Docket

DOCKET / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

USDA Organic Integrity Database Company Search: PE Guide

> 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 · 2026-10-24 · usda organic integrity database company search · organic integrity database · certified operations · organic handling · entity resolution · parent company ownership · private equity origination · organic food target mapping

Original article: https://docket.capital/articles/usda-organic-integrity-database-target-mapping



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Key Changes
4. Finding Handling Operations
5. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
6. The Operation-to-Business Crosswalk
7. Missing Records and Conflicting Evidence
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

A **USDA Organic Integrity Database company search** should begin with certification verification and end with a separate business-identity decision. Under the organic regulations, a certified operation can be an operation or a portion of one. Its record is therefore evidence about certification, rather than an automatic identification of the company a private equity firm could acquire. The certificate must be generated from the **Organic Integrity Database (OID)**, but that requirement does not turn the certificate into an ownership record. (www.ecfr.gov)

For an organic food handling or manufacturing mandate, begin with **Handling**, relevant products and a defined geography. MOSA documents searches using generic or exact product names, while Wisconsin's agriculture department describes advanced filters and spreadsheet export. Handling can include activities without physical contact, so analysts must separately establish whether a lead manufactures, stores, distributes or trades products. Preserve the operation identifier and original names before investigating the business behind them. (mosaorganic.org) (datcp.wi.gov) (www.ams.usda.gov)

The decisive crosswalk connects an operation to a jurisdiction-qualified legal entity, then records any supported parent relationship separately. California explicitly excludes ownership and subsidiary information from its Secretary of State records; a registry match alone cannot settle the parent question. Brand evidence also needs care: CCOF requires certifier-generated addenda for brand verification, including private-label products made by a co-packer. The practical outcomes are **new verified operating entity**, **linked to an existing entity or parent**, and **unresolved lead**. These are proposed research decisions, not USDA classifications. (www.sos.ca.gov) (www.ccof.org)

Status and timing remain independent checks. The codified rule specifies **3 business days** for the relevant certification-status updates. (www.ecfr.gov) Certification continues until surrendered, suspended or revoked. (www.ecfr.gov) This report's fictional extract illustrates why distinct verified entities divided by distinct operations measures research yield within an extract, not total market coverage. For context, the Organic Trade Association estimates **2025 organic food sales of $70.1 billion**, representing **6.1%** of food sales.

(ota.com) Neither figure counts acquisition candidates. Research for this report could not inspect the live OID export or API, so documented field definitions are distinguished throughout from an unverified current technical contract.

Introduction and Background

The lookup question and the origination question are different. A buyer checking an organic supplier wants evidence about certification status, products and the certifier. New Jersey's agriculture department points users to OID for those purposes. A private equity analyst subsequently needs to establish whether that operation represents another business, another location of an existing business, or a name already present in the target map. (www.nj.gov)

The distinction resembles, without exactly reproducing, the Census Bureau's separation of an **establishment**, a physical business location, from an **enterprise**, a group under common ownership or control. The Bureau of Labor Statistics also explains that an enterprise can report under multiple Employer Identification Numbers (EINs). Consequently, neither location counts nor identifier counts should automatically become counts of independent acquisition targets. (www.census.gov) (www.bls.gov)

This guide focuses on that post-lookup task. It proposes an evidence standard for matching certified organic handlers to businesses while leaving unsupported ownership and commercial questions open. An entity name, a doing-business-as name (**DBA**), a trademark and a domain belong in separate fields; the Small Business Administration describes these name registrations as legally independent. (www.sba.gov)

Table 1 compares the roles of the evidence sources and the downstream research record.

Source or research layer	Question it helps answer	Boundary for target mapping
OID certificate and operation record	What operation is certified?	Certification is not a corporate ownership determination. (www.ecfr.gov)
Certifier and addendum	Which operation and product details need further verification?	Retain the addendum's connection to its certified operation. (www.federalregister.gov)
State business registry	Which legal entity and jurisdiction match?	Available ownership information varies; California does not record subsidiary relationships. (www.sos.ca.gov)
Company website and dated corporate documents	What identity or relationship does the business explicitly disclose?	Treat a common website as a lead to corroborate, rather than a merge instruction.
Docket, publisher perspective	How should an origination researcher classify the evidence?	This guide proposes accepted, linked and unresolved outcomes; the research layer does not confer certification.

