of our members, and we would not be able to offer as big a subsidy for the tickets, limiting the reach and access of theatre.

If you require any further information, especially in regarding to specific financial information (e.g. expenditure), please do not hesitate to email me anytime at jtt123@ic.ac.uk.

REA Rock and Metal (265)

Recreation Sector (100)

Total Expenditure: £ 2,400.00
Grant Requested: £ 1,020.00
Amount Allocated: £ 480.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/876>

APPEAL MESSAGE

We would like to respectfully appeal the decision regarding line 13861 (in the ABCEX stage) that ticket subsidies are "not grant fundable in line with principles", as we believe there is sufficient evidence to the contrary. Please see the additional information form submission.

ADDITIONAL INFO

We would like to respectfully appeal the decision regarding line 13861 (in the ABCEX stage) that ticket subsidies are "not grant fundable in line with principles", as we believe there is sufficient evidence to the contrary, as follows:

We believe that funding for ticket subsidies would fall under point 22(1)(a) of the Annual Budgeting Principles. This is the primary activity that the Metal society organises for which members pay the membership fee, and the main means by which members come together to socialise and engage with the society. As such it forms the backbone of Metalsoc's initiatives to foster a community for heavy music fans at Imperial.

We also believe that this activity satisfies the given criteria for prioritisation in funding allocations, for the following reasons:

1a Need: The society needs this funding in order to provide the core activity of subsidised concert events, in line with points 2.1, 2.3 and 2.6 of our constitution.

1b Reach: In the past two years, Metalsoc has grown enormously from a completely dormant society to a highly active and inclusive one with many members. We currently have 47 paying members, exceeding our membership goal of 40, and have as many as 197 in the Whatsapp groupchat. For many, Metalsoc is their primary social group.

1c Merit: This funding facilitates access to a part of London's uniquely rich cultural offering and vibrant music scene. Given the the high cost of living, student budgets often impede such access. Furthermore, subsidised tickets allow the society to run collective concert visits, which provides a sense of security for those who may be intimidated or feel unsafe when going out alone in London, and may therefore avoid doing so.

1d Context: Aligns with point B(4) of ICU constitutional articles of association in facilitating the provision of cultural activities for personal development of students.

Having had this funding provided last year, we can say from experience that this funding for ticket subsidies is highly beneficial to the society and much appreciated by members. Additionally it aids in continuing the growth of the society and justifying the membership fee. We thank the committee in advance for its consideration of our case.

REA SCC Film (232)

Recreation Sector (100)

Total Expenditure: £ 1,416.67
Grant Requested: £ 615.00
Amount Allocated: £ 0.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/979>

APPEAL MESSAGE

We request grant funding for two CORE ACTIVITIES: monthly cinema trips and BFI Film Festival visits. These events are central to our mission of fostering community and cultural belonging, aligning with Section 22, Category C. Open, inclusive, and student-led, they create a sense of connection through film. The grant is essential to ensure these CORE ACTIVITIES remain accessible and affordable for all members, enabling us to continue fulfilling our purpose.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Grant Appeal: Justification for Funding Screenings and Film Festival Trips

In alignment with the Principles and Eligibility Criteria, Section 22 (Category C), page 6

We are requesting grant funding to support two CORE ACTIVITIES of our society:

1. Monthly cinema screenings at London venues, and
2. Trips to the BFI London Film Festival.

These events are not only core to our society's purpose, but they directly meet the funding eligibility outlined under Section 22, Category C, page 6 of the Annual Budgeting Principles:

Section 22, Category C – Academic-related, Culture & Community

(1) Fostering community and belonging

(a) Initiatives and events within a CSP which foster community and belonging shall be eligible for Grant Funding.

(b) The cost shall be eligible for Grant Funding.

Our core activities align directly with this section.

Both our monthly cinema trips and film festival outings are designed to foster community and belonging through shared cultural experiences. Film is a uniquely accessible and engaging medium that brings people together around stories, ideas, and identities from around the world. These events give members a chance to connect, discuss, and reflect together building a genuine sense of community rooted in cultural appreciation.

Events are open to all members, democratically selected, and student-led. They are inclusive, participatory, and culturally enriching embodying the values set out in Section 22, Category C. These are exactly the types of initiatives the Grant was created to support.

Core Activities

The events proposed are the core activities that define the Film Society. The cinema trips and festival visits are central to our purpose as a cultural and community-based CSP. Without these events, the society cannot fulfil its basic mission to bring students together through film. We are committed to keeping them inclusive and affordable, but we need grant funding to do that effectively. Subsidising ticket costs is the only way to ensure that students from all backgrounds can take part.

In line with Section 22, Category C, we are directly fulfilling the stated aims of fostering community and culture. These events are foundational to our operations, and we urge you to support them with the grant funding they

clearly qualify for.

REE Canoe (105)*Recreation Sector (100)*

Total Expenditure: £ 19,152.19

Grant Requested: £ 8,360.96

Amount Allocated: £ 5,211.88

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/841>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ID 12878, 12881 - The fuel costs stated by ABCEX are not representative of a kayaking trip. We feel principle 8.1 has not been applied fairly. ID 12904, 12906, 12911 - These are all yearly expenses which can be seen in the club's transaction pages. Under principles 12.1.a, b and 12.4 these should be eligible for grant funding. We feel this is unjust process and should be eligible for funding in line with other equipment costs. Please see more details in the appeals additional information form.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Please see attached document for appeals information.

UPLOADED FILE

REE Gliding (112)

Recreation Sector (100)

Total Expenditure: £ 42,628.34

Grant Requested: £ 26,809.12

Amount Allocated: £ 7,592.42

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/846>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Administrative Error: Line 14749 has been allocated 0% of grant requested with no comment as to why this is the case. Therefore unsure of whether the allocation is a mistake or intentional. Please may you either provide the justification for this allocation if it was only the comment that was omitted or review the allocation for this line if it was not completed correctly.

ADDITIONAL INFO

The grant allocation for line 14749 in the budget was 0% of the requested amount with no comment as to why this decision had been made. Following consultation with the activities team we were encouraged to appeal on the grounds that this was an administrative error.

As no comment was provided for this allocation we have been unable to determine whether the entire allocation line was erroneous or just the omission of a comment explaining the allocation.

