Docket

DOCKET / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

EPA Registration Dependency Chemical Company Due Diligence

> 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 · 2026-11-20 · epa registration dependency · chemical company due diligence · supplemental distributor pesticide · 40 cfr 152.132 · epa establishment number · private label pesticide · fifra registration transfer · pesticide registrant due diligence

Original article: https://docket.capital/articles/epa-registration-dependency-worksheet-chemical-screens



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Brand Names, Registration Numbers and Supplemental Distribution
4. Registrants, Producers and Establishments
5. Transfers, Cancellations and Ownership Changes
6. Lookup Tools and Their Limits
7. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Case Studies and Real-World Examples
10. Implications and Future Directions
11. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
12. Conclusion

Executive Summary

Private-equity screens of U.S. pesticide and antimicrobial businesses often start from a brand name on a label, and that name is weak evidence of role. Under federal rules a registrant may sell its registered product under another company's name and address, an arrangement EPA calls **supplemental distribution** (EPA Chapter 9; 40 CFR 152.132). The distributor is treated as the registrant's agent, so a recognizable brand can sit on top of a registration that belongs to a different company (40 CFR 152.132). This report gives analysts a worksheet that keeps brand, registration, distributor, producing site, ownership and activity as separate nodes. It returns one of four outcomes: role-supported, dependent-portfolio-evidence, mixed-role or unresolved.

Three identifiers carry most of the weight. A **two-part registration number** names the company and the product. A **three-part number** appends the distributor's company number to the basic product number (40 CFR 152.132). The **establishment number** names a producing site, and EPA's definition of production covers packaging and relabeling as well as formulation (EPA establishment reporting). On a distributor label the establishment must be the final establishment where the product was produced, not the distributor's (40 CFR 152.132).

Transfers need separate handling. A registration transfer takes effect on the date EPA approves it (EPA Chapter 16), and EPA's manual states that supplemental distributorships do not transfer with the section 3 registration (EPA Chapter 9). A company-number sale or merger is a different event from a product registration transfer (EPA Chapter 14). An acquisition announcement is therefore a lead to verify, not proof that product rights persisted or ended.

The public record has limits. EPA's national establishment list says an identifier does not signify FIFRA compliance (EPA national establishment list), and annual reports are required even when no products are produced (EPA establishment reporting). Public counts give scale only: EPA's 2021 notice estimated 1,885 respondents for the supplemental-distribution notice (Federal Register, 2021), and a 2023 notice put

establishments at 19,114 (Federal Register, 2023). None of these figures measures revenue or supplier dependence. Supply contracts, customer mix and formulation ownership remain nonpublic and need authorized diligence.

Introduction and Background

This report examines one narrow question for origination teams: what can public EPA records support about the role of a pesticide or antimicrobial product business, and does the observed portfolio rely on a separate registrant? It is acquisition-screening evidence. It is not a consumer safety view, a compliance verdict or an instruction on how to transfer products. Docket, a research platform that supplies sourced target research to private-equity origination teams, treats the output below as a worksheet for the next reviewer rather than a legal conclusion. The separate question of joining EPA and OSHA facility records to a company is a different protocol and is not repeated here.

The regulatory frame is long established and should not be read as new. FIFRA (the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act) defines a registrant as a person who has registered a pesticide (7 U.S.C. 136). States add their own product registration on top of the federal one. Pennsylvania, for example, requires products distributed into the state to be registered with its Department of Agriculture (www.pa.gov), so a complete picture has at least two layers.

Five questions drive the worksheet:

- **Brand identity:** which name is on the label, and is it a product name, a distributor or a registrant?
- **Basic registration:** which company number and product number authorize the product?
- **Distributor link:** does a third number segment show a company selling under another registrant's basic registration?
- **Producing site:** which establishment made or packaged the product, and what did it do there?
- **Ownership and activity:** who owns the registrant or distributor, and is the registration or site actually in use?

Two cautions apply throughout. First, a label is one evidence object and a registration record is another. EPA states that product labels in its label system differ from those found in the marketplace, because companies may change graphics and alter the product name (ordspub.epa.gov). Second, an exempt product may not need a federal registration at all. A treated article is one example (www.ecfr.gov), and Texas notes that state registration is not required for a pesticide exempt from EPA registration (texasagriculture.gov). Where a registration is not applicable, the worksheet records a source selector and moves on without inferring anything about legality.

Brand Names, Registration Numbers and Supplemental Distribution

The supplemental-distribution rule is 40 CFR 152.132. It requires a statement signed by both parties that lists names, addresses, the distributor's company number and the registration number (40 CFR 152.132). The eCFR displayed the rule as current through November 17, 2026 (40 CFR 152.132), and EPA's Chapter 9 page

was last updated on September 11, 2026 (EPA Chapter 9). The distributor product must be produced, packaged and labeled in a registered establishment operated by the same producer, or under contract with that producer (www.ecfr.gov). It may not be repackaged along the way.

