Docket

DOCKET / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

PHMSA Operator ID Ownership: Safety-Program Worksheet

> 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 · 2026-11-15 · phmsa operator id ownership · phmsa opid lookup · pipeline operator identification number · pipeline ownership · safety programs · pipeline due diligence · private equity · lng operators · entity resolution

Original article: https://docket.capital/articles/phmsa-opid-pipeline-ownership-worksheet



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Key Changes: Separate the Relationships Before Grouping Companies
4. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
5. Selecting Sources by Pipeline and Facility Scope
6. Verifying Legal Entities and Corporate Relationships
7. Timing, Exceptions and Review Decisions
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Worked Relationship Decisions (Hypothetical Example)
10. Implications and Future Directions
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

PHMSA operator ID ownership research requires separate regulatory and corporate evidence. PHMSA expressly says its safety-program data does not imply a financial or legal relationship between operators. Sharing a Primary OpID therefore supports a program relationship, without independently proving a corporate parent or acquisition group. (www.phmsa.dot.gov) Current registration rules assign the identifier around operator responsibility for the relevant infrastructure. (www.ecfr.gov) Historical rulemaking also distinguishes program responsibility from ownership change. (www.federalregister.gov)

As of **November 15, 2026**, the retrieved roster landing page lists a **November 2, 2026** effective date; that release date does not validate every underlying relationship. (www.phmsa.dot.gov) Current assignment instructions ask about a wholly owned subsidiary's parent, an important qualification: PHMSA collects some parent information, but a reporting question does not establish public availability or a complete current ownership graph. (www.phmsa.dot.gov) Corporate verification should retain legal identity, relationship type and timing. GLEIF identifies accounting-consolidating parents, while IFRS separately recognizes joint control. (www.gleif.org) (www.ifrs.org)

The proposed worksheet separates **OpID, infrastructure, safety program, operating legal entity and owner/parent**. Its source-to-claim matrix, edge legend and blank ledger support four decisions: keep separate, combine with support, request review or classify outside source scope. State registries require careful interpretation: Texas does not maintain LLC ownership information, and California does not record subsidiary relationships. (www.sos.state.tx.us) (www.sos.ca.gov) SEC subsidiary-list rules also contain qualifications requiring legal review, including an exception concerning subsidiaries regulated by another federal agency. (www.ecfr.gov)

The quantitative evidence illustrates scope rather than deal opportunity. FERC states that more than **170** LNG facilities operate nationally and that it regulates **27** operational facilities; these are differently defined universes. (www.ferc.gov) A clearly labeled fictional batch produces a **40% verified-parent rate** and **75% safety-only-link rate**, with operator-record and inspected-link denominators kept separate. These are proposed QA

calculations, not market estimates. GAO's reliability framework supports evaluating data against its intended use. (www.gao.gov) W3C relationship attributes and source-provenance metadata offer general support for keeping evidence and context attached to each assertion. (www.w3.org) (csrc.nist.gov)

Introduction and Background

A pipeline acquisition map needs an explicit unit of analysis. The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) assigns an operator identification number, usually written **OpID**, to the operator with primary responsibility for the relevant pipeline, facility or system. The registration rule describes responsibility for operation, which is a different question from the identity of the investment vehicle a buyer might acquire. (www.ecfr.gov)

For private equity (PE) origination teams, the practical question is therefore narrower than “who owns this pipeline?” It is: **what relationship does this particular observation establish, for what infrastructure and on what date?** A defensible answer might establish operator identity while leaving the asset owner and ultimate corporate parent unresolved. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) treats applicability to the intended purpose as part of data reliability, alongside accuracy and completeness. That distinction is useful here: reliable regulatory data can still be unsuitable evidence for an ownership assertion. (www.gao.gov)

This report proposes a PHMSA-specific worksheet for pipeline acquisition target research. It addresses operator lookup, infrastructure scope, safety-program links, legal identity, parent verification and research-quality measures. Docket is positioned as a direct provider of sourced target research; the proposed worksheet is presented as an analytical method, with independent records supplying the evidence.

The method preserves original observations and adds dated, typed relationships. This follows the general provenance principle of retaining information about a datum's origin, rather than replacing it with an unsupported summary. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) glossary describes provenance in terms of source metadata. (csrc.nist.gov) The framework is a research recommendation, rather than an agency-prescribed ownership model.