In previous years Gliding has received grant (£1685.24 in 2024/25. £2826.41 in 2023/34) to enable the club to subsidise the flying fees we charge as part of our core weekend trips. This has helped keep the cost of gliding more affordable, enabling more people to fly with us. Loss of this subsidy will likely lead to a sizeable increase in the flying costs for our members to take part in our core activity.

Obviously if this allocation amount was a deliberate decision then we will be disappointed that we are no longer receiving grant for this purpose but we understand that the Union has limits to what they are able to provide.

REE Skydiving (117)*Recreation Sector (100)*

Total Expenditure: £ 49,365.00

Grant Requested: £ 10,510.09

Amount Allocated: £ 6,691.72

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/848>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Equipment Maintenance: Parachutes are life-saving equipment and if not maintained, students risk death. 50% funding is not enough for 6 parachutes which require major service soon. This year we exceeded 100% grant

Spring Tour: This is an annual and essential trip for training new licensed skydivers, which isnt possible in UK due to weather. Without it, we risk the clubs future. It must be booked by end of term 1, so we need the grant, which has been awarded every year before. Please re consid

REE Surfing (685)

Recreation Sector (100)

Total Expenditure: £ 48,610.00
Grant Requested: £ 6,322.70
Amount Allocated: £ 2,238.25

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/965>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Please see the additional information form we have submitted.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Validity of the Bucs fuel money:

Newquay is 280+ miles from Imperial. At 30 miles per gallon (upper estimate due to cars carrying multiple surfboards and people), this is 43.4l of petrol which costs £57.6 with current petrol prices (£1.36 per litre). We usually need three cars for this trip, hence reaching the £180 total as specified in the budget.

Funding for International Trip:

The vast majority of our decrease in grant for next year is due to the clarification of our international trips as non-core activities. We feel this is unjust and explain our reasoning below:

Under 'Imperial College Union Clubs, Societies & Projects Board CSP Annual Budgeting Principles' (7), a core activity is defined as:

'Core Activity' is all activities of a CSP which are accessible to and benefit a majority of the CSP's membership, in line with the CSP's aims and objectives, as interpreted by the Activities Manager(s) and Deputy President (Clubs & Societies)!

To satisfy the first part of this statement, (accessibility to the majority) we make each international trip available to any member of the society and act on a first come first serve basis with our ticket sales. However, in order to ensure no one is missing out, we often try to expand or contract trip numbers in order to exactly fit the demand of each trip. We are also aware that if we are not able to use our grant for international trips, these trips are likely to become less accessible due to high costs. We could make our trips only local to the UK, however, due to cold temperatures and often higher prices, this significantly reduces accessibility of our trips to new incoming surfers.

In our constitution, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4 (under Aims and Objectives) indicate our intent to carry out what is said above. Thus ensuring the international trips are 'in line with [our] CSP's aims and objectives'. These international trips have also been carried out by our society for the majority of the last 10 years.

In conclusion, we are appealing due the unjust interpretation of our international trips as non-core activities and the decision that our fuel cost for driving to Newquay for BUCS was invalid.

REE Underwater (126)

Recreation Sector (100)

Total Expenditure: £ 31,224.34

Grant Requested: £ 15,350.43

Amount Allocated: £ 8,619.67

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/853>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Appealing on grounds of admin error / unjust allocation for lines #16116 and #16114.

ADDITIONAL INFO

#16116 -- Administrative Error -- Description doesn't match title and has been copy/pasted from #16114

#16116 -- Unjust Process -- The club relies on the compressor to fill cylinders with safe breathing air for our pool training (a core aim in the club's constitution) and for open water trips, therefore the reach of the compressor is every diving member of the club. Using an external compressor is impossible (the nearest commercial SCUBA compressor is outside the M25) due to both the cost and committee time involved in transporting cylinders, getting them filled, and returning them to the cellar (see attached document). We argue that, since we have budgeted for the eventual end-of-life replacement of the compressor over the last 10 years, the annual cost is less than the £10k threshold for capex projects, and this is not an upgrade or extension of what we're able to offer as a club rather an equal replacement of our current capacity, this should be treated as an equipment rolling replacement under 12(5).

#16114 -- Unjust Process -- The boat is essential to delivering the club's core aims of SCUBA diving diverse sites outside of London and completing diver training, and impacts every member of the club. Chartering a dive boat is completely impractical due to safety, flexibility and cost concerns. (1) The club boat is significantly smaller and more manoeuvrable, and therefore can offer better surface cover and can conduct a safer, faster rescue than a larger boat. (2) By relying on charter boats, we lose our ability to choose dive sites that reflect the ability, experience and any lessons required of our members on a given trip. This flexibility allows us to make the safest plan for diving on any given day with any given divers on board. Additionally, charter boats are booked up by the public months in advance, and as such the opportunities to get out on the water as a club would become incredibly limited to cold, poorer visibility periods of the year which is by definition less safe as well as being less valuable as training or experience dives. (3) The cost of chartering a boat for the amount of diving we do is completely impractical (see attachment). Additionally, the boat is a key draw for more experienced members and instructors, without these volunteers the club would not be able to function. Similar to the reasoning in #16116, we argue that this should be treated as rolling replacement and we can continue making regular contributions to our DMF pot which already totals a significant proportion of the price of a new boat, therefore guaranteeing the future viability of the club without having to rely on a Harlington decision when the boat reaches the end of her life.

Finally, we have struggled this year due to a change of union policy on VAT reclaiming, essentially reducing our grant income by 20%. As a result of a further reduction this year, the club will essentially be 30% poorer than in 2024, and we will have to pass these costs on to our members directly if we cannot increase our grant funding through the above appeals.

UPLOADED FILE

REE Wakeboarding (137)

Recreation Sector (100)

Total Expenditure: £ 7,486.67

Grant Requested: £ 3,366.52

Amount Allocated: £ 477.72

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/857>

APPEAL MESSAGE

0.52 Scale factor Unjust – Some members pay the wakeboarding centre directly. If this is considered, the expenditure is accurate. We plan on making all transactions through the union from now on ABCEX

Administrative error – We currently have 45/60 (not 35) members from winter season. Given wakeboarding is more popular in summer, we will definitely exceed 60 members. Transport is essential. Train takes 2.5 hr and includes 40min walk. Car is only 1 hour and is necessary to transport wakeboards.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Hi,

I hope you're well and I would like to thank you before hand for taking the time to consider our appeal, whatever the outcome may be.