The table separates evidence production from research judgment. Its final row states the publisher's methodological position, not an independent source for a target fact. No row alone establishes revenue, capacity, willingness to sell or the suitability of a transaction.

Key Changes

Replace “one certificate, one company” with distinct objects

The regulatory definition of **certified operation** includes a portion of a production or handling operation. Analysts should therefore keep the certification object separate from the legal entity, physical site, commercial brand and ownership group. A certificate documents the certifier's determination about the operation; it does not define the boundaries of an acquisition. (www.ecfr.gov)

Likewise, CCOF distinguishes the certificate PDF from the **Operation Profile** and from certifier-generated addenda containing additional information. A product or brand relationship found in an addendum should be retained with its own evidence, rather than copied into the corporate-owner field. (www.ccof.org)

Use explicit objects in the research model:

- **Operation:** The certification record being investigated.
- **Certificate:** The evidence document associated with that operation.
- **Site:** A physical location, when verified as such.
- **Legal entity:** The jurisdiction-specific business identified through records.
- **Brand or DBA:** A commercial or registered name requiring its own crosswalk.
- **Parent relationship:** A separately sourced link with a stated relationship type.

These are research-model distinctions. The Census establishment and enterprise definitions provide a useful check against collapsing physical locations into ownership groups, but an OID operation should not simply be relabeled a Census establishment. (www.census.gov)

Treat certification as maintained status

Current regulations require certifiers to maintain current and accurate OID data. (www.ecfr.gov) They also require annual continuation information and inspections at least once per calendar year. (www.ecfr.gov) Those obligations support a continuing verification process, rather than treating an old downloaded certificate as the complete current record.

USDA's catalog lists **Certified**, **Surrendered**, **Suspended** and **Revoked** statuses. Preserve the source label and distinguish historical records from the current certified working extract. (agdatacommons.nal.usda.gov)

For the relevant status changes, the codified text says **3 business days**. (www.ecfr.gov) Some explanatory material uses hours instead, so this guide follows the operative regulatory wording. Certification itself continues until surrendered, suspended or revoked; an anniversary or review date should not be converted into an assumed expiry date. (www.ecfr.gov)

Separate documentation from a tested technical contract

The fetched USDA **Data Dictionary for Certifiers, Version 6.1**, is dated **February 5, 2026**. (www.ams.usda.gov) It describes submission and database mappings. Such documentation explains field semantics, but does not demonstrate that a current public download has identical headers or exposes every documented field.

The final-rule explanation similarly distinguishes public certification information from nonpublic information, using organic acreage as an example of the latter. Avoid promising acreage, financial details or an unrestricted API merely because related concepts appear in documentation. (www.federalregister.gov)

For this report, the live application and linked API help could not be inspected through either the built-in fetch or the permitted fallback. This is a limitation of the research session, not evidence that the service is universally unavailable. The workflow below uses documented guidance and requires the analyst to inspect the actual returned file before automating it.

Finding Handling Operations

Define the extract before searching

For manufacturing research, **Handling is a starting filter**, not proof of factory activity. USDA's guidance includes trading and other handling activities without physical contact with the product. A broker can therefore satisfy a broad handling screen while failing a mandate requiring production equipment or a processing facility. (www.ams.usda.gov)

Write the search specification before collecting records:

- **Product boundary:** Specify the included category, product terms and relevant synonyms.
- **Activity boundary:** State whether manufacturers, co-packers, warehouses, distributors or traders qualify.
- **Geographic rule:** Set the country to United States and require physical activity in the selected state, or explicitly label a mailing-location screen.
- **Certification rule:** State the status included in the working extract.
- **Retrieval record:** Preserve the search terms, filter settings and access date.
- **Deduplication unit:** Count distinct operation identifiers before counting resolved entities.