Key Changes: Separate the Relationships Before Grouping Companies

“Changes” here means changes to the research process. It does not imply that PHMSA recently changed the legal meaning of an OpID.

An operator identifier is a regulatory identity key

For a **PHMSA OpID lookup**, the Operator Information page routes individual-operator data to Operator Search. (www.phmsa.dot.gov) Record the submitted identifier or raw name, filters, retrieval date and returned evidence. If an interface supplies no validated result rows, leave the query outcome unresolved. A portal landing page establishes a navigation route, without establishing a successful operator match.

Keep **OpID**, **raw operator name**, **legal entity** and **acquisition group** in different fields. PHMSA describes its identifier as supporting operator reporting; its annual infrastructure information is a separate report family. (www.phmsa.dot.gov) Preserve a raw-name observation even after a registry search supplies a normalized legal name. The proposed join should carry its own evidence and reviewer decision.

Multiple identifiers also require care. The current assignment instructions accommodate an operator with multiple OpIDs and require the appropriate identifier for the particular assets. Consequently, an analyst should verify the entity join before converting an identifier count into a company count. (www.phmsa.dot.gov)

Primary OpID describes a safety-program role

For each safety program, operators submit a **Primary OpID** and an **Effective Date**, and PHMSA assigns a program name to the primary identifier. (www.phmsa.dot.gov) The safe interpretation is the stated program role. There is no basis for automatically renaming that field “ultimate parent.”

Historical agency explanation reinforces the distinction: the registry rulemaking described primary safety-program responsibility as capable of changing whether or not ownership changed. That historical explanation helps interpret the relationship; current instructions and rules govern current reporting obligations. (www.federalregister.gov)

Corporate ownership requires an additional evidence path

A corporate relationship should have an independently identified subject and parent, a defined relationship type, supporting evidence and a time basis. Global Legal Entity Identifier Foundation (GLEIF) Level 2 data, for example, describes **direct and ultimate accounting consolidating parents**. Preserve that accounting meaning when using it. (www.gleif.org) A source that supports accounting consolidation does not automatically establish every equity interest, asset title or acquisition perimeter.

The International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) Foundation describes control as the consolidation basis under IFRS 10 and identifies an investment-entity exception. These are reasons to preserve the source's accounting terminology and ask an accounting specialist about its application to a specific structure. (www.ifrs.org)

Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

Use a source-to-claim matrix

Table 1 sets out the worksheet's authority rules. “Unsupported inference” identifies the question that still needs evidence. The Docket row describes the proposed research output rather than an additional official register.

Observation or source	Claim it can support	Unsupported inference to avoid
OpID registration rule	Operator responsibility for the specified pipeline, facility or system. (www.ecfr.gov)	Corporate parent, seller identity or title to every associated asset.

Observation or source	Claim it can support	Unsupported inference to avoid
PHMSA annual infrastructure reports	Reported mileage, facilities, commodities, materials and installation information within the report's scope. (www.phmsa.dot.gov)	Enterprise value or a complete transaction perimeter.
Safety-program relationship	Administrative responsibility for a common program, interpreted in its stated regulatory context. (www.federalregister.gov)	A subsidiary relationship inferred from Primary OpID.
Geographic operator lookup	Public operator contacts within the lookup's infrastructure and geographic scope. (www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov)	Complete national company coverage or legal title.
State formation and amendment records	Legal identity and documentary continuity, where the relevant filing supports the join. (www.sos.ca.gov)	A complete shareholder or corporate-family register.
Securities filings	Disclosed businesses, subsidiaries and reporting-period context. (www.sec.gov)	Present ownership established solely by an older annual report.
GLEIF relationship record	The reported accounting-parent relationship and its separate time fields. (www.gleif.org)	All beneficial owners or all asset owners.
Docket worksheet proposed here	A reviewable research decision based on retained independent sources. The general reliability framework supports purpose-specific evaluation. (www.gao.gov)	New ownership evidence created merely by aggregating records.

