Docket

DOCKET / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

# PACA License Search: Vetting PE Produce Distributor Maps

> Build a more reviewable acquisition pipeline with Docket. Our deal-origination software and managed research help private equity teams screen companies against a mandate and understand the evidence behind each finding.

Published by Docket · 2026-10-22 · paca license search · paca license lookup · epaca · produce distributors · private equity · entity resolution · market mapping · due diligence · paca license verification

Original article: https://docket.capital/articles/paca-license-search-produce-distributor-maps



### In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Key Changes
4. PACA License Lookup Workflow
5. Reconcile Legal Names, Branches and Ownership
6. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
7. Reusable PACA-to-Legal-Entity Worksheet
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Conclusion

# Executive Summary

A **PACA license search** should begin with USDA's official ePACA landing page and its link to the public search. USDA documents searches by business, branch or trade name, license number and geography. (www.ams.usda.gov) Its catalog describes records containing trade names, branch locations and principals. (catalog.data.gov) These are useful identity clues for private-equity origination, but the analyst must reconcile the licensed operator to the candidate company before accepting a match.

**The PACA license number and ePACA portal ID are different identifiers.** (www.ams.usda.gov) Store them separately, and leave an unavailable portal ID unpopulated. A trade name also requires its own field: Pennsylvania explicitly says that using a fictitious name does not create a separate legal entity. (www.pa.gov) Neither a portal identifier nor a brand should silently replace the legal entity in a target universe.

Coverage requires particular care. USDA's general licensing summary says **more than 2,000 pounds** of fresh or frozen produce in a day. (www.ams.usda.gov) The regulation defines wholesale quantities as **one ton, or 2,000 pounds, or more**. (www.ecfr.gov) Preserve that boundary difference and refer threshold cases to USDA or counsel. Retailers face a separate **$230,000 annual purchase-cost threshold**. (www.ams.usda.gov) The frozen-only broker exception has its own conditions. (www.ecfr.gov) These rules make a simple count of PACA hits an unsuitable denominator for the whole produce distribution market.

This report recommends separate decisions for **identity, sector fit, ownership and follow-up**. Ownership needs additional evidence: GLEIF's parent relationships concern accounting consolidation. (www.gleif.org) Delaware cautions that its free entity search does not establish entity status. (corp.delaware.gov) The quantitative measure developed below is an internal reconciliation rate, with a fictional calculation and reusable worksheet. It is not market coverage. Census classification further illustrates the mismatch: code **424480** addresses fresh fruit and vegetable merchant wholesalers. (www.census.gov) Research was conducted on October 22, 2026. The public search application returned a loading screen, and the permitted fallback did not retrieve a usable interface. Consequently, search instructions below are attributed to USDA documentation. No actual license record, company match, complaint history, or acquisition target was verified for this report.

# Introduction and Background

The **Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA)** is relevant to a produce-company screen because its licensing framework concerns commission merchants, dealers and brokers. A license certifies authorization to engage in those activities. For an origination analyst, the immediate question is narrower than whether a company is attractive: does the record belong to the business being researched? (www.ecfr.gov)

A conventional trading-partner check and an acquisition target map serve different decisions. **Blue Book** positions its guide around combining license status with credit scores, payment history and risk alerts. Those are its stated trading-information uses. An acquisition map also needs to establish whether apparent companies are separate operators, branches, aliases, or parts of a larger ownership group. (www.bluebookservices.com)

A **doing-business-as name (DBA)** is an identity under which a business may operate separately from its formal entity name. The Small Business Administration explains that distinction. The crosswalk proposed here therefore keeps the searched name, trading name and legal entity apart, even where they appear on the same website. (www.sba.gov)

The counting unit matters just as much. The Bureau of Labor Statistics distinguishes a company from its establishments and explains that a company may contain multiple establishments. A map of locations and a map of potential acquisition counterparties therefore require separate records and explicit relationships. (www.bls.gov)

Docket's editorial perspective here is private-equity origination research. The proposed method addresses one source-specific decision: when a PACA result supports identity and produce-sector relevance, and when unresolved evidence requires more work. It is intended to supplement the search rather than replace the official service. USDA's catalog describes the underlying record as license information, including branches, trade names and principals. (catalog.data.gov)

# Key Changes

The changes in this section concern the research process recommended for a target map. They are not a claim that PACA legislation changed in the publication year.

