FISHMAN RESEARCH TECHNOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

Contractor Due Diligence: Window-Replacement Proposal

Public-source review of Contractor X and a Phase One proposal for Sample Tower, 100 Sample Street, Sample City

Prepared for the limited partners of Sample Residential Limited Partnership (Client A). Public sources retrieved during a recent review. Items marked unverified could not be confirmed from a primary source.

SAMPLE PORTFOLIO DELIVERABLE. Names, places, amounts, dates, and other identifying details have been changed or generalized. This is not a document from a real client matter. It is not legal advice.

Bottom line

Contractor X is a licensed, long-operating small contractor with general-building and glazing classifications, a clear published license status, and completed prior work for buildings run by Management Company Y. The concern is the proposal, not the license as it appears in secondary sources.

- As written, the proposal contains no insurance, additional-insured, bond, indemnity, lien-release, or retention terms.
- It is not addressed to the Partnership.
- It asks for about half of the contract price before any installation begins.
- It supports product claims mainly with links to the manufacturer's website.
- The lump-sum price, about $1.65 million in this sample, is more than twice the largest permit value in the contractor's published city record (that prior high-water mark was in the high six figures).
- The product's U.S. certification path and energy-code compliance documentation were unverified at the time of the review.

The Partnership should not sign or pay any deposit until the items in the request list at the end are received and independently checked. License-board details that could not be read from the official site (bond number and dates, workers' compensation policy, disciplinary history) should be rechecked by hand on the official license-board site.

License and company record (as published)

Secondary aggregators, not the official board page, were the sources that could be retrieved. The official page was blocked to scripted access and was not bypassed.

Item	Published value (generalized)	Status
License status	Clear / active, issued in the late 2000s, corporate entity formed in the early 2000s	Republished board data. Official page not retrieved.
Classifications	General building and glazing	Secondary sources.
Responsible managing officer	Named officers appear in aggregator listings	Unverified against the official board file. Names omitted from this sample.
Discipline, citations, complaints	None shown in secondary sources	Unverified. Official disciplinary disclosures were not readable.

The proposal, as written

- Scope: Phase One, south-facing stacks only, described as the first of three phases. Mock-ups were said to have been installed in three units; results were described as excellent. A letter from the general partner said windows and sliding glass doors were failing and would be addressed over several years.
- Product: a premium European thermally broken aluminum window and lift-and-slide door system from Manufacturer M, with dual-pane glass (not triple). Energy and finish claims were not independently verified.

- Price and terms (sample, scaled): a single lump sum of about $1.65 million, a multi-month installation window, and permit fees extra. About half the price would be paid before installation begins, and only a small remainder would be held to completion.
- Method and warranty: swing-stage work in an occupied building, on the order of a couple of days per unit, with a limited product and installation warranty.

The proposal does not state an opening count, a window schedule, per-opening prices, a glass specification, certified energy ratings for the actual configurations, test reports, or whether concrete repair, flashing, engineering, or access costs are included. No competing bid was in the file.

Prior work

City permit records show Contractor X as the contractor on a small, completed window job at the subject property itself (a handful of sliding windows in one unit, in the mid-five figures) and on earlier window permits at another building associated with the same manager. The contractor's city-wide permit history is long and mostly much smaller jobs. The Phase One lump sum is far above any permit value in that record. A separate memo reviews whether a prior working relationship with the manager is documented, and whether any ownership or family tie appears in public records.

Request list before any deposit

- Insurance, additional-insured endorsements, a performance or payment bond, indemnity, lien-release, and retention terms, in a written contract addressed to the Partnership.
- A scope sheet, schedule of values, and opening count.
- Certified energy ratings and the code-compliance path for each actual window and door configuration, not only catalog pages.
- Laboratory test reports, stamped structural calculations, and a mock-up air-and-water test plan.
- Swing-stage permits, engineered rigging, and insurance for access equipment.
- Building-department permit status and product specifications for the mock-ups already installed.
- Proof of authorization to supply the product in the United States, and the manufacturer's written warranty.
- References for completed high-rise aluminum window replacements of similar scale, and evidence the contractor can carry a job of this size.
- Independent competing bids and an independent building-envelope consultant's review, with counsel review of the contract.

Public-source due diligence, not a legal opinion or a credit rating. License numbers, officer names, street addresses, and exact bid figures have been omitted or scaled.