I am writing to raise concerns regarding our annual budget, which I feel is unfair, inaccurate, and unjust. Specifically, I would like to address:

1. The scaling factor of 0.52 applied to our budget due to discrepancies between budgeted and historical expenditure.
2. The administrative error and unjust process of scaling our grant request by 35/60.
3. The claim that the wakeboarding centre is accessible by public transport, and the resulting rejection of our transport grant.
4. The overall grant outcome, which does not reflect our club's rapid growth and success this year.

1. Scaling Factor of 0.52

The 0.52 scaling factor was based on a discrepancy between our budgeted and recorded expenditure. However, many of our members pay the wakeboarding centre directly on trips instead of through Union shop products, so our reported expenditure is a significant underestimate.

We've already started directing payments through the Union shop to correct this. If past direct payments are accounted for, our actual expenditure aligns closely with our submitted budget, which includes a clear and detailed breakdown of all the calculations, which if you kindly refer to, will find that our budgeted expenditure is indeed well-justified and accurate.

Additionally, our membership has grown from 40 members in May 2022-2023 (our previous most successful year) (see figure attached) to 50 currently – a 25% increase and an all time high for May. Scaling the actual expenditure of 2022-2023 (£4,594) by 25% gives £5,742, which is well above the capped upper limit you applied to our CSP of £3,893. Therefore, our proposed budget of £7,487 is reasonable. For this reason, I kindly ask that the scale factor be increased from 0.52 to at least 0.77 (5742/7487), or ideally removed, as our budget is a realistic estimate reflecting our exponential growth.

2. ABCEX Scaling Error

The ABCEX scaling was based on us having 35/60 members. While this is 58.33%, it seems a 43.75% scaling was applied instead—a clear miscalculation. Regardless, we currently have 50/60 (83%) members, so the ABCEX scaling is inaccurate.

Furthermore, wakeboarding interest peaks in warmer months. We've already seen membership increase from 35 to 50 in May alone, and expect this trend to continue until the year-end, where we are we will exceed full membership (60/60) and potentially reach 75/60. Given this, I believe the scaling applied here is not representative of our growth and should be removed entirely.

3. Transport Grant Rejection

Though technically accessible via public transport, the wakeboarding centre requires a 2.5-hour journey each way with multiple transfers (tube, train, bus) and a 40-minute walk—totalling 5 hours of travel for just a 2-hour wakeboarding session. This is simply not feasible for most of our members.

Road transport reduces this to 1 hour and is essential for carrying heavy and bulky wakeboarding equipment, which is not possible on public transport. I kindly ask that the rejection of our transport funding be reconsidered.

4. General Grant Outcome

To finish, please refer to the membership trend graph attached in our form. At this point last year (May), we have tripled our members and are clearly on track to make an all time high. Yet despite this, our grant has been reduced from £1,533.34 to £477.72 — an all time low. Before scaling that is.

This is unjust. A 3× increase in membership has resulted in 3× less funding. I ask that this outcome be reviewed and reconsidered in light of our club's significant growth and performance this year.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Paul

UPLOADED FILE

REG Skate (124)

Recreation Sector (100)

Total Expenditure: £ 7,395.84

Grant Requested: £ 3,953.50

Amount Allocated: £ 2,227.44

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/851>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ADDITIONAL INFO

Appealing item: Inline Skating Instructors Trials

ABCEX remarked that this line was potentially fundable in line with 22(1)(d) but not funded in the original budget due to unclear breakdown of instructor costs. We are providing further information in the interest of appealing this decision.

We have agreed lessons on a once per two week basis, to take place in the Autumn Term. The sessions are agreed to cost £120 and last 75 minutes. As coaching for inline (roller) skating is a new implementation next year, we would like the budget for one term to be supported by grant, to allow us to provide more concrete numbers for future years.

As our society does both ice skating and roller skating, the proportion of members interested in roller skating is approximately half our member count (around 40). This makes the 15-person estimate a significant proportion of our usual roller skating attendees.

In addition, it is worth noting that the reach of 15 members was estimated from one WhatsApp poll, which wasn't seen by everyone, and interest in coaching during regular weekly sessions has been consistently high from regular attendees; when we start providing lessons in the new academic year, we would of course expect to see a lot of interest in lessons from those new to skating.

RSM Football (651)

RSM (Royal School of Mines)

Total Expenditure: £ 3,240.42

Grant Requested: £ 2,275.21

Amount Allocated: £ 443.16

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/945>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ID:15760-Unjust process; policy 20(4) states up to 70% of cost for match-day officials shall be funded, no justification to why only 6 out of the 12 home matches are being funded, other football clubs have been allocated ~58.31% of referee costs. ID:15825-Unjust process; document will be submitted via the form to state reasons for external ground hire. ID:15841-Error; no reason for the full amount of requested grant not to be funded, yet only 80% has been allocated.

ADDITIONAL INFO

I have attached a document explaining reasons behind our appeal against the lack of allocated grant for budget item ID: 15825.

Also as a side, for the appeal against the allocated grant for budget item ID:15760, our team plays in two different leagues, the total number of home matches played each year is 12 (not including away matches) and therefore funding is required for all 12 and not just 6 of the games. I am unsure if I was clear about this in the original budget application, so apologies if I was not.

UPLOADED FILE

SPC ACC Netball (018)*Sports Sector (000)*

Total Expenditure: £ 12,391.00

Grant Requested: £ 7,747.60

Amount Allocated: £ 3,379.59

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/821>

APPEAL MESSAGE**ADDITIONAL INFO**

We would like to appeal the grant allocated for ID numbers 13881 and 13882 under the reasoning that LUSL is a non-core activity. ICUNC have all 4 teams in the LUSL leagues and therefore under the definition that core activity is an activity which is accessible by the majority of our CSP's memberships, we believe LUSL is a core activity for us.