### Replace a universal weight filter with a scope assessment

USDA's general licensing page uses the wording "more than 2,000 pounds" for daily purchases or sales of fresh or frozen fruits and vegetables. (www.ams.usda.gov) The regulatory definition of wholesale or jobbing quantities uses "one ton (2,000 pounds) or more," including quantities shipped, received, or contracted for shipment or receipt. (www.ecfr.gov) The exact boundary should remain visible in research notes.

Apply Table 1 within PACA's **interstate- or foreign-commerce scope**. (USDA PACA guidance) A transaction conducted within one state can still fall within the statutory current of commerce—for example, a sale for processing within the state followed by shipment of the resulting products out of state. (7 U.S.C. § 499a(b)(8)) Refer uncertain scope cases to USDA or counsel.

*Table 1* summarizes the distinctions that should be checked before treating a missing license as evidence against inclusion.

| Activity or circumstance | Published scope evidence | Research implication |
|---|---|---|
| General produce dealing | USDA summarizes a daily threshold above **2,000 pounds**; the regulatory wholesale-quantity definition includes **2,000 pounds**. (www.ams.usda.gov) (www.ecfr.gov) | Record activity and volume evidence; escalate exact-boundary cases. |
| Negotiating sales for another party | USDA generally describes licensing from the **first transaction**. (www.ams.usda.gov) | Physical possession is an unsuitable universal screen. |
| Retail produce purchases | USDA describes invoice purchase costs exceeding **$230,000 per calendar year**. (www.ams.usda.gov) | Record purchase costs separately from sales revenue. |
| Qualifying frozen-only brokerage | The regulation describes an independent agent negotiating exclusively for the vendor, with annual negotiated invoice value not exceeding **$230,000**. (www.ecfr.gov) | Check the activity, agency relationship and value measure together. |
| Producer selling its own crop | The statutory dealer definition reproduced by Cornell contains an exclusion concerning commodities of the producer's own raising. (www.law.cornell.edu) | Distinguish own production from third-party produce marketing. |

These are different tests with different units. Daily weight, annual purchase cost and negotiated invoice value should never occupy an undifferentiated "size" column. An analyst should retain the applicable test and its evidence rather than convert all thresholds into a presumed revenue band.

## Treat exceptions as follow-up categories

A grower name does not settle licensing scope: the regulation expressly includes growers marketing produce grown by others. Conversely, the statute allows certain persons outside the dealer definition to elect to obtain a license. Thus, neither a grower label nor a positive license hit determines a company's exact operating model. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.law.cornell.edu)

Use an activity note that distinguishes buying for resale, brokerage, own-crop sales, processing and retailing. USDA's application resource explicitly includes wholesalers, processors, truckers, grocery wholesalers and foodservice firms within its general explanation. A PACA hit can therefore be relevant without proving that the company is a produce-focused distributor. (www.ams.usda.gov)

## Separate new entities from additional locations

USDA says a separate legal entity conducting PACA-subject business needs a new license, even where ownership is unchanged. Adding a branch facility or additional trade name does not, by itself, require a new license. This distinction should drive the analyst's duplicate review. (www.ams.usda.gov)

Keep three proposed relationships visible: **same operator, additional branch**; **same operator, additional trade name**; and **different legal operator**. Accepting one relationship should not automatically accept the others. A name match is a candidate connection requiring corroboration.

# PACA License Lookup Workflow

## Begin with the official route and record the search

Use USDA's ePACA landing page as the starting route. Its search tip sheet says the public search does not require login and documents searches by business, branch or trade name, license number, city, state or territory, and ZIP code or ZIP range. These are documented capabilities; the live layout could not be confirmed during this research. (www.ams.usda.gov)

For a **PACA licensee search by company name**, apply the following sequence as an analyst procedure:

- **Preserve the input:** retain the candidate name exactly as received.
- **Search the trading name:** record the spelling and search category used.
- **Search the legal name:** include names found in official filings.
- **Broaden carefully:** try distinctive name components without losing the original query.
- **Use an available license number:** retain its original formatting in the evidence record.
- **Check geography:** compare documented city, state and branch clues.
- **Open the business profile:** retain the result details rather than relying on a result-list resemblance.
- **Record the outcome:** distinguish matched, unresolved, no match and access blocked.