MOSA's instructions support both generic-product and exact-product searches. Wisconsin's official guidance describes filters for location, certification status, scope and business type. Together they support a repeatable search specification, while leaving product terminology and mandate fit for the analyst to evaluate. (mosaorganic.org) (datcp.wi.gov)

Run complementary searches rather than assuming a single product phrase is exhaustive. For example, a hypothetical ingredient mandate could search a broad category and then an exact ingredient name. Record which query produced each row; do not interpret the combined results as an independently measured market universe.

Open the operation before interpreting the name

QCS directs users to search by operation name and open the resulting OID profile. Its instructions then describe viewing or printing the certificate from that profile. Those are useful navigation instructions, but they are not a verification of the current screen layout in this research session. (qcsinfo.org)

Within the returned record, preserve the identifier, displayed operation name, certifier, certification status, scope and product description as source values. USDA's glossary describes the operation identifier as **10 digits**, with the certifier represented by the first **3** and the remaining **7** assigned by the certifier. Keep it as text so formatting does not alter the identifier. It is an operation key, not a corporate registry number. (www.ams.usda.gov)

Wisconsin documents spreadsheet export, and USDA's catalog describes monthly historical snapshots. These are separate retrieval options: a filtered result and a historical full-dataset snapshot should not silently share the same provenance label. Before using either, inspect the file, retain its actual headers and record which fields were present. (datcp.wi.gov) (agdatacommons.nal.usda.gov)

Where detail is missing or inconsistent, USDA's FAQ directs users toward the issuing certifier for the most current, detailed information. A research workflow should record that dependency instead of filling missing cells with inferred values. (www.ams.usda.gov)

Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

Resolve the operation to a jurisdiction-specific entity

Start with the source name and addresses, then use the relevant jurisdiction's registry. The objective is a documented match, not the closest-looking search result. California's available entity information includes entity identifiers, jurisdiction, addresses and service-of-process details, while expressly excluding corporate ownership and subsidiary information. (www.sos.ca.gov)

A practical sequence is:

- **Preserve the source:** Keep the OID name and address exactly as retrieved.
- **Generate candidates:** Search legal-name variants and separately recorded aliases.
- **Select the jurisdiction:** Investigate where the business is organized and where it operates.
- **Compare identifiers:** Store the registry identifier together with its jurisdiction.
- **Reconcile addresses:** Label principal, physical, mailing and registered-agent roles separately.
- **Record the conclusion:** Accept a match only when the evidence distinguishes it from plausible alternatives.

State-specific instructions matter. Wisconsin identifies its **DFI Entity ID** as distinct from a Federal Employer Identification Number (FEIN). Oregon supports lookup by business name or Business Registry Number. These are usable matching keys within their own systems; neither should be substituted for the USDA operation identifier. (apps.dfi.wi.gov) (sos.oregon.gov)

Name handling also varies by jurisdiction. California directs fictitious-business-name filings to the appropriate county. Oregon warns that identical assumed names can appear in different counties. Accordingly, an exact DBA match is a candidate-generation signal, not sufficient evidence to combine businesses. (www.sos.ca.gov) (sos.oregon.gov)

Verify parent relationships independently

An accepted legal-entity match does not establish a parent. California says subsidiary and associated-business information is not made of record with its Secretary of State. Delaware's free search additionally warns that appearing in search results does not itself indicate current entity status. Corporate existence, current status, operating activity and ownership should remain distinct conclusions. (www.sos.ca.gov) (icis.corp.delaware.gov)

For a disclosed public-company relationship, inspect the relevant subsidiary exhibit and its surrounding filing context. The securities rule permits certain subsidiaries to be omitted, so absence from a subsidiary list does not prove independence. Record the entity names, jurisdictions and period covered before joining a certified operation to a parent. (www.ecfr.gov)

A **Legal Entity Identifier (LEI)** relationship can add evidence where available. The Global Legal Entity Identifier Foundation (GLEIF) describes direct and ultimate **accounting consolidating parents**, together with reporting exceptions. Preserve that precise relationship type: an absent parent or an exception is not proof of founder ownership or the absence of corporate control. (www.gleif.org)