SPC ACC Volleyball (031)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 48,248.33

Grant Requested: £ 28,945.50

Amount Allocated: £ 9,475.45

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/830>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ADDITIONAL INFO

Hello, I would like to appeal several decisions made regarding our budget:

1) We requested grant for our men's 2 travel. In the description we estimated 4 games outside of London (in South Eastern England), but it was impossible for us to confidently provide exact locations (some depend on the exact league we would be in, some are completely random and we would know once the competition begins). All we can say is that the games would be outside of London in South Eastern England, hence we estimated ticket price to be £20 per person, which is the cheapest (return) train tickets cost to virtually outside of zone 6. Hence, I am confused as to why not providing exact locations is grounds to not allocate any grant at all.

2) Each of our grant requests for external venue hire was met with "lack of justification for the need for an external venue" and "no justification as to the higher cost of the venue". I can see how we didn't spend much thought justifying the need for it, but we used the same justification as last year which was enough back then so I am curious why is it different this year. Even then, I am not sure how is this supposed to be justified? We are already using all the spaces ethos can provide us (which can be seen based on our grant request by checking how many ethos bookings we are planning to have). Regarding lack of justification as to the higher cost, we did say that these were the actual costs this year (implicitly, we will be using the same courts), which I would imagine to be enough, there is not much choice in the venue selection and it would be unreasonable to expect costs to be as cheap as ethos (in fact, one of our venues is extremely cheap compared to the market average).

Furthermore, even assuming justification is indeed lacking, I believe there are some mistakes in how the expense based on ethos rate was calculated. For the men's 2 BUCS match external court hire, it should be 21×48 (which is the rate for the full ethos court, it is not possible to play a game on one half only), which after applying the 40% maximal grant requested should give £403.2 instead of £157.46. Similarly, for Mixed Team's Court Hire (External) - Matches, it should be 40% of 12×48 , i.e. £230.4, instead of £75. Next, for Men's 1, Mixed and Women's teams Court Hire (External) - Training it should be 40% of 44×24 (here trainings can be done on half of the ethos court, hence 24), giving £422.4 instead of £275, £275, £307.92 respectively (just the fact that there are 2 different values for the same expense shows that some error has occurred).

3) We asked for some funding for organisation of internal tournaments. This was rejected on the basis of this not being our core activity, which sounds weird to me as the most core activities of our club are organising volleyball sessions for both competitive and RECREATIONAL players, hence I am surprised this doesn't fit.

4) For the same reason we did not receive funding for anything related to our participation in the Student Cup. This is the biggest volleyball tournament for british universities in the United Kingdom, so I'm not sure how can this not be our core activity of competing in university competitions. Additionally, this was not the case last year. What I could understand is not giving funding for the finals since not all of our teams have qualified yet (though this also was not a problem last year), but as mentioned in a couple of grant item descriptions, our women's team has already qualified to the finals, so at least 1/3 of what we requested for student cup finals should be eligible I believe?

SPC Dodgeball (063)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 14,511.50

Grant Requested: £ 9,493.50

Amount Allocated: £ 3,574.25

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1018>

APPEAL MESSAGE**ADDITIONAL INFO**

Apologies for not having an associated action message, hoping this is resolved before the deadline:

This is our brief justification for context:

The core thing we would like to appeal is our overall lack of grant allocation for Open Event Entry and Travel:

We fundamentally disagree that open entry is not a core-activity (2.7. of grant allocation), we can justify this belief with section 2.2 of our constitution, 'participate and succeed in British Dodgeball's Tournaments and Leagues'. British Dodgeball Opens represent a different competition format than BUCS and also the predominate opportunity for our members to engage in competition overall. We believe that treating us the same as other sports does not acknowledge the fundamental differences in quantity of league fixtures, BUCS for instance offers our Men's 1s only three opportunities to play competitively over the whole year in contrast with other sports that play weekly or fortnightly in BUCS. We also believe that the definition of core activity has also not been applied consistently amongst clubs, the reason for removing our funding allocation, for instance squash has been allocated money for BUCS and LUSL entry whilst other clubs have only been allocated funding for BUCS which has been determined to be core.

We would like our grant allocation to be reinstated at 35 % allocation for travel, and 50 % for competition entry.

UPLOADED FILE

SPC Handball (060)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 21,901.42

Grant Requested: £ 9,629.19

Amount Allocated: £ 2,464.94

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1008>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ADDITIONAL INFO

We would like to appeal our grant allocation due to administrative error as outlined in the appeal criteria.

- Misnaming of budget items:

There has been an accidental naming inconsistency on our part which we believe has led to misunderstandings in the review process. Specifically:

1. The “Summer Cup” was mistakenly classified by the union under “tours/cups” activities, when in fact, it is a formal part of the BUCS competition structure in handball. Handball, unlike other sports, does not have a weekly BUCS format. We instead have BUCS split in 2 competitions; Nationals and Summer Cup. This is supported by the official England Handball documentation:

[<https://englandhandball.com/universitycompetitions/>]. In our budget, it was listed under “team entrance fee summer cup (ID: 15012)”, “summer cup accommodation (ID: 15022)” and “summer cup travel (ID: 15742),” all of which should be recognised as core competition costs, and the Activity Grouping should be changed to “BUCS”.

2. The term “friendlies” was also accidentally inherited from older years, but inaccurately reflects the nature of our external matches. These are structured, external competitive fixtures hosted by other universities as preparation for BUCS, and were previously labelled under “external court hire” and “train tickets for away competitions” in our 2024 budget allocation which had grant allocated to them. The only difference was the comments and titles in which we wrongly included the phrase “friendlies” this year. This year these have been named as “External Court Hire (ID: 15000)” and “Train tickets for friendly competitions (ID: 15021)”. These are essential to our team’s development and performance and are considered part of our core competitive activities.

- Incorrect categorisation of “glue/resin (ID: 14973)”:

The glue/resin used in handball was wrongly placed under “consumables (640)”. It should be categorised under “equipment purchase (685)”, as it lasts more than a year and meets the criteria of an equipment good. We even referred to it as “equipment” in our grant rationale. Therefore, it should not be subject to the 30% cap, and instead meet the 50% noted under 12(5).

We would also like to kindly note that this year, we were allocated £54.78 per member, a sharp decrease from £133.79 per member last year, with nearly a 66% reduction. Two years ago, our club was in serious debt, and we worked hard to recover through careful budgeting and increased member fees. A further reduction now would threaten our financial sustainability and put unnecessary pressure on members.