Name-search behavior varies between systems. California's published guidance recommends fewer keywords when a search fails and warns that spacing matters; Florida says an entire corporate name is unnecessary. These are useful reminders to log query variants, not grounds for assuming every registry uses the same matching algorithm. (www.sos.ca.gov) (dos.fl.gov)

## Keep identifiers in separate fields

The **USDA license number** belongs in the license-number field. USDA explicitly says the **ePACA ID** is not that number. Do not infer a portal ID from a license number, a URL token, or a third-party profile. If it was not available to the researcher, record "not collected." (www.ams.usda.gov)

Other systems introduce further identifiers. Blue Book describes its **BBID** as a unique business ID, and the Securities and Exchange Commission assigns a **Central Index Key (CIK)** within its filing system. Store such identifiers with their issuing system; neither should overwrite a PACA identifier or a state registry identifier. (www.bluebookservices.com) (www.sec.gov)

## Retain a dated source snapshot

For each substantive result, retain the source URL, exact query, search category, displayed name, literal status, collection time and a permitted saved copy or screenshot. This is a recommended evidence procedure, not a claim that the live portal provides an export function. No export capability was verified.

Keep **source-update date** separate from **capture date**. New York says its online entity information is updated daily. (dos.ny.gov) The Data.gov PACA catalog, meanwhile, shows a dataset update date of **December 23, 2014**. (catalog.data.gov) That catalog date should not be assigned to an individual license record or treated as proof that current license information dates from that year.

A blocked page is also an outcome worth retaining. Document the access limitation and continue through other sources; do not turn an unsuccessful fetch into either a positive identity match or a substantive no-match finding.

# Reconcile Legal Names, Branches and Ownership

## Connect the alias to the entity

A **PACA license legal name and DBA lookup** should produce a crosswalk, with the relation between names stated explicitly. Pennsylvania explains that a fictitious name does not create a separate legal entity and that different entities may register the same fictitious name. Name equality alone is therefore insufficient for a unique match. (www.pa.gov)

Florida's fictitious-name guide provides a useful linkage method: searches can use the owning entity's Charter/Document Number, and multiple registrations can appear under that number. Where available, retain that identifier and the underlying fictitious-name record together. (dos.fl.gov)

Jurisdiction can explain a name difference. New Jersey permits registered alternate names and explains that an out-of-state business may need a secondary DBA when its home-state name is unavailable there. An apparent mismatch can therefore require a foreign-registration crosswalk rather than a new company row. (business.nj.gov)

Preserve the exact legal spelling in the accepted entity record. New York's assumed-name instructions explicitly say not to abbreviate or change the entity name and request the addresses of locations operating under the assumed name. Those instructions illustrate why legal-name and location evidence should be reviewed together. (dos.ny.gov)

## Use corroborating fields without overstating them

A proposed matching standard for this worksheet is to accept an entity only when the evidence connects the names and supplies corroborating identifiers or operating details. The standard is an analyst control, not a USDA rule.

Useful checks include:

- **Legal-name continuity:** compare the PACA operator name with a filed entity name.
- **Registry identity:** record the issuing jurisdiction and entity identifier together.
- **Trade-name linkage:** retain the filing that connects the alias to the entity.
- **Address role:** label principal office, branch, mailing and service addresses separately.
- **Website linkage:** look for an explicit operator statement in terms, invoices or contact material.
- **Historical changes:** preserve previous names and dates instead of overwriting them.
- **Conflict handling:** leave an unresolved relationship open when sources disagree.

New York's public entity information includes jurisdiction, county, service-of-process address and registered-agent information where applicable. Those fields can help distinguish address roles, but the analyst should record what each field actually represents. A service address should not silently become a warehouse location.