Trademark evidence needs a different label again. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) explains that some recorded changes do not automatically update its trademark database. A trademark-owner match may help resolve a brand, but it should not overwrite the certified operator or establish ownership of its operating assets. (www.uspto.gov)

The Operation-to-Business Crosswalk

A useful crosswalk retains original evidence and research conclusions together. It should allow multiple operations to link to the same legal entity, and multiple entities to link to a supported parent, without erasing the underlying certification records. This is an analyst-designed structure, not a representation of the current OID export schema.

Table 2 provides the proposed field-level evidence ladder. The USDA dictionary supports documented operation, alias, address and certificate-field semantics; the business and research fields are additions requiring separate evidence. In particular, the dictionary permits at least a physical or mailing address, so a populated address is not automatically a verified plant location. (www.ams.usda.gov)

Field or field group	Preferred evidence	Acceptance rule and limitation
Operation ID and source URL	Retrieved operation record or certificate	Preserve as source text; never replace with a company ID.
Scope, product and category	Operation record, certificate, relevant addendum	Preserve source wording; assign the mandate category separately.
Certification status	Current operation record; certifier clarification where needed	Record retrieval time and any conflicting document.
Certifier and certificate details	Operation profile and certificate	Keep certificate number and operation identifier separate.

Field or field group	Preferred evidence	Acceptance rule and limitation
Physical address	Explicitly labeled source address, corroborated for the site	Do not substitute a mailing or registered-agent address.
Mailing address	Explicitly labeled source address	Useful for correspondence or matching, not plant geography.
Operation name and other/former names	Original certification source	Retain spelling and aliases without asserting legal identity.
Legal name and registry identifier	Official registry and relevant filing	Include jurisdiction and retain the actual identifier format.
DBA or brand link	Applicable name filing, certifier addendum, trademark or explicit business disclosure	State whether the evidence links a name, a product or a legal entity.
Website evidence	Dated legal notice, contact page or explicit corporate disclosure	Save the specific claim and page; domain similarity alone is insufficient.
Parent and relationship type	Dated filing, explicit corporate disclosure or relevant relationship record	Preserve the relationship definition and unresolved alternatives.
As-of dates and confidence	Source date, retrieval date and analyst review	Score certification, entity and parent confidence separately.

The ladder is **field-specific**. A certifier is the stronger source for certification detail; a state registry may be stronger for jurisdiction and legal identity; an explicit filing may be stronger for a parent relationship. CCOF's brand-verification guidance illustrates why a certificate and its addendum can answer different questions. (www.ccof.org)

Use operational confidence labels rather than an unexplained aggregate score:

- **Verified certification:** The retrieved evidence supports the recorded operation status.
- **Verified entity:** The legal entity is distinguished from plausible alternatives.
- **Supported parent link:** The source explicitly supports the stated relationship.
- **Provisional match:** Evidence is suggestive but lacks a discriminating connection.
- **Conflicting evidence:** Sources support incompatible names, addresses or relationships.
- **Unresolved lead:** The operation is retained without an accepted entity or parent conclusion.

These are proposed workflow labels. A strong certification conclusion can coexist with unresolved ownership. The BLS discussion of enterprises reporting under multiple EINs reinforces the need to maintain a separate entity-to-group crosswalk rather than forcing every identifier into a single company key. (www.bls.gov)

Apply a decision tree before creating a target

First ask whether the operation is already present under its source identifier. If so, update its evidence history. If it is new, test whether it matches a verified entity already in the research file. An accepted match adds an operation link, not another independent target.

If the entity is new but a parent relationship is supported, add the entity under that existing group and preserve its distinct legal identity. If neither entity nor parent is sufficiently supported, retain the operation as unresolved. The evidence can then be completed without inflating the target count or inventing independence. This decision tree is the report's recommended method, not a USDA classification.