We respectfully ask that these points be reconsidered for grant allocation and that the decision-making process be reviewed in light of the above. Thank you very much for your time and support.

SPC Ice Hockey (134)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 26,600.20

Grant Requested: £ 18,416.60

Amount Allocated: £ 5,874.25

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/856>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ADDITIONAL INFO

ID 13603, ID 13614 – Ice Rink Hire

Due to the nature of our sport, the Ice Hockey Society is unable to make use of Imperial College's facilities such as Ethos and Harlington. As a result, we are required to hire external ice rinks, significantly increasing our ground hire costs compared to most other clubs and societies. This constitutes the majority of our annual expenditure. We kindly request that the Committee consider greater flexibility regarding the flat rate allocation, to better reflect the facility requirements of the club.

Varsity Event Funding Request

We would also like to request funding for our annual Varsity match, which serves as our flagship event of the year. At the time of our initial budget submission, we were not aware that funding for such events could be requested. The associated costs are detailed below:

- Ice Rink Hire: £380

- Referees: £160

- Security: £180

We believe this event represents a valuable opportunity to showcase the sport, build community spirit, and represent Imperial College in a high-profile setting. We would greatly appreciate the Committee's support in helping us deliver it.

SPC Squash (027)*Sports Sector (000)*

Total Expenditure: £ 11,397.10

Grant Requested: £ 7,786.32

Amount Allocated: £ 3,453.07

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/827>

APPEAL MESSAGE**ADDITIONAL INFO**

I recently submitted the appeal form on eactivities by clicking the 'Appeal' button, but I realise now that it was submitted without the supporting information (I was under the impression that I click the button to begin the editing/comment process). Please find attached the relevant document containing all the necessary details and evidence to support the Squash Society's appeal.

UPLOADED FILE

SPF ACC Womens Rugby (022)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 7,844.33

Grant Requested: £ 3,306.53

Amount Allocated: £ 2,470.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/824>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ADDITIONAL INFO

We are appealing the budget line regarding first aid equipment (ID 13993) as we believe it is an administrative error. Reasoning to not give this was that it is not a yearly expense. Minor injuries occur often at matches requiring ice packs and bandages etc to be used. There is a lack of first aiders and on pitch physios at Harlington therefore we must purchase these supplies every year, often more than once and not having them puts us at risk of injury meaning we would struggle to keep playing. Many referees demand appropriately stocked medic bags before playing a match and new players may feel unsafe with a lack of equipment making the team less accessible, going against our core values as a club. Please reconsider this reasoning as we certainly believe it is a yearly expense and as a club would appreciate being allocated the requested amount, thank you.

MG Comments

Line ID 13993 - First Aid Equipment:

We agree with this appeal, on the grounds of an administrative error.

The first aid kit is a yearly expense - they do already own and resupply first aid kits. I can find claims/POs supporting this from the past 3 years eg. Claim 107153, Claim 125869, PO 5043608.

This is also a mandatory expense - the BUCs sport specific regulations state that:

RUU 1.5.3 All teams are expected to provide their own first aid kit, gloves, water spray bottles and sterile wipes for the treatment of blood injuries. The use of buckets and sponges is discouraged. Current Home Union and World Rugby guidelines for treatment of blood injuries are to be adhered to.

<https://www.bucs.org.uk/rules-and-regulations/sport/rugby-union.html>

This should therefore be funded in line with 13(3).

SPF Cricket (007)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 22,936.00

Grant Requested: £ 16,993.80

Amount Allocated: £ 7,823.90

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/810>

APPEAL MESSAGE

We would like to appeal the lines 13275, 13262, and 15149 for unjust process. Please refer to our form submission for additional information.

ADDITIONAL INFO

Please refer to the attached document

UPLOADED FILE

SPF Football (001)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 29,402.50
Grant Requested: £ 14,264.26
Amount Allocated: £ 6,403.98

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/805>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ID 12875 – Referees. See the form for reasoning & evidence. ID 12880 – Transport Saturday Trials. See the form for reasoning & evidence. ID 12882 – Training Transport. See the form for reasoning & evidence. ID 13340 – Footballs. See the form for reasoning & evidence.

ADDITIONAL INFO

ID 12875 – Referees. This year, we played 65 home games, expecting to play the same amount next year, meaning we will need to pay 65 referees. Breakdown provided in the files attached.

ID 12880 – Transport Saturday Trials. Whilst transport for Wednesday trials is funded by Imperial Athletes, Saturday trials are organised and paid for by the club. Evidence in the attached email from Nick Murkett, and an invoice from this year's payment.

ID 12882 – Training Transport. Imperial Athletes organise and subsidise transport but do not cover the full costs – the club must make up the difference. Evidenced by the attached email from Nick Murkett.

ID 13440 – Footballs. 15 footballs funded by a grant would mean 2.5 balls per team – given that we have 6 teams, each needing to provide match and training balls, we would expect closer to 5 balls per team to be funded.

UPLOADED FILE

MG Comments

Line ID 12875 – Referees:

Disagree with this appeal - agree with original allocation.

They have not realised that teams who have entries in both BUCS and LUSL will only have one of these leagues funded by grant. I have reached out to them directly about this.

Line ID 12880 - Transport to Saturday Trials:

Disagree with this appeal - agree with original allocation.

This is not core expenditure, although the union does centrally fund transport for all other sports society trials - which seems slightly unfair as football (and ICSM football) are simply unable to accommodate everyone on one day. I would appreciate a follow up conversation with you/Tom to determine if Saturday funding/support for the very large societies could be sourced to allow trials to continue to be accessible for everyone.

Line ID 12882 - Training Transport:

Disagree with this appeal - agree with original allocation.

They were not aware that the system will be changing next year, again I have reached out to them directly.

Line ID 13440 – Footballs:

Agree with the appeal on grounds of administrative error.

While I agree that the allocation should be equitable with Women's Football, it is important to note that Men's

Football play a lot more matches than Women's Football. They have comparable training hours (2 hours per week per team) - however Men's Football expect to host 65 matches next year, whereas Women's Football only expect to host 20 matches. The home team is expected to provide 'match balls' for these games, accounting for a lot of wear and tear on the balls. I therefore believe that a more equitable solution would be as follows:

Training:

Women's Football - 4 teams, 2 hours per week, ~20 weeks

Men's Football - 6 teams, 2 hours per week, ~20 weeks

Matches:

Women's Football - 20 matches, 2 hours per game (accounting for injury time, warm ups, extra time etc.)