(dos.ny.gov)

Florida also warns that multiple entities may appear under a single Federal Employer Identification number. Treat that as a caution against building a universal automatic-merge rule around an identifier without inspecting the underlying records. (dos.fl.gov)

### Keep operator, manager and owner separate

California states that its business entity records do not maintain owner, shareholder and employee information. Texas explains that an entity may contract for registered-agent services. Illinois separately identifies manager names and addresses among available limited liability company details. These are different roles, and the crosswalk should preserve their labels. (www.sos.ca.gov) (www.sos.state.tx.us) (www.ilsos.gov)

An **ultimate owner** conclusion requires its own evidence. Where an entity has a Legal Entity Identifier (LEI), GLEIF's relationship data concerns direct and ultimate accounting consolidating parents. A reported accounting parent can inform the ownership workstream, but its defined relationship should remain attached to the finding. (www.gleif.org)

GLEIF also makes publication of a parent LEI conditional on the parent having one. An absent parent identifier should therefore remain an evidence gap rather than become an "independent" ownership classification. (www.gleif.org)

## Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

### Interpret status within the issuing system

An active license observation can support a licensing-status field for the identified operator at the capture time. It does not establish revenue, profitability, owner willingness to sell, or transaction readiness. The regulation describes what the license certifies: authorization to engage in the specified produce businesses. (www.ecfr.gov)

For a lapsed, terminated, expired, inactive, or otherwise non-current result, retain the literal displayed wording. No complete current portal status glossary was verified in this research. The renewal regulation does provide for automatic termination on the anniversary date unless the required renewal application and applicable fee are supplied; a legal interpretation still requires the relevant facts. (www.ecfr.gov)

Avoid transferring meanings between systems. Delaware says its free entity search returns active and inactive entities but does not establish entity status; it also distinguishes an online status result from a good-standing certificate. Florida's fictitious-name guide separately describes active or expired filing status. These observations concern different records and questions. (corp.delaware.gov) (dos.fl.gov)

### Preserve complaint pointers without scoring guilt

USDA's ePACA landing page says license search includes informal and formal complaint information. Its tip sheet additionally describes complaint counts and formal complaint claim amounts. This supports retaining a **complaint pointer** for later review; it does not support treating a count or claimed amount as a resolved liability. (www.ams.usda.gov)

The worksheet should record the source, collection time and the record category actually displayed. Leave interpretation to an appropriate diligence workstream. Do not rank identifiable companies adversely from a bare count, infer a debt from an asserted amount, or write a transaction conclusion from an unmatched name.

### Apply an escalation decision tree to missing records

A **produce company missing from PACA license search** should enter a follow-up queue. The proposed decision tree is:

- **Access failed?** Record “search unavailable” and retry through the official route later.
- **Search incomplete?** Check legal, trade and historical names plus geography.
- **Identity differs?** Review branch, subsidiary and alternate-name relationships.
- **Activity unclear?** Establish what the company buys, sells or negotiates.
- **Exception plausible?** Record the relevant scope question and supporting evidence.
- **Status unclear?** Retain the exact wording and seek USDA clarification.
- **Evidence still conflicts?** Keep the candidate unresolved with a named next action.
- **Fit disproved independently?** Exclude using the documented mandate reason.

Do not mistake another identifier search for PACA verification. Texas’s franchise-tax search accepts taxpayer or federal employer identifiers, entity names and Secretary of State file numbers. It can contribute a separate entity crosscheck, but its result answers a different administrative question. (comptroller.texas.gov)

Finally, research scale does not override access terms. Illinois describes its business database as available for individual searches and restricts bulk copying or downloading. Design the reconciliation workflow around each source’s permitted use. (www.ilsos.gov)

## Reusable PACA-to-Legal-Entity Worksheet

The worksheet is designed to preserve an accepted finding and the unresolved alternatives. USDA’s catalog describes branch, trade-name and principal information within the license record; those categories motivate separate columns rather than a single company-name cell. (catalog.data.gov)

*Table 2* maps source fields to permissible research uses. Its inference rules are proposed analyst controls.