How the three-part number forms

On the label, the registration number of the registered product is followed by a dash and the distributor's company number (www.law.cornell.edu). In practice the first two parts point to the basic registrant and its product, and the third part points to the company selling under that registration. The third part is a company number. It is not evidence that the distributor owns, controls or formulates anything.

Why several brands can share one basic product

A distributor's product name may differ from the registrant's as long as it is not misleading (www.law.cornell.edu). FIFRA section 3(e) separately allows products with the same formulation and claims to be registered as a single pesticide with additional names attached (www.law.cornell.edu). The practical consequence is that three differently branded labels can resolve to one basic product record. Counting brands overstates the number of independent authorizations.

What a distributor label shows

A name qualified by wording such as "Distributed by" signals that the named company is not the producer, because an unqualified name and address on a label is read as the producer's (www.ecfr.gov). Washington State describes the same relationship as a product federally registered by a primary company but labeled and marketed by a second company through an agreement (agr.wa.gov). State registrations of distributor products form a separate layer with their own dates, as the state sections below show.

Private label, repack and the other route

Supplemental distribution is not the only private-label structure. EPA's Chapter 2 also lists an identical repack registration, a complete repackaging of an already registered product with an identical label other than name, address, product name and registration number (www.epa.gov). That route produces a registration held by the repackager, which is a different dependency profile from a distributor product that has no registration of its own. A screen should record which route a number reflects before calling a portfolio dependent.

Registrants, Producers and Establishments

The producing-site question is where role misclassification is most likely. EPA defines production to include formulation, packaging, repackaging, labeling and relabeling, and the regulation defines "produce" to include packaging, repackaging, labeling and relabeling or otherwise changing the container (www.law.cornell.edu). A site that only fills drums or relabels containers is therefore a producing establishment. A final establishment on a label can describe packaging, not formulation.

Company number versus establishment number

An establishment is any site where a product, active ingredient or device is produced (www.law.cornell.edu). The establishment number therefore names a place and not a company. Any establishment where a pesticidal product is produced must be registered (www.ecfr.gov). The definition does not depend on who owns or operates the site, so contract sites count and an establishment cannot be assigned to a company by its address alone.

What the label shows

The label shows the establishment number of the final establishment at which the product was produced (www.law.cornell.edu). Michigan State University Extension notes that only labels on actual product packaging carry this number, not labels viewed online (www.canr.msu.edu). Virginia Tech Extension separately defines it as identifying the facility where the pesticide was produced (pubs.ext.vt.edu). An analyst working only from online label PDFs may therefore lack the establishment string entirely and should record that as unresolved, not as absent.

Same producer is a legal test, not a street address

The regulation treats two establishments as operated by the same producer where one person owns them or leases them for operation under its control (www.ecfr.gov). Rule text separately allows an unregistered pesticide to move between registered establishments of different producers solely for further formulation, packaging or labeling into a registered product (www.law.cornell.edu). Shared addresses or shared active ingredients prove neither common ownership nor a shared formulation.

Role taxonomy for screening

The following working categories keep roles apart. They are screening labels, not regulatory categories.

- **Basic registrant:** holds the two-part registration and appears as the company on the registration record.
- **Independent formulator or manufacturer:** the registrant also operates a producing establishment where formulation is documented. Public records rarely show formulation itself.
- **Contract producer or packager:** an establishment operated by a company that fills or relabels for another company.
- **Supplemental distributor:** the third segment of a registration number names its company, and the label names it with qualifying words.
- **Mixed or unresolved:** the same company number appears in more than one role, or evidence for a role is missing. One 2014 law-firm newsletter observes that a distributor can also be a toll formulator or repackager of the product (wiley.law).

Transfers, Cancellations and Ownership Changes

Three events look similar in news flow and differ in record keeping: a registration transfer, a company-number transfer and a change in corporate equity. Each leaves a different trace and a different date.

Registration transfer

A registrant may transfer a product's registration to another person under 40 CFR 152.135 (www.ecfr.gov). The transferor irrevocably transfers all right, title and interest in the registration (www.ecfr.gov), and the transfer is effective on the date of Agency approval (www.law.cornell.edu). Data rights are a distinct matter, since the rule says they are separate from the registration and may be retained by the transferor (www.ecfr.gov).