The matrix should guide acceptance at the claim level. A reviewer can accept an operator observation and leave its parent unresolved. That preserves useful work while keeping the unresolved question visible. GAO's framework explicitly allows reliability work to reflect the circumstances of the engagement. (www.gao.gov)

Maintain a typed edge legend

The following labels are **proposed worksheet conventions**. Their purpose is to prevent a generic “related company” field from carrying incompatible meanings. The World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) PROV-O model provides a general precedent for adding attributes to relationships. (www.w3.org)

- **IDENTIFIES_OPERATOR:** An OpID observation identifies the reported operator.
- **OPERATES:** An operator is associated with specified infrastructure and a stated period.
- **SHARES_SAFETY_PROGRAM:** Operators share a specified program relationship.
- **MATCHES_LEGAL_ENTITY:** A documented identity join connects a raw operator name to a registry entity.
- **ACCOUNTING_PARENT:** A source reports a consolidation relationship using its own definitions.
- **OWNS_OR_CONTROLS:** Separate corporate evidence supports the stated ownership or control relationship.
- **UNRESOLVED_ASSOCIATION:** A potentially relevant link awaits sufficient evidence.

Store each edge's source and decision independently. A change to one program relationship should not rewrite legal identity or ownership fields. W3C distinguishes entities, activities and agents, a useful basis for separating source material, research actions and responsible reviewers. (www.w3.org)

Keep a reusable blank ledger

Table 2 is a blank specification rather than a claimed PHMSA download schema. “Not established” is a substantive research outcome; leave the value blank only when the field has not yet been processed.

Field group	Blank entry	Required completion rule
Observation identity	OpID: ___; raw operator: ___	Preserve the source spelling and identifier.
Source and vintage	URL/file: ___; release/report period: ___; retrieved: ___	Retain the source version and collection context. (www.archives.gov)
Safety-program detail	Type/name: ___; submitting OpID: ___; primary OpID: ___	Enter only observed fields; mark unavailable fields explicitly.
Effective period	Effective date: ___; end date: ___; date meaning: ___	Distinguish relationship validity from document-update dates. (www.gleif.org)
Infrastructure scope	Pipeline/facility reference: ___; report scope: ___	State which infrastructure observation the relationship covers.
Legal identity	Legal name: ___; jurisdiction: ___; registry ID: ___	Retain the identity evidence and any competing candidate.
Corporate corroboration	Parent/owner: ___; relationship type: ___; source/date: ___	Record what the document establishes and what remains open.
Research disposition	Decision: ___; reviewer: ___; unresolved question: ___	Identify who accepts the finding and who owns the follow-up. (www.gao.gov)

The ledger deliberately separates evidence collection from acceptance. Provenance metadata identifies where an observation came from; an ownership conclusion additionally requires a defensible interpretation of that evidence. (csrc.nist.gov) This structure can be implemented in a spreadsheet or database without making the software itself an authority.

Selecting Sources by Pipeline and Facility Scope

Start with the infrastructure question

The **National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS)** geographic lookup covers hazardous-liquid and gas-transmission operator contacts. It explicitly excludes gathering and distribution pipeline data. A gathering or distribution no-result should therefore be classified as outside that source's scope, rather than as proof that an entity operates no pipelines. (www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov)

Geographic observations also have precision limits. NPMS says its public viewer must not identify exact pipeline locations and states minimum geospatial accuracy of **plus or minus 500 feet**. The research use is geographic orientation and source routing, with the published limitations retained. (www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov) An investment map should not silently become an engineering or asset-title map.

The **U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA)** describes infrastructure material covering pipeline capacities, flows, networks and transportation corridors. It separately describes projects announced or under construction. These categories are useful for infrastructure context, but project status must travel with the observation. (www.eia.gov)

Keep LNG facility universes distinct

The **Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)** describes its liquefied natural gas (LNG) role as authorizing siting and construction of certain onshore and near-shore import/export facilities. (www.ferc.gov) Its LNG page states that more than **170** facilities operate nationally and that FERC regulates **27** operational facilities. The national count and jurisdictional count describe different universes. (www.ferc.gov)

For origination research, record the facility, operating entity, regulatory source and published status separately. A permit, an infrastructure listing and a subsidiary disclosure should each produce the relationship they actually support. FERC's jurisdictional role supplies regulatory context, while the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) describes annual reports as a source of business and subsidiary information. (www.ferc.gov) (www.sec.gov)