| License or crosswalk field | Permissible inference | Common false inference | Next source or action |
|---|---|---|---|
| Displayed operator and license number | Identify the observed license record. | The operator is necessarily the ultimate owner. | State entity filing and ownership evidence. |
| ePACA portal ID | Identify the portal’s business-system reference if available. | Substituting this value for the license number. | Keep separate identifiers and provenance. |
| Trade name | Record an alias requiring entity linkage. | Every alias is a separate acquisition candidate. (www.pa.gov) | Fictitious-name or alternate-name filing. |
| Branch | Record a location relationship. | Counting every location as a separate operator. | Operator profile and location evidence. |

| License or crosswalk field | Permissible inference | Common false inference | Next source or action |
|---|---|---|---|
| Principal or registered agent | Preserve the reported role. | An agent necessarily owns the company. (www.sos.state.tx.us) | Role-specific filings and ownership documents. |
| Literal status | Preserve the issuing system's observation. | All registers use "active" identically. (corp.delaware.gov) | Relevant status guidance or certificate. |
| Complaint pointer | Locate material for separate review. | A count establishes a financial liability. | Open the underlying record and obtain qualified review. |
| State-registry match | Connect the operator to a jurisdiction-specific entity. | A matched DBA uniquely identifies an entity. (www.pa.gov) | Compare identifiers and original filings. |
| Company website match | Record explicit operator and service evidence. | A shared brand proves common ownership. | Separate operator, brand and parent findings. |

Read the table horizontally. The next source should answer the unresolved question in that row. A state filing cannot substitute for current business activity evidence, and an attractive website cannot settle a licensing-status question.

## Copy-and-save worksheet

The following CSV header is a reusable crosswalk. Copy it into a text file named paca-entity-crosswalk.csv and import it into a spreadsheet. It is included within this article so the research protocol and worksheet travel together.

```
searched_name,trade_name,legal_operator,usda_license_number,epaca_portal_id,status,branches,city_state,compl
aint_pointer,state_registry_match,company_website_match,capture_date,unresolved_conflict
```

Use these entry rules:

- **Searched name:** preserve the input string and link to a separate query log.
- **Trade name:** record each alias without replacing the legal operator.
- **License number:** store as text and retain the source's formatting.
- **Portal ID:** enter only when independently available; otherwise use "not collected."
- **Status:** retain the literal source value and associated capture time.
- **Branches:** use a linked location sheet when several locations are present.
- **Registry match:** include jurisdiction, identifier and evidence pointer.
- **Website match:** cite the page connecting the domain to the operator.
- **Complaint pointer:** distinguish "not assessed" from an observed empty result.
- **Unresolved conflict:** state what differs and what evidence would resolve it.

## Fictional worked row (Hypothetical Example)

*Table 3* is entirely fictional. The identifiers are deliberately invalid training placeholders, the location is invented, and no registry or company website was checked for this row.

| Searched name | Trade name | Legal operator | USDA license number | ePACA portal ID | Status | Branches | City/state | Complaint pointer | State-registry match | Company website match | Capture date | Unresolved conflict |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fictional Orchard Fresh | Fictional Orchard Fresh | Fictional Orchard Distribution LLC | MOCK-LIC-001, invalid | Not collected | Active, invented | Fictional branch A | Example City, FL, invented | Not assessed | MOCK-REG-001, invented | Not populated | 2026-10-22, illustrative | Alias-to-entity link awaits an original filing |

The appropriate decision is “identity unresolved,” despite the invented active status. A proposed Florida follow-up would inspect the fictitious-name linkage using the owning entity’s Charter/Document Number, because the state guide permits that search. The example supplies no evidence about a real business and no estimate of research performance. (dos.fl.gov)

# Data Analysis and Evidence

## Compare scope and units before comparing totals

The **2022 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS)** identifies fresh fruit and vegetable merchant wholesalers as code **424480**. (www.census.gov) It separately identifies packaged frozen food merchant wholesalers as **424420**, (www.census.gov) and other grocery and related products merchant wholesalers as **424490**. (www.census.gov) These categories should remain distinct when defining the candidate-source boundary.