Missing Records and Conflicting Evidence

Treat unsuccessful searches as unresolved observations

An unsuccessful name search should not become a conclusion about certification or corporate existence. USDA's FAQ explains special-character mismatches and recommends using location or product information; it also directs questions about formerly certified operations to the issuing certifier. This supports a documented escalation path rather than a binary found/not-found assumption. (www.ams.usda.gov)

Use a short exception protocol:

- **Name mismatch:** Preserve the original string; test documented aliases and special characters.
- **No name result:** Narrow by product, location or certifier before concluding the search is exhausted.
- **Missing physical address:** Mark plant geography unknown and retain the mailing address separately.
- **Different certificate and profile details:** Record both sources and seek certifier clarification.
- **Old certification evidence:** Recheck current status instead of inferring expiry from a review date.
- **Shared address or website:** Investigate the relationship before merging entities.
- **Unclear ownership:** Keep parent confidence unresolved even when the operation match is strong.

QCS specifically directs users needing help locating an operation to its support team. MOSA describes searches using the certifier, product and client or certificate identifiers. These additional routes can resolve a search problem, but none automatically resolves company ownership. (qcsinfo.org) (mosaorganic.org)

Keep geographical uncertainty visible

A mailing address is not evidence that production takes place there. USDA's FAQ explains that summary counts can use mailing addresses when physical addresses are unavailable. Consequently, a physical-address-only extract can differ from an official geographical summary without either being a valid count of independent manufacturers. (www.ams.usda.gov)

Store **geography basis** as a research field: physical location verified, mailing location only, or location unresolved. For a mandate requiring a plant in a particular state, accept only the first category unless the deal team explicitly changes the inclusion rule. Preserve excluded and unresolved operations so another analyst can reproduce the boundary.

Separate facility changes from company changes

Oregon Tilth's guidance requires approval of relevant processing changes and an inspection before new or relocated facilities can sell products as organic. That demonstrates why facility, product and certification updates should be monitored independently of a corporate ownership conclusion. A newly documented location does not, by itself, establish a new business. (tilth.org)

A brand's appearance on a co-packer's addendum similarly establishes a product-certification relationship, rather than proving the brand owns the processor. Keep that link alongside, not inside, the ownership field. For historical reconstruction, USDA's catalog describes monthly snapshots, but a snapshot supplies certification history rather than a substitute for dated corporate evidence. (www.ccof.org) (agdatacommons.nal.usda.gov)

Data Analysis and Evidence

Distinguish market context from target counts

The Organic Trade Association's **2026** report announcement estimates **$70.1 billion** in organic food sales during **2025**, representing **6.1%** of food sales. (ota.com) Its described method combines sales data, interviews, annual reports and survey inputs. (ota.com) These are originator estimates of commercial activity, not a denominator for counting certified handlers or determining an individual target's revenue.

The USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service schedules its **2025 Organic Survey** results for **October 30, 2026**, after this report's **October 24, 2026** publication date. (data.nass.usda.gov) The survey page also describes producer populations beyond a current certified-handling extract. No unpublished survey result is treated here as evidence of the number of acquisition candidates.

A repeatable calculation (Hypothetical Example)

The following figures are entirely fictional, chosen to demonstrate the calculation. They describe an invented product-state extract, not an observed OID download, a client list or a market estimate. Assume a Wisconsin organic ingredient screen, restricted to current certified Handling operations and a verified physical-state rule. Wisconsin documents relevant filters and spreadsheet export, but this research session did not retrieve such an export. (datcp.wi.gov)

Table 3 shows the hypothetical crosswalk. The operation labels are internal placeholders, not valid USDA operation IDs; all businesses and parent relationships are invented.