Use this source-routing checklist:

- **Transmission or hazardous liquid:** Retain each geographic result with its source's scope note.
- **Gathering or distribution:** Route beyond the excluded geographic tool; retain the exclusion as the no-result reason.
- **Pipeline projects:** Preserve EIA's announced or construction status. (www.eia.gov)
- **LNG:** Separate national facility scope from FERC jurisdiction. (www.ferc.gov)
- **Corporate identity:** Resolve the legal entity before adding an ownership assertion.
- **Transaction perimeter:** Request documentary evidence identifying the interests or assets actually transferred.

The final items are proposed diligence controls. They prevent a source-selection decision from becoming an ownership assumption.

Verifying Legal Entities and Corporate Relationships

Resolve identity before adding a parent

A PHMSA raw name is a search input, not a completed registry match. The recommended identity record includes the exact legal name, jurisdiction and registry identifier, with the source observation linked separately.

Delaware's search describes identity fields including the entity name, file number, formation date and registered-agent details. It also warns that a search result does not establish current entity status. (icis.corp.delaware.gov) California makes formation, registration, amendment and other business documents available, enabling researchers to examine a candidate identity more closely. (www.sos.ca.gov)

A registered agent is a role that needs its own label. Louisiana defines the agent as the person designated to receive legal documents and permits several professional or business roles to serve. An agent match therefore supplies a service relationship, without independently establishing parent ownership. (www.sos.la.gov)

The following acceptance controls are analytical recommendations:

- **Retain raw names:** Keep every source observation alongside the normalized candidate.
- **Qualify identifiers:** Include jurisdiction with the registry number.
- **Read filing images:** Check what document actually connects the names.
- **Separate roles:** Preserve agent, manager, member, officer and parent as distinct descriptions.
- **Record ambiguity:** Keep competing candidates until the evidence resolves them.
- **Require a join rationale:** Explain why the operator observation belongs to the legal entity.

Do not ask a registry to answer an unrecorded question

Texas states that its Secretary of State does not maintain LLC ownership information. Delaware states that corporate shareholder/owner information is not on file with its Division of Corporations. California says subsidiaries and associated businesses are not recorded in its business-entity information. Those limitations belong in the worksheet's evidence notes. (www.sos.state.tx.us) (corp.delaware.gov) (www.sos.ca.gov)

A missing owner field should produce a follow-up task. It should not produce an “independent company” designation. Similarly, Louisiana's requirement for home-state existence evidence when a foreign entity qualifies provides an identity-document route, rather than evidence of a new corporate parent. (www.sos.la.gov)

Inspect reported parent information without assuming public completeness

The current OpID assignment instructions treat the supplied operator name as the operating entity's legal name. They also ask whether the operator is wholly owned by another company and, if so, request that parent's name. (www.phmsa.dot.gov) Thus, a blanket claim that PHMSA never collects parent information would be inaccurate.

These instructions establish reporting questions. They do not establish the public workbook's fields, the availability of each response, or the currentness of an individual corporate relationship. If a public record supplies parent information, preserve it as a reported assertion and seek corroboration appropriate to the acquisition question. The acceptance policy should state whether it establishes direct corporate ownership, accounting consolidation or another relationship.

Use corporate disclosures with their qualifications

The SEC identifies the business section of an annual Form 10-K as a place to examine subsidiaries and markets. Its reporting-period context must remain attached to any extracted relationship. (www.sec.gov)

Exhibit 21 requires a subsidiary list with organizational jurisdiction and business names. The rule also contains a significance-based omission instruction and important exceptions. In particular, the instruction does not apply to a subsidiary subject to regulation by another federal agency. A pipeline researcher should obtain

qualified securities-law advice before applying that exception or assuming an operator could be omitted. (www.ecfr.gov)

This qualification matters: “subsidiary lists can omit insignificant entities” is an incomplete rule summary for this audience. The proper task is to read the applicable filing, identify the relevant provision, and preserve the scope question for counsel.