This matters because PACA’s general licensing explanation covers fresh and frozen produce across several types of business. A union of license records and a fresh-produce industry-code list can add useful candidates, but the lists do not describe identical populations. The appropriate research task is to reconcile their differences rather than declare one a complete market census. (www.ams.usda.gov)

**County Business Patterns (CBP)** publishes economic information for establishments with paid employees, organized by industry and employment size. **Statistics of U.S. Businesses (SUSB)** publishes both firm and establishment counts. Neither label should be shortened to “companies” without reviewing the selected table’s unit. (www.census.gov)

The SUSB glossary defines an establishment as a single physical business location. Its firm definition groups establishments under common ownership or control within the same geography and industry. The geographic and industry boundaries of a table therefore matter when interpreting firm totals. (www.census.gov)

BLS similarly explains that one company may include multiple establishments with different activities. Branch counts may inform a location map, but they should not be mechanically added to a legal-entity count. (www.bls.gov)

CBP confidentiality protections also limit its use for finding named targets: Census says it does not publish data disclosing an individual employer’s operations. Use statistical tables for contextual comparisons and company-level sources for identities. (www.census.gov)

### Measure internal reconciliation, with an explicit denominator

The proposed metric is:

**Internal reconciliation rate = matched unique legal entities / candidate companies × 100.**

Before calculating it, normalize the candidate denominator to distinct candidate-company records. Keep raw imported names in a separate count. Otherwise, aliases in the denominator and deduplicated entities in the numerator measure incompatible units.

**Fictional calculation (Hypothetical Example):** suppose an analyst has **120** normalized candidate companies and accepts PACA-to-entity matches for **84** unique legal operators. The internal reconciliation rate is **84 / 120 × 100 = 70%**. These are invented inputs and arithmetic, not observed company data or an industry estimate.

The remaining **36** candidates in this fictional calculation require reason codes such as incomplete search, uncertain alias, scope question, stale evidence, or access failure. The ratio describes that candidate batch under that matching policy. It says nothing about the percentage of the national market identified.

Keep separate measures for **license match**, **sector fit**, **ownership resolved**, and **investment criteria assessed**. Do not add them together into a single coverage score. No supported public count of the addressable acquisition universe was established in this research, and no paid-search volume or conversion figure is used as a proxy for buyer demand.

## Implications and Future Directions

The main implementation choice is what constitutes an accepted company record. A PACA search result should populate a source record first. The analyst then accepts or rejects particular connections between that record, the legal entity, the website, the branch and the ownership group.

A conservative workflow should retain reversible decisions:

- **Accept identity:** document the link between the license record and legal operator.
- **Accept sector fit:** retain evidence of the business activity relevant to the mandate.
- **Keep ownership open:** separate unanswered parent and shareholder questions.
- **Hold conflicts:** preserve competing matches and the next resolving action.
- **Refresh selectively:** recheck source fields when a relevant change is reported.
- **Track exclusions:** distinguish a documented fit exclusion from unresolved research.

The need for these separate connections is visible in public-source limitations. SBA warns that multiple businesses can use the same DBA. California says its entity records do not maintain ownership information. Neither a name match nor a successful registry search should close every research question. (www.sba.gov) (www.sos.ca.gov)

Cross-state expansion also deserves a relationship record. New Jersey’s secondary-name requirement for some out-of-state entities illustrates how the same business can present different names across jurisdictions. Preserve the formation-state identity and foreign-registration evidence together before deciding whether to merge. (business.nj.gov)

Future automation should preserve these distinctions. Store the original names and source identifiers, make match decisions reviewable, and retain missing evidence explicitly. Where a source limits automated collection, use a permitted workflow; Illinois's individual-search restriction is a concrete example. (www.ilsos.gov)

At diligence handoff, provide the crosswalk and the unanswered questions together. Licensing scope, entity continuity and the meaning of complaint material may require USDA clarification or legal advice. The purpose of the screen is to direct that work and prevent premature exclusions, without representing that a license establishes investment quality.

## Conclusion

A PACA license search is most useful when the research question remains precise: does this observed license record belong to the operator being screened? The regulation describes the license as authorization to engage in specified produce businesses. That is a meaningful input to a company record, while financial scale, ownership and sale readiness remain separate questions. (www.ecfr.gov)

The recommended workflow preserves the original query, separates the license number from other identifiers, connects aliases through documentary evidence, and labels branch relationships explicitly. A shared trading name should not decide the entity count. Pennsylvania's explanation that a fictitious name does not create a separate legal entity captures that distinction directly. (www.pa.gov)

A missing result should retain a reason and a next action. Search failure, incomplete naming information, uncertain scope and evidence conflict should remain distinguishable. Likewise, a status observation and a complaint pointer should be preserved in their original context, with interpretation assigned to the appropriate diligence workstream.