Operation placeholder	Fictional source name	Verified entity in the example	Parent in the example	Research decision
SYN-A	Alder Ingredient Processing	Alder Processing LLC	Cedar Foods Holdings	Add entity; link to existing parent
SYN-B	Alder Dry Blending	Alder Processing LLC	Cedar Foods Holdings	Add operation to existing entity
SYN-C	Birch Organic Milling	Birch Milling Inc.	Unresolved	Add verified entity; parent unresolved
SYN-D	Clover Packing	Clover Packing LLC	Unresolved	Add verified entity; parent unresolved
SYN-E	Clover Ingredients	Clover Packing LLC	Unresolved	Add operation to existing entity
SYN-F	Meadow Organic Supply	Unresolved	Unresolved	Retain unresolved lead

The example contains **6 distinct operations**, **3 verified operating entities**, and **1 operation with unresolved entity identity**. The verified-entity yield is **3 / 6 = 50%**. The operation-resolution rate is **5 / 6 = 83.3%**, and the unresolved-operation share is **1 / 6 = 16.7%**. These are arithmetic results from the fictional table, not sourced market statistics.

The numerators answer different questions. Entity yield measures how many distinct verified entities emerged per operation in this extract. Operation resolution measures how many operation records obtained an accepted entity link. Parent resolution remains incomplete and should be shown separately; it cannot be inferred from either ratio.

For reproducibility, retain the product terms, state rule, certification-status rule, actual retrieval timestamp and original records. Deduplicate operation identifiers before calculating the denominator. State how ambiguous rows were treated and preserve the entity-to-parent mapping used at calculation time.

Neither **50%** nor **83.3%** is total market coverage. The Census distinction between establishments and enterprises already shows why a location-related denominator differs from an ownership-group denominator. A broader target-universe claim would additionally require evidence about businesses outside the extract and the relevant inclusion boundaries. (www.census.gov)

Implications and Future Directions

The useful output is a research file that can be updated without losing why each conclusion was accepted. Certifiers' duty to maintain current OID data supports revisiting the certification layer, while the company layer needs its own evidence and review timing. A fresh certification observation should not silently refresh an older parent-company conclusion. (www.ecfr.gov)

Maintain separate change histories for certification, operating identity, product fit and ownership. Oregon Tilth's facility and product guidance illustrates why an operation's approved activities can change independently of the business grouping used in a target map. Avoid treating every changed product list as a newly discovered company. (tilth.org)

For origination teams, the proposed handoff should include:

- **Accepted targets:** Verified entities that satisfy the documented activity and geography rules.
- **Existing-group additions:** Newly discovered operations or entities connected to an accepted business group.
- **Unresolved queue:** Leads missing an entity match, physical location or parent conclusion.
- **Evidence conflicts:** Competing source statements retained with their dates.
- **Separate commercial research:** Revenue, capacity and acquisition-interest questions awaiting appropriate evidence.

An unresolved parent is a legitimate research outcome. GLEIF's reporting exceptions demonstrate why missing relationship data cannot be transformed into a positive claim of independence. Similarly, a trademark record needs its own date and relationship interpretation, particularly when recorded changes and displayed owner data require reconciliation. (www.gleif.org) (www.uspto.gov)

Future automation should therefore start with the inspected input file and a documented mapping, rather than a presumed API schema. Save source values, version the transformation and leave rejected or ambiguous matches recoverable. The objective is a traceable decision about each operation's business identity; reducing the count of open questions is useful only when the underlying evidence improves.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

How does an analyst search the USDA Organic Integrity Database?

Use the official OID service and follow the documented operation-name or advanced-search workflow. QCS describes opening the operation profile from a name result; Wisconsin describes filtering and spreadsheet export. Inspect the returned record before treating the result as a target. (qcsinfo.org) (datcp.wi.gov)

Is an organic certificate the same as a certified operation?

No. The certificate documents the certification determination concerning an operation, which can include a portion of a production or handling operation. The certificate must be generated from OID; the operation and its legal owner still require separate treatment. (www.ecfr.gov)

Does OID identify the parent company?

A parent conclusion needs separate evidence. Even an official corporate registry may not supply it: California expressly excludes subsidiary and ownership information from its records. Use a supported, dated corporate relationship rather than an inference from an operation name. (www.sos.ca.gov)

Can multiple operations belong to the same company?

The research model should permit that outcome without assuming it. Keep the operation-to-entity links and parent links separate. Brand and co-packer relationships also need their own interpretation; CCOF's guidance requires checking branded products against the relevant addendum. (www.ccof.org)

Is Handling enough to identify a manufacturing target?