GLEIF offers a complementary relationship source. Its legal-entity data includes official name and registered address, while its parent data uses accounting-consolidation definitions. (www.gleif.org) Reporting exceptions include a parent without a Legal Entity Identifier (LEI), and GLEIF describes limits on requiring non-public relationship information. An empty parent result needs its exception context. (www.gleif.org)

Preserve joint arrangements

IFRS 11 describes joint arrangements as involving joint control by two or more parties and describes unanimous consent for relevant decisions. (www.ifrs.org) These accounting definitions illustrate why a forced single-parent tree can erase a material relationship type.

For a specific joint venture, request the relevant agreements, ownership disclosures and operating arrangements. Have accounting specialists assess consolidation and transaction counsel assess legal interests. The worksheet should preserve the unresolved role until the relevant evidence supports a defined conclusion.

Timing, Exceptions and Review Decisions

Keep different dates in different fields

The retrieved public sources display different date types. The roster landing page now lists **November 2, 2026** as its effective date. The safety-program page shows an **October 16, 2026** update, and the forms index shows **November 12, 2026**. These are page or release observations, not guarantees about every underlying row. (www.phmsa.dot.gov)

The proposed ledger distinguishes:

- **Release date:** When the publisher identifies a dataset version.
- **Report period:** The period an infrastructure or corporate report describes.
- **Relationship effective date:** When the reported relationship applies.
- **Submission date:** When the operator supplies a notification.
- **Retrieval date:** When the research team collects the evidence.
- **Review date:** When the team accepts or revisits its conclusion.

PHMSA notification instructions distinguish submission and transaction-effective dates. GLEIF likewise separates relationship validity from other reporting periods and records an information-update date. (www.phmsa.dot.gov) (www.gleif.org)

Current section 191.22 requires listed post-event notifications within **60 days** and separately identifies operator-name and other changes. That reporting timetable should not be treated as evidence that a particular transaction closed or that a public export already reflects it. (www.ecfr.gov)

Use explicit dispositions

The following decisions are recommended research statuses:

- **Keep separate:** Evidence supports distinct operator or entity records; retain any shared-program edge.
- **Combine only with support:** Accept a documented identity duplicate or corporate grouping while preserving original records.
- **Request review:** Escalate contradictory identity, parent, joint-venture or timing evidence.
- **Outside source scope:** Record the source limitation and route the unanswered question elsewhere.

PHMSA's LNG resources state that the relevant notifications are not posted on its website. Public notifications therefore cannot be assumed to form a complete transaction feed. (www.phmsa.dot.gov) Retain earlier observations when an update arrives; the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) describes changing web content as a version-control issue. (www.archives.gov)

Data Analysis and Evidence

Research access and limits

Sources were checked for this report on **November 15, 2026**. The current linked roster was retrieved and its full parsed header inspected: **Operator ID**, **Operator Business Name**, **Operator Status**, **Status Date** and infrastructure-type columns. The parsed worksheet label is **11_1_2026**, separately from the landing page's release date. The inspected header contains no owner or parent field. Numeric status-date values were left uninterpreted. (www.phmsa.dot.gov)

Public portal interfaces were retrieved, but interactive result rows were not validated. No real operator-to-parent match or national roster count is presented. The fictional records demonstrate proposed acceptance decisions; a live mandate still requires the relevant current records and independent corporate corroboration.

Quantify source scope before calculating ownership measures

The strongest numeric comparison here concerns scope, rather than acquisition opportunity. FERC's **more than 170** national LNG facilities and **27** FERC-regulated operational facilities are differently defined counts. Dividing them would not establish corporate-family coverage or PHMSA ownership completeness. (www.ferc.gov)

Likewise, the **500-foot** NPMS accuracy statement concerns geographic data. It is neither an ownership-confidence interval nor a basis for establishing a legal asset boundary. (www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov) The numerical lesson is to retain the original unit and denominator before introducing a research metric.

For financial and corporate analysis, also retain the annual-report period. The SEC describes the 10-K as reporting operating and financial results for the fiscal year; collection today does not turn an earlier reporting period into a current ownership assertion. (www.sec.gov)

Proposed QA measures (Hypothetical Example)

All numbers in this subsection are **fictional worksheet arithmetic**. They are not observed PHMSA counts, market estimates or performance claims.

