Jack Butler-Kettle

contact@jackbutlerkettle.com

Quantum Report

Loss and Expense: Prolongation and Thickening

Prepared for	Calder Claims Consulting Ltd (instructing consultancy), for their client, a drylining subcontractor
Project	A residential scheme, London. Anonymised at the consultancy's request
Contract	JCT SBCSub/D 2016 as amended
Service	Claim Quantum Build. Quantum only, white-label, shown here under my own name for illustration
Our reference	26-014-R04
Date	21 August 2026
Status	Final

Worked example. The project, the parties and every figure are illustrative, shown so you can see the format and depth a real instruction receives.

Contents

1. Your instruction

Your delay analyst has concluded an entitlement case for a 9-week extension of time driven by late access to cores 2 and 3. You instructed me to build the money that follows from it (prolongation, thickened preliminaries and disruption) from the client's records, to sit behind your narrative.

2. Scope, basis, and the boundary

This report values the money. Entitlement is assumed as instructed: every figure below is conditional on the 9-week extension your analyst has pleaded, and the report says so wherever the assumption bites. If the tribunal awards fewer weeks, section 6 shows the arithmetic to rescale each head. No delay analysis or programme opinion is offered here. That boundary is deliberate, and it is why these figures can be defended independently of the time case.

Ref	Document	From	Dated / received
A	Cost ledger, native Excel, 14,120 lines	Client bookkeeper	4 August 2026
B	Weekly labour allocation sheets, weeks 1 to 61	Site records	4 August 2026
C	Preliminaries build-up in the accepted tender	Client	6 August 2026
D	Delay analysis and pleaded extension of time (9 weeks)	Your analyst	6 August 2026
E	Plant and supervision invoices for the claim period	Client purchase ledger	11 August 2026

3. What I did

Step	What was done, and against what
1	The cost ledger reconciled: 312 duplicate lines removed, two rival versions of the labour costs resolved against the allocation sheets, and one set of figures left standing
2	Prolongation built from actual time-related costs in the 9 assumed weeks, never from a weekly tender rate multiplied out
3	Thickening built from the supervision actually added, invoice by invoice, against the tender's supervision allowance
4	Disruption tested against the records and, on what the records will carry, confined to the two cores rather than claimed project-wide
5	Every head tested against the others for double counting: supervision claimed in thickening is excluded from prolongation, line by line

4. The heads, summarised

Head	Basis	Records	Sum
Prolongation: time-related site costs, 9 assumed weeks	Assumed entitlement (doc D); actual costs, not tender rates	A, B, E	£74,890
Thickened preliminaries: added supervision, weeks 18 to 43	Actual added supervisor, invoiced	C, E	£18,240
Disruption: cores 2 and 3 only, measured against undisrupted areas	Labour allocation comparison, like for like activity	B	£31,760
Total, conditional on the 9-week entitlement			**£124,890**

Prolongation, £74,890. The nine assumed weeks carry actual site staff, welfare, hoist and scaffold hire and consumables from the ledger, week by week: £8,321 average against the tender's £6,900 weekly preliminaries allowance, and the difference is itself a check that the costs are real rather than rates re-badged.

Disruption, £31,760, and the honest note. The client's instinct was a project-wide productivity claim near £90,000. The records will not carry it: allocation sheets are complete for cores 2 and 3 and patchy elsewhere. The comparison of disrupted against undisrupted weeks on like activities supports £31,760, and a tribunal will believe a confined head built on complete records over a global one built on averages. The larger number was available and was not taken. That is the soft spot named, and answered.

5. What this means, and what happens next

The quantum stands at £124,890, conditional on the pleaded 9 weeks. Each head rescales independently: prolongation at £8,321 per awarded week; thickening fixed once any extension covering weeks 18 to 43 is awarded; disruption independent of the award entirely. The schedules and build-ups are delivered in native Excel alongside this report, structured to drop into your submission.

6. Basis of figures

Figure	Source and build-up	Where it appears
£74,890	Ledger lines coded time-related, weeks matching doc D's window, schedule Q1	Section 4
£18,240	Invoices E-114 to E-131 less the tender allowance, schedule Q2	Section 4
£31,760	Allocation-sheet comparison, schedule Q3, method stated on its face	Section 4

Assumptions. One: the 9-week entitlement, assumed as instructed and marked at every point it bites. Nothing else.

Sign-off

Prepared, checked and issued by:

Jack Butler-Kettle
Quantity Surveying and Construction Claims

Date