Men's Football - 65 matches, 2 hours per game (accounting for injury time, warm ups, extra time etc.)

Overall:

Women's Football - 10 balls, 200 hours playing time

Men's Football - 370 hours playing time

So Men's Football should receive funding for roughly 19 balls ie. 95 pounds

SPF Ultimate Frisbee (035)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 19,028.66

Grant Requested: £ 9,346.46

Amount Allocated: £ 2,991.11

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/832>

APPEAL MESSAGE

We would like to appeal the grants items that we received 0% for. We believe we had justified these expenses and would like to appeal the decision. Thank you for your consideration. Please find a detailed justification in the additional information form from our CSP. Additional indoor training sessions before nationals Transport to BUCS away games Men's + Women's + Mixed BUCS Indoor Nationals Transport Men's + Women's + Mixed Outdoor Nationals Transport

ADDITIONAL INFO

Please find below the list of line items we would like to appeal, the justifications provided are as stated in our initial proposal:

Additional indoor training sessions before nationals - Every year we host additional training sessions for nationals held at Primary Kensington Academy, who provide us the overall cheapest place we can find, while considering factors such as timeslot availability, ease of transport and facility quality.

This fee is crucial in our preparation for indoors nationals, and has contributed to the stellar results we achieved this year. Through the grant funding, we hope to be able to continue being able to support this key line item and continue developing our team at a higher level.

Historically, this fee has been paid in full via club funding, mostly SGI, and not as an additional fee for members, and we expect this to be paid the same way next year. A goal we have this year is to reduce additional fees members have to pay throughout the year, calculated to be upwards of £500 and funding for these training sessions would help us significantly in reaching that goal

1) Transport to BUCS away games

2) Men's + Women's + Mixed BUCS Indoor Nationals Transport

3) Men's + Women's + Mixed Outdoor Nationals Transport - We have bundled these 3 line items into one as our justification for all 3 is very similar.

Each team (2 teams, 15 players per team) will have approximately 4 mandatory away games per team (outside London) per year. We utilize the cheapest transport (trains and buses) taken, along with the use of railcards. (Completely necessary)

We would like to start sponsoring more of the transport to our BUCS away games to reduce the amount of cancellations and no shows, which ultimate saves money for the club and Union. This grant would incentivise people to come to BUCS and improve Imperial's attendance and image in being responsible to attend BUCS games.

1) This is calculated by 2 teams * 15 players * 4 away games * 15 pounds (using the cheapest form of transport, railcards, discounts etc.)

2) This is calculated by 3 teams * 10 players * 35 pounds. (using the cheapest form of transport, railcards, discounts etc.)

3) This is calculated by 3 teams * 20 players * 30 pounds. (using the cheapest form of transport, railcards, discounts etc.)

We have taken every single initiative we can to try and reduce costs for the club. Costs shown here in this annual budgeting spreadsheet are conservative estimates to try provide Union an accurate value for what we expect to spend.

We know our club has been way too expensive for our members in general and when compared to other universities, especially when we pay tax on sales due to us not being registered as a sport at Imperial. Even without the tax, our sponsorships are not as strong as other universities, hence why our membership is double if not triple what a lot of other universities pay.

We want to increase the financial viability of playing Ultimate Frisbee, especially to local students. We have seen increasing numbers of local students interested in playing and want to make Imperial an avenue for students to try Ultimate, promoting healthy exercise and diversity.

Additionally, we have shown significant improvement this year in accolades and hope this can be reflected by an increased grant allowance, allowing us to provide optimal training to produce the same and if not better results next year. (As listed below)

UXIR (3 teams): Div 2 Nats

UMIR (3 teams): 1st team 2nd place (Div 1 Nats)

UWIR (2 teams): 1st team 1st place (Div 1 Nats), Div 2 Nats

UXIN Div 2: 1st place

UWIR Div 1: 3rd place

Thank you for your consideration.

SPF Womens Football (002)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 25,378.99

Grant Requested: £ 10,403.25

Amount Allocated: £ 3,664.56

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/806>

APPEAL MESSAGE

This year, we established a futsal team with ADF support, and it is now a core part of our club. The constitution and core risk assessment has been updated on eActivities to reflect this, though it may not have been approved in time for budgeting. We're requesting funding for key futsal costs we cannot cover without assistance, including: (13523) Coach, (13532) Affiliation, (13537) Referee, (13547) Training/Ground Hire, (15285) Balls, and (15294) Kit.

ADDITIONAL INFO

This year, we established a futsal team with ADF support, and it is now a core part of our club. The constitution and core risk assessment has been updated on eActivities to reflect this, though it may not have been approved in time for budgeting. We're requesting funding for key futsal costs we cannot cover without assistance, including: (13523) Coach, (13532) Affiliation, (13537) Referee, (13547) Training/Ground Hire, (15285) Balls, and (15294) Kit.

The ammended risk assessment has been attached to this form.

UPLOADED FILE

SPF Yacht (034)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 49,573.17
Grant Requested: £ 25,129.92
Amount Allocated: £ 6,498.01

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/831>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ADDITIONAL INFO

Appeal for 14024 and 14025 Easter and Christmas DS & CS training: In accordance with budgeting principle 9(1)(a), which states that “a grant will be prioritised where there is need,” we wish to highlight that the inability to train and qualify new skippers to Royal Yachting Association (RYA) standards is actively undermining the long-term sustainability of the club. Without continued investment in training, we cannot maintain the necessary number of qualified individuals to lead trips safely and effectively—posing a significant risk to the future of club operations.

Further, under budgeting principle 19(1)(a), we believe our application clearly demonstrated both the need for the grant and the measurable positive impact on our members—both in the immediate year and over the long term.