Assume a reviewed batch contains **20 distinct OpID records**. Separate identity work establishes **16 distinct legal companies**. Parent evidence sufficient for the worksheet's acceptance policy is available for **8 of the 20 operator records**. Separately, reviewers inspect **12 relationship links**, of which **9** have safety-program evidence only.

The calculations are:

- **Source operator count:** 20 distinct identifiers in the fictional reviewed batch.
- **Verified legal-company count:** 16 deduplicated companies with accepted identity evidence.
- **Verified-parent rate:** 8 reviewed operator records with accepted parent evidence divided by 20 reviewed operator records, or **40%**.
- **Safety-only-link rate:** 9 inspected links lacking separate corporate corroboration divided by 12 inspected links, or **75%**.

The remaining operator records have unresolved parent status under the assumed policy. They should not be relabeled independent companies. The parent rate counts operator records with supported assertions; it does not count distinct parent groups. The safety-only rate measures the inspected links, leaving uninspected links outside its denominator.

These formulas are proposed QA measures. GAO's reliability framework supports evaluating applicability to the intended purpose, but it does not prescribe these particular calculations. (www.gao.gov) A research lead should publish the batch definition, identity rules, acceptance policy and excluded records with the rates.

No pipeline-mileage total, program-link count or facility count is converted into corporate value. No acquisition propensity is calculated. The fictional arithmetic measures what the research has established and what remains open.

Worked Relationship Decisions (Hypothetical Example)

The records below are entirely fictional. Their labels are worksheet placeholders, not real OpIDs, companies, transactions or acquisition targets. The independent-company and verified-parent conditions are stipulated for illustration.

Table 3 shows how different evidence produces different decisions, even when a common program is present.

Fictional observation	Additional assumed evidence	Accepted relationship and decision
F-A, Fictional Cedar Reach LLC, uses program P with Primary F-A	Separate identity and corporate documents establish its independent ownership	Keep its company record separate; preserve the program edge.

Fictional observation	Additional assumed evidence	Accepted relationship and decision
F-B, Fictional Basin Relay LLC, uses program P with Primary F-A	Separate documents establish different ownership from Cedar Reach	Keep separate; the common program does not alter the corporate evidence.
F-C, Fictional Quartz Transport LLC, uses program P with Primary F-A	Legal identity verified; no adequate parent evidence	Keep separate and request parent review; independence remains unanswered.
F-D and F-E use different programs	Separate registry matches and an assumed completed-transaction record establish both under Fictional Harbor Holdings LLC	Accept the stated parent grouping and preserve both operator records.
F-F has no result in a gathering-pipeline search through the excluded geographic tool	No other evidence examined	Outside source scope; route to an appropriate source before deciding.

The first rows illustrate a stipulated independent-ownership case. The third shows the more common research difficulty: identity can be accepted while parent ownership remains unresolved. PHMSA's historical explanation supports separating safety-program administration from ownership change, but the fictional ownership determinations come entirely from the assumed additional documents. (www.federalregister.gov)

The fourth row illustrates a different evidence path. The accepted parent relationship comes from separate corporate corroboration. Program similarity is unnecessary to that conclusion. For a real case, the team would retain the actual legal entities, transferred interests, effective date and any later changes.

The final row illustrates a proposed scope disposition. A missing result is useful when its reason is recorded; it becomes misleading when translated into an unsupported absence claim.

Implications and Future Directions

The main operational change is to make acceptance **relationship-specific**. A researcher should be able to approve an operator identity without also approving a parent. The proposed worksheet then becomes useful to a sector lead because every unresolved relationship has a defined next question.

A practical handoff should include:

- **Evidence package:** Source URL or file, supporting passage, relevant source dates and retained version.
- **Identity record:** OpID observations, legal-name candidates and the accepted registry join.
- **Relationship ledger:** Program links and corporate links with separate labels.
- **Open questions:** Ownership percentage, asset title, joint-venture role and acquisition perimeter where unresolved.
- **Assigned review:** A named research owner and the appropriate legal, accounting or technical specialist.