What happens to distributors

EPA states that supplemental distributorships do not transfer with the section 3 registration (EPA Chapter 9). The new basic registrant must file a new notice to continue an existing distributorship or add new ones (www.epa.gov). If a basic registration is voluntarily canceled, the cancellation applies to the registered product and all distributor products (www.law.cornell.edu). After the basic registrant terminates a supplemental registration, EPA generally permits the supplemental distributor 18 months to sell existing stocks, limited to product already released for shipment at termination and subject to any narrower contract terms (EPA Chapter 9). EPA's manual does not describe this as a sell-off period after a registration transfer, so old labels in the market after a cancellation or transfer remain ambiguous evidence, and the supply contract that may limit any sale is not public.

Company ownership is a separate track

EPA distinguishes a sale, merger or spin-off of a company number, which usually involves a Company Number Transfer, from other changes (www.epa.gov). A transferred company number can sometimes continue as a separate division or D/B/A of the transferee, so the same number can appear under a new name. Establishment name or ownership changes are reportable within 30 days (www.law.cornell.edu). A change in the equity owner of a company that keeps its own company number is a corporate event and does not by itself appear as a registration transfer.

State layers can restart

California states that a product license cannot be transferred when business ownership changes (www.cdpr.ca.gov), and defines the change as a transfer of an EPA company number between legal entities (www.cdpr.ca.gov). Under that process each affected product is processed as a new product registration (www.cdpr.ca.gov). A 2014 law-firm newsletter, now dated, observed that new state registrations for distributor products cannot be obtained until EPA approves the registration transfer (wiley.law). State timing varies, so a federal approval date alone does not establish state-level continuity.

Lookup Tools and Their Limits

How to find EPA-registered pesticide products by company is mostly a matter of choosing the right tool and recording what each can and cannot show. EPA's label system, PPLS (Pesticide Product and Label System), is the usual starting point. EPA revises its tool and manual pages, so each update date should be re-read at retrieval.

What each source adds

- **PPLS:** accepted labels with transfer history. A company's divisions may be returned together, so name roll-ups need care.
- **APPRIL and the API:** a database of active and canceled products (www.epa.gov) with status fields for pending, active and cancelled records.
- **PPIS download files:** EPA's product information system publishes separate files for distributor products and transfers.
- **National active-establishment list:** a site-level list that places an establishment number at a location.
- **NPIC NPRO:** Oregon State University's tool searches by registration number, product name or registrant (npic.orst.edu).

Gaps the analyst should record

PPLS excludes devices, company numbers with no registered products, and supplemental distributor product labels (ordspub.epa.gov). The NPRO tool draws only on public EPA data (npic.orst.edu), reloads about weekly (npic.orst.edu), shows federally registered labels only (npic.orst.edu), and warns that the label on the actual product takes precedence (npic.orst.edu). Its page carries a 2015 release stamp, so its link paths and data currency need checking. NPRO helps product lookup. It does not decide a role.

State lists are separate. Texas states its public list is updated daily but may not include all products (texasagriculture.gov), and Pennsylvania requires Form 8570-5 for supplemental registrations (www.pa.gov). Texas likewise asks for the date-stamped notice for each supplemental distribution (texasagriculture.gov). Washington notes that EPA does not review supplemental distributor labels, so the state is the sole reviewer of that label (agr.wa.gov). The same page asks that the basic registrant submit the confidential statement of formula, which indicates where formulation records sit (agr.wa.gov).

Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

The worksheet below can be run on any public sample. It is an evidence-handling routine, not a compliance review.

Step sequence

- **Capture raw strings first.** Record the brand, product name, "EPA Reg. No." string, "EPA Est." string, label name and address, label stamp date and retrieval date exactly as seen.
- **Split the registration number.** Separate company number, product number and distributor suffix, and treat the suffix as a company identifier only.
- **Resolve each company number** to a legal entity through the registration record, noting divisions and D/B/A names. NPIC's label guide lists the manufacturer's contact information as a label element, which is the company named on the label and not necessarily the registrant (npic.orst.edu).
- **Resolve the establishment** to a site and operator, and note what activity the label implies. A packaging role is not formulation.
- **Check status and transfers.** Record status and dates, keeping approval dates apart from announcement and retrieval dates.

- **Check state layers** where the target sells, and use a source selector where a product appears to be exempt, such as a cleaning agent without a pesticidal claim (www.ecfr.gov).
- **Add ownership evidence last,** from corporate records, and never from an identifier.

Role and claim matrix

Table 1 below lists the fields the matrix should hold and what each one can and cannot support.