No. USDA describes handling activities that may involve no physical contact with the product. Product searches help generate candidates, but manufacturing activity and site geography require additional evidence. (www.ams.usda.gov) (mosaorganic.org)

Conclusion

The defensible answer to a USDA Organic Integrity Database company search is a linked set of evidence and decisions. OID supports certification verification; New Jersey's official guidance identifies status, products and certifying agent as relevant checks. The additional origination task is deciding which business the certified operation belongs to and which conclusions remain unsupported. (www.nj.gov)

A useful target map therefore preserves the operation record, separates physical and mailing geography, resolves the jurisdiction-specific legal entity, and sources parent relationships independently. It also keeps brands, co-packers and operating sites distinguishable. The Census distinction between a physical establishment and an enterprise under common ownership is a helpful reminder that different counting units answer different questions. (www.census.gov)

The proposed crosswalk and decision tree make those distinctions reviewable. Accepted entity matches can add targets; accepted links can expand an existing business record; unresolved leads can remain visible without inflating the independent-company count. A certification conclusion should never be stretched into a revenue estimate, a capacity claim or a statement about willingness to sell.

Finally, describe the limits of the input. A documented field is not a tested export header, and an extract-level entity yield is not total market coverage. Reproducible filters, retained source values, independent ownership evidence and explicit uncertainty give an origination team a firmer basis for deciding what to research next.

Source links

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

1. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-7/subtitle-B/chapter-I/subchapter-M/part-205/section-205.2
2. https://mosaorganic.org/find-organic
3. https://datcp.wi.gov/Pages/AgDevelopment/OrganicFarmingAndFood.aspx
4. https://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/strengthening-organic-enforcement/faq
5. https://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/business-entities/information-requests
6. https://www.ccof.org/news/oid-certifications-and-addenda
7. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-7/subtitle-B/chapter-I/subchapter-M/part-205/section-205.662
8. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-7/subtitle-B/chapter-I/subchapter-M/part-205/section-205.404
9. https://ota.com/about-ota/press-releases/us-organic-marketplace-achieved-significant-growth-2025
10. https://www.nj.gov/agriculture/divisions/md/prog/jerseyorganic.shtml
11. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/esp/about/glossary.html
12. https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2016/article/establishment-firm-or-enterprise.htm
13. https://www.sba.gov/counseling/launch-your-business
14. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/01/19/2023-00702/national-organic-program-nop-strengthening-organic-enforcement
15. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-7/subtitle-B/chapter-I/subchapter-M/part-205/section-205.501
16. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-7/subtitle-B/chapter-I/subchapter-M/part-205/section-205.406
17. https://agdatacommons.nal.usda.gov/articles/dataset/The_Organic_INTEGRITY_Database/24661722
18. https://www.ams.usda.gov/sites/default/files/media/INTEGRITY%20Data%20Dictionary.pdf
19. https://qcsinfo.org/download-a-certificate
20. https://www.ams.usda.gov/sites/default/files/media/INTEGRITY%20Glossary%20of%20Terms.pdf
21. https://www.ams.usda.gov/sites/default/files/media/INTEGRITY%20FAQ.pdf

22. https://apps.dfi.wi.gov/apps/corpSearch/Search.aspx
23. https://sos.oregon.gov/business/Pages/find.aspx
24. https://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/business-entities/faqs
25. https://sos.oregon.gov/business/Pages/name-availability-help.aspx
26. https://icis.corp.delaware.gov/ecorp/EntitySearch/NameSearch.aspx
27. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-17/chapter-II/part-229/section-229.601
28. https://www.gleif.org/en/lei-data/access-and-use-lei-data/level-2-data-reporting-exceptions-2-1-format
29. https://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/trademark-assignments-change-search-ownership
30. https://tilth.org/help-center/additions-and-updates-to-processing-certification
31. https://data.nass.usda.gov/Surveys/Guide_to_NASS_Surveys/Organic_Production

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.