This recommendation applies general records-management principles to origination research. NARA emphasizes content and context in preserving web records, while GAO emphasizes appropriate participation in reliability decisions. Neither source prescribes this PHMSA-specific worksheet. (www.archives.gov) (www.gao.gov)

Future public-data changes should be assessed field by field. If a new export exposes parent information, the team should inspect its definition, reporting basis and update mechanism before changing the acceptance policy. GLEIF's separate relationship-validity and update fields offer a useful example of why a single “last updated” date cannot answer every timing question. (www.gleif.org)

Automation should preserve these distinctions. The proposed control is straightforward: reject a parent assertion when its only supporting edge is a safety-program relationship, and retain the unresolved research task. W3C's qualified-relation model supports attaching context to an edge, while NIST's provenance definition supports retaining its source metadata. (www.w3.org) (csrc.nist.gov)

Conclusion

PHMSA operator ID ownership research should begin with a precisely defined claim. An operator identifier, a geographic contact, an infrastructure observation, a common safety program and a corporate parent answer different questions. A source can be authoritative for one of those questions while leaving another unanswered.

The proposed worksheet preserves those differences through typed relationships, original names, separate legal-entity joins and dates with explicit meanings. Source routing comes before negative inference. Corporate corroboration comes before grouping an acquisition universe. Joint arrangements and unresolved roles remain visible rather than being forced into a single parent field.

For PE origination teams, the resulting deliverable is a map of supported assertions and outstanding diligence questions. It should make clear which operator identities are established, which companies are separately verified, which program links remain administrative and which parent relationships have independent support. Its QA rates measure the reviewed batch and inspected links, with their denominators retained.

The acceptance decision remains concrete: keep separate, combine with sufficient evidence, request review or classify the observation outside the source's scope. That discipline allows useful operator information to enter the research process while preserving the questions that corporate, legal, accounting and technical diligence still need to resolve.

Source links

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

1. https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/data-and-statistics/pipeline/safety-program-data-pipeline-and-lng-operators
2. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-49/subtitle-B/chapter-I/subchapter-D/part-191/section-191.22
3. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2010/11/26/2010-29087/pipeline-safety-updates-to-pipeline-and-liquefied-natural-gas-reporting-requirements
4. https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/data-and-statistics/pipeline/pipeline-operators-opids

5. https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/sites/phmsa.dot.gov/files/2025-07/Current_OpID_Assignment_Instructions_PHMSA%20F%201000.1_6-2025%20and%20Beyond.pdf
6. https://www.gleif.org/en/lei-data/access-and-use-lei-data/level-2-data-who-owns-whom
7. https://www.ifrs.org/issued-standards/list-of-standards/ifrs-11-joint-arrangements
8. https://www.sos.state.tx.us/corp/managementinfofaqs.shtml
9. https://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/business-entities/information-requests
10. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-17/chapter-II/part-229/subpart-229.600/section-229.601
11. https://www.ferc.gov/natural-gas/lng
12. https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-20-283g
13. https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-o
14. https://csrc.nist.gov/glossary/term/provenance
15. https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/data-and-statistics/pipeline/operator-information
16. https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/data-and-statistics/pipeline/source-data
17. https://www.ifrs.org/issued-standards/list-of-standards/ifrs-10-consolidated-financial-statements
18. https://www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov/findwhosoperating.aspx
19. https://www.sec.gov/answers/reada10k.htm
20. https://www.gleif.org/en/lei-data/access-and-use-lei-data/level-2-data-relationship-record-rr-cdf-2-1-format
21. https://www.archives.gov/records-mgmt/policy/managing-web-records.html
22. https://www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov/AboutPublicViewer.aspx
23. https://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/data.php
24. https://icis.corp.delaware.gov/ecorp/EntitySearch/NameSearch.aspx
25. https://www.sos.la.gov/business-services/frequently-asked-questions
26. https://corp.delaware.gov/faqs
27. https://www.gleif.org/en/lei-data/access-and-use-lei-data/level-2-data-reporting-exceptions-2-1-format
28. https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/sites/phmsa.dot.gov/files/2025-07/Current_National_Registry_Notification_Instructions_PHMSA%20F1000.2_5-2022%20and%20Beyond_0.pdf
29. https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/pipeline/liquified-natural-gas/lng-operator-resources
30. https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/sites/phmsa.dot.gov/files/2026-11/Pipeline%20Operators%20-%20OpIDs%20.xlsx

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.