Finally, keep the denominator honest. SUSB publishes firms and establishments as distinct measures; the proposed reconciliation rate measures only the accepted entity matches within a defined candidate batch. It cannot establish national market coverage or demonstrate that the list contains every suitable acquisition target. (www.census.gov)

The reusable worksheet makes these decisions reviewable: what was searched, which operator was matched, which names and locations were linked, when the evidence was captured, and what remains unresolved. That is the appropriate handoff from navigational license lookup to evidence-backed produce-distributor research.

## Source links

Links cited in this article, in order of first appearance. Full addresses are provided for readers using extracted text.

1. https://www.ams.usda.gov/sites/default/files/media/PACASearchTipSheet.pdf
2. https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/perishable-agricultural-commodities-act-search-engine
3. https://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/paca/epacaportal
4. https://www.pa.gov/agencies/dos/programs/business/types-of-filings-and-registrations/fictitious-names
5. https://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/paca/licensing

6. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-7/subtitle-B/chapter-I/subchapter-B/part-46/section-46.2
7. https://www.gleif.org/en/lei-data/access-and-use-lei-data/level-2-data-who-owns-whom
8. https://corp.delaware.gov/more-information
9. https://www.census.gov/naics/reference_files_tools/2022_NAICS_Manual.pdf
10. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-7/subtitle-B/chapter-I/subchapter-B/part-46/section-46.7
11. https://www.bluebookservices.com/paca-license-search
12. https://www.sba.gov/counseling/launch-your-business
13. https://www.bls.gov/opub/hom/cew/concepts.htm
14. https://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/paca/common-questions
15. https://www.govinfo.gov/link/uscode/7/499a
16. https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/7/499a
17. https://www.ams.usda.gov/resources/paca-license-application
18. https://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/business-entities/cbs-search-tips
19. https://dos.fl.gov/sunbiz/search/guides/corporation-records
20. https://www.bluebookservices.com/paca
21. https://www.sec.gov/submit-filings/filer-support-resources/how-do-i-guides/look-central-index-key-cik-number
22. https://dos.ny.gov/node/35461
23. https://dos.fl.gov/sunbiz/search/guides/fictitious-name
24. https://business.nj.gov/pages/business-names
25. https://dos.ny.gov/node/35606
26. https://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/business-entities/information-requests
27. https://www.sos.state.tx.us/corp/registeredagentfaqs.shtml
28. https://www.ilsos.gov/departments/business-services/business-searches.html
29. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-7/subtitle-B/chapter-I/subchapter-B/part-46/section-46.9
30. https://comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/franchise/account-status/search.php
31. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/cbp.html
32. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/susb/about/glossary.html
33. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/cbp/technical-documentation/methodology.html
34. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/susb/about.html

THE PUBLISHER

# About Docket

Docket provides deal-origination research software and managed research for private equity firms. We help investment teams investigate acquisition targets using structured screening criteria, retained sources and reviewable company evidence. Teams can work through a self-serve platform or use managed research, depending on how they want research delivered.

### Research against a defined mandate

A useful target list needs more than company names. Docket focuses on the questions that determine whether a company fits an investment mandate, including the evidence needed to support or qualify each answer. Our research approach makes the connection between screening criteria, source material and conclusions visible to the team reviewing the work.

### Triage, Scout and Audit

Docket's three named research agents perform complementary tasks. Triage resolves company identity and screens fit. Scout collects sourced answers against the mandate. Audit checks retained evidence, addresses contradictions and leaves unsupported answers visibly unresolved. This structure helps reviewers distinguish established findings from missing information and questions requiring further investigation.

### Evidence that supports investment-team judgment

Our research library covers market mapping, screening criteria, private-company data, succession and ownership, source evaluation and evidence standards. These resources explain the methods and limitations behind origination research. Findings support a team's judgment; they do not establish that a company is for sale or guarantee a transaction or investment outcome.

### Work with Docket

Visit Docket to explore the platform, managed research and the current contact path. Read about screening criteria, evidence standards, AI research agents and market mapping.

Public examples are illustrative unless explicitly identified otherwise. Research preparation and authorized outreach are separate activities; confidential target lists and customer outcomes should never be inferred from an educational example.

**Website:** https://docket.capital

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.