We would like to clarify a key point that may have led to the rejection of applications 14024 and 14025 for the Christmas and Easter RYA Day Skipper (DS) and Competent Crew (CC) training programmes. The feedback noted that the amount requested was too high for “just two individuals.” However, this appears to be a misunderstanding: the “two units” referenced in our applications referred to two boats, not two people. Each boat supports five trainees, meaning 10 individuals per training period—and 20 individuals across both programmes. This significantly changes the cost-per-person analysis and better reflects the value delivered by the proposed training.

These programmes have a broader impact than simply qualifying individuals. They are a vital pipeline for developing the next generation of skippers and crew, who are essential for maintaining safe, inclusive, and accessible club trips. The benefits of this training cascade to the wider membership, ensuring that more trips can be offered and led by qualified volunteers.

Given that funding for similar training initiatives has been approved in previous years, we are concerned about the inconsistency in decision-making, particularly as this application aligns with the same budgeting principles and continues to offer proven, club-wide benefits.

We respectfully request that the decision be reconsidered in light of the above clarification and the critical role this training plays in sustaining the club’s core activities.

MG Comments

Line ID 14024 - December - DS & CC:

Agree with this appeal on the grounds of administrative error.

As stated in their appeal, this course will provide training to 10 members. So, within context of 9(1a) and 9(1b), this should be grant fundable.

Line ID 14025 - Easter Courses - DS & CC:

Agree with this appeal on the grounds of administrative error.

As stated in their appeal, this course will provide training to 10 members. So, within context of 9(1a) and 9(1b), this should be grant fundable.

SPI ACC Table Tennis (029)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 12,868.34

Grant Requested: £ 7,659.84

Amount Allocated: £ 2,860.00

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/829>

APPEAL MESSAGE

(ID: 15157) Breakdown is 3 Star Balls 4.19 x 10 + 2 Star Training Balls Box 36.00 x 5 + 1 Star Balls Box 32.99 x 5 = 386.85, adjusted for inflation is a little over 400. (ID: 15171) Our team has been consistently been able to qualify for the EUSA international tournament throughout the past few years, requesting ADF for this.

SPI Archery (046)*Sports Sector (000)*

Total Expenditure: £ 11,230.76

Grant Requested: £ 4,639.80

Amount Allocated: £ 3,435.16

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/836>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ID 14637: Comment says valid but no grant is allocated. ID 14629: This is a yearly purchase. ID 14631: This is a one-off purchase, the cost stated is an estimate of the full cost. ID 14642: This is a yearly purchase. Please notify us if you require further clarification on these items. The club would like to avoid a steep rise in membership prices, which is only possible if we can ensure we obtain grant for the items which qualify. Thank you for your time.

SPI Boat (006)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 58,376.66
Grant Requested: £ 16,407.75
Amount Allocated: £ 8,071.31

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/809>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Appeal against outcomes for IDs 13531, 13548, 13553 and 13555. Outline of grounds for appeal made in an email addressed to the DPCS and ICU Finance, sent on Friday 8th, as this action box is too small to convey all relevant information. Desired outcomes of allocated grant to IDs in accordance with Points 17 and 16(1).

ADDITIONAL INFO

Appeal for ID 13531 and 13548 (BUCS Regatta and BUCS Head Accommodation) against Point 9(1)(a) - Need. BUCS Head and Regatta are the only opportunities for the club to earn BUCS points for the University and are therefore necessary races to participate in. These are a big focus for our athletes to get the recognition they deserve for their hard work and sacrifices made to train 10 times a week all year round from Imperial Athletes (who use the results at these events to rank us against the other sports). BUCS regatta also acts the only qualification pathway for the European University Championships (EUSA) where we have sent crews for the past 5+ years to represent Imperial Internationally. These two events require the participation of all the mens, women's and novice squads to compete and represent Imperial where this year we had everyone racing. BUCS Head (ID 13548) is held over 2 days in Newcastle which is over 7hrs away by Union minibus. With racing starting at 8am, it is not feasible to travel up the morning of racing. Therefore, accommodation is required for Friday and Saturday night. BUCS Regatta (ID 13531) is held over 4 days in Nottingham approx 3 and 1/2 hrs away by minibus. Racing starts at midday on Friday so we travel up in the morning and back on Monday night so accommodation is only required for 3 nights (Fri,Sat,Sun). We actively search for the cheapest accommodation for these events and book months in advance. We book 100% refundable rooms so that we can cancel any unnecessary and formulate an accommodation plan to allocate and reuse rooms for those racing on some but not all days (eg. someone racing on the Friday and Saturday will leave and someone racing on Sunday and Monday will arrive and then take over the room). In the past to also save on costs, we have booked twin rooms with an extra sofa/pull out bed or had 3 people in a double bed to reduce the number of rooms needed. Desired Outcome: We request 30% grant for both events ID 13531 and 1354, in line with the amendment made to Point 17 - Accommodation for Core Activity

Appeal for ID 13553 and 13555 (Transport to Dorney Lake weekends) against Point 2(7) - Inclusion and Core Activity. These trips to Dorney lake are a necessity for crew formation for races. At these weekends we use the lake for "seat racing" which involves multiple crews doing a number of timed 1500m races with swaps of people between crews, using the time differences of crews between runs to determine which individuals make the boat go faster. This is not possible to run on the Thames as the river has a number of factors which would greatly affect the results such as bends and stream compared to a straight lane buoyed lake. This ensures a fair and equal opportunity to all members wishing to race for Imperial in selection and good training opportunity. These are attended by all members of the club (including novices) as you can't ensure fair crew selection which effects and involves the entire squad without the entire squad being there, so sending only elite members would be redundant. In addition, if we were to not take everyone, it would leave those not going with no coach for a session on the Thames and therefore they couldn't row that day which wouldn't be fair, so we take everyone who wants to. Thus a judgement of "prohibited to elite members" only is unjust and untrue. We are one of the only high performance University rowing programs in the county that is inclusive of all members abilities, the majority of others, namely Durham, Newcastle, Edinburgh, UL and Oxford Brookes all have a minimum standard to be a member and cut those who do not reach that to focus of their elite performance only. We do not do this as it is against our values and we want rowing to be accessible and enjoyable to everyone no matter what, hence why when we do something, everyone does it. Desired Outcome: We request

50% grant for both Union minibus hire and fuel, IDs 13553 and 13555, in line with Point 16(1)

SPI Fencing (010)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 21,421.34
Grant Requested: £ 12,115.41
Amount Allocated: £ 6,767.78

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/813>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ADDITIONAL INFO

Appeal for Away Match Accommodation - M1 and W1 (ID 12871):

Accommodation is often less expensive or comparable in cost to train tickets, especially when booked in advance. BUCS weekends follow a highly demanding schedule, starting early, running late, and involving up to five rounds, which makes daily travel exhausting and detrimental to performance. Repeated travel would significantly drain the team's energy and compromise recovery time, ultimately hindering their ability to compete at their best. There is also the possibility of the weekends being held at Exeter as nothing has been confirmed yet, and it would be unfeasible to make same day trips there and back for two days in a row.

Appeal for Equipment Purchase (ID 12872):

At least 15 blades have to be replaced each year (unable to be repaired as they are snapped in half). For other equipment, such as wires (£15) and lames (£80), at least 1 has to be bought every year due to wear and tear of the electrical components. Using only the Harlington fund is unfeasible as it is only available every 3 years while we have to replace equipment every year.

Appeal for BUCs Individuals Transport (ID 12873) and BUCs Individuals Accommodation (ID 12874):

~25/90 members attend BUCs Individuals every year (more than a quarter of all members) which is a significant proportion of our club. There has also been an increase in interest and participation every year, which broadens our reach and engagement. Furthermore, this allows us to fulfil our constitutional aim to "offer opportunities for national and international competitions of all levels and encourage engagement in these." and is thus a core activity for our society, as it is the primary national competition we organise every year for competitive fencers. Finally, without financial support from the club, members would not be able to afford to attend. Given that they are representing Imperial, it is appropriate and expected that the club would help to support this activity. However, we would not be able to cover the full cost from our membership and income.

UPLOADED FILE

SPI Pole & Aerial (165)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 11,521.09

Grant Requested: £ 6,825.54

Amount Allocated: £ 4,895.82

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/1035>

APPEAL MESSAGE

ADDITIONAL INFO

Line 14279 - Consumable mandatory for core activity so as of 13(3) should be funded at 40%.

Line 14308 - Mandatory for running of pole classes.

Line 14311 - Under 12(4) this is to cover the 10-year replacement of the poles so should be funded at 40%.

Line 14319 - Please see original grant rationale box; training only provided to committee who will be full members of the society, and this training is mandatory for core activity.

MG Comments

Line ID 14279 - Consumables (grip and alcohol):

Agree with this appeal on the grounds of an administrative error.

These consumables are mandatory for participation in core activity. It is impossible for the dancers to hold onto the pole without the use of grip, and the alcohol is required to clean the pole between uses. The dancers are therefore unable to pole dance without these items. This should be funded in line with 13(3) at 40%.

Line ID 14308 - Supersaas subscription:

Agree with this appeal on the grounds of administrative error.

The subscription to this software is required for them to book the pole classes, they are unable to do so without this subscription. Therefore, this subscription should be funded in line with instructors as it is essentially an extension to the instructor costs, so should be funded at 50%.

Line ID 14311 - Pole replacements:

Agree with this appeal on the grounds of administrative error.

They did receive Harlington grant for new poles, due to historical failure to correctly budget for the replacement of poles. However, this line budgets for the long term replacement of these poles in 10 years time. This is in line with 12(4) and is essentially comparable to a sports team buying new goalie kit once every 5 years. The poles are expected to last 10 years, and they are essential for core activity.

Line ID 14319 - First aid:

Agree with this appeal on the grounds of administrative error.

This training is only provided to full members, as stated in the original grant rationale. To clarify, the instructors being referenced here are more experienced members of the society, who are full time members, not external instructors.

SPI Snowsports (025)

Sports Sector (000)

Total Expenditure: £ 13,383.15

Grant Requested: £ 8,345.27

Amount Allocated: £ 4,205.44

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/826>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Appeal grant allocations

ADDITIONAL INFO

I apologise but the needed details were not included in the action message. The IDs of the lines I wish to appeal are - 14162, 14166, 14169, 14170, 14172 and 14174.

14162, 14166, 14169, 14170 - These are all to do with Scotland Training Weekend not being deemed as a core activity. We deem Scotland as a core activity as not only does it offer training to racers we take, but also it comes under our fundamental aim of making snowsports more accessible to our members. Without grant we are unable to provide the trip at an affordable cost which massively reduces interest and puts the trip in jeopardy. After 3 very successful years, it is only growing and becoming a more streamlined trip. I realise 1 minibuss of people is not the whole member base, but with funding and having more experience we would to grow the trip and benefit more members.

14172 - This is for Beginner Lessons Instructor fee. These were incredibly popular this year with both sessions taking 12 beginners each and being in high demand. We want to continue to provide these as cheaply as possible as high costs put off students wanting to learn a new sport. With more grant allocation we can offer more sessions next year which I know will be appreciated by a large number of members. Limiting the cost of beginner lessons directly aligns with our clubs core aim of making the sport accessible. I believe these should be eligible for 60% grant allocation under 22(1).

14174 - This is about travel to the KINGs racing events across the year. In terms of supporters I will remove these from the estimation however they are committee members there for logistics as well as support. Grant allocation is however needed as these races are a large part of Imperials racing scene across the year, and members are far less likely to take part without travel subsidies. Due to how far away the events are, we only think it fair to alleviate the burden. There are 5 racers in a team and we aim to take 1 team per event. This calculates to 576.50 GBP for 5 members based on public transport to Brentwood for 2 events (£14.65 pp), and to Southampton for 2 events (£35 pp). Including taxi to get from station to event (£10 per journey per event - £80 total).

SPM Ju-Jitsu (013)*Sports Sector (000)*

Total Expenditure: £ 4,592.33

Grant Requested: £ 2,121.50

Amount Allocated: £ 1,598.26

<https://eactivities.union.ic.ac.uk/finance/budgets/annual/budgets/816>

APPEAL MESSAGE

Line 13152 (unjust process appeal): The grant was not given on the basis that instructors should pay their own licenses, however without instructors who have licences we are not able to train at all, making it essential to the functioning of the club. Our instructors only teach at Imperial and come in their free time (not paid), so we should be funding their licenses in order to do that. We would like to request grant for full allocation of these fees since they are paid to our affiliative body.