Field	What it identifies	What it does not prove	Source anchor
Brand or product name	Marketing name on a label, which may differ across distributors	Registrant, producer or owner	(www.law.cornell.edu)
Two-part registration number	Company number plus product number of the basic registration	That the label company formulates the product	(www.canr.msu.edu)
Three-part number	Distributor company number appended to the basic number	Corporate ownership or a shared formulation	Same rule as cited above
Establishment number	A producing site, including packagers and relabelers	Activity level, compliance or revenue	(www.canr.msu.edu)
Label name and address	Name qualified as distributor, or unqualified producer	Registrant of record	(www.cdpr.ca.gov)
Status and transfer date	Active, pending or canceled status and approval date	Contract continuity or consent	EPA PPLS, APPRIL and PPIS status and transfer fields (see Lookup Tools and Their Limits)
Corporate ownership	Entity linkage from corporate records	Registration rights or data rights	(www.cdpr.ca.gov)

The table shows why a single field cannot classify a business. Each column keeps a claim tied to the one kind of evidence that can support it. Rows for ownership and status deliberately point to different record types, because product authorization edges and ownership edges should sit in separate layers of the dependency graph.

Edge types for the dependency graph

- **Basic-registration edge:** product record to registrant company number.
- **Supplemental-distribution edge:** distributor company number to basic registration, with notice and status dates.
- **Production-site edge:** product to final establishment, with activity qualified as formulation, packaging or unknown.
- **Packaging-role edge:** establishment operator to registrant, where a contract arrangement is documented.
- **Ownership edge:** legal entity to legal entity, from corporate evidence only.

Same active ingredient or same address does not create an edge. Commercial agreements and consent are matters for later authorized diligence.

Data Analysis and Evidence

Public statistics describe the population of filers, not any target's dependence. They are useful as scale anchors and as a caution against reading volume into an identifier.

Federal counts

- **Supplemental distribution notices:** EPA's 2021 information collection notice estimated 1,885 respondents and 603 burden hours per year for the notice form (respondents; burden hours). An OMB-hosted mirror of the 2016 request lists 1,904 notices in fiscal 2012, 1,822 in fiscal 2013 and 1,930 in fiscal 2014 (omb.report).
- **Company-number assignments:** EPA's supporting statement assumes about one-third of notice responses involve a newly assigned distributor company number, and says the exact number cannot be determined (omb.report).
- **Producing establishments:** a 2019 notice estimated 15,063 respondents for establishment reporting (www.govinfo.gov). A February 2023 notice reported a rise from 14,248 establishments in 2019 to 19,114 in 2023 (public-inspection.federalregister.gov), while the later approved collection stated 18,904 (omb.report).
- **Registration applications:** a 2020 notice estimated 1,808 respondents for the collection covering new and amended registrations (www.govinfo.gov).

The two 2023 establishment totals conflict (19,114 in the proposed notice, 18,904 in the approved collection), and the public documents do not resolve the difference. Cite the source and date of whichever figure is used. These are burden estimates for paperwork collections, not census counts, and no source states how many distinct supplemental distributors exist. The OMB mirror is a secondary host of EPA documents, and the Federal Register copies are the originators.

A product-record count, not a market measure

For a stated future sample, the research team can count observed brands, unique basic registrations, distinct resolved registrants and distributors, and unresolved links. The count describes the product records observed on a stated date. It is not market coverage.

If a team computes an observed dependent-product share, the denominator must be declared as uniquely resolved products on a named date. The numerator is products whose three-part number places the basic registration with a different company number. The result must not be called revenue concentration or supplier revenue dependence. Revenue-weighted concentration requires private financial and contractual evidence that public records do not supply. EPA's production reports carry registration number, product name and amounts produced and distributed by establishment (www.epa.gov), but production amounts are not an open dataset an analyst can rely on, and no public figure ties them to revenue.

Table 2 below works a fictional reduction of five labels to two basic registrations.

Label (Hypothetical Example)	Registration string	Basic registration	Basic registrant (fictional)	Distributor suffix
Brightline Sanitizer	90001-12	90001-12	Calder Chemical Works	none
Harbor Pine Sanitizer	90001-12-90210	90001-12	Calder Chemical Works	90210
Summit Select Cleaner	90001-12-90344	90001-12	Calder Chemical Works	90344
Alder Foam	90500-7-90210	90500-7	Marlow Biocides	90210
Alder Foam Plus	90500-7-90344	90500-7	Marlow Biocides	90344

The five observed labels reduce to two unique basic registrations and two basic registrants, with two distributor company numbers. The reduction is a product-record count. It says nothing about volumes, margins or which company produces the goods. Every company, number and brand in the table is invented for illustration.

Case Studies and Real-World Examples

No real target is analyzed here. The scenarios are wholly fictional, use invented identifiers, and are labeled accordingly. *Table 3* below summarizes how each scenario resolves.

Scenario (Hypothetical Example)	Evidence pattern	Outcome
Three brands, one basic product	Two three-part numbers and one two-part number share 90001-12	Dependent-portfolio-evidence for the two distributor brands
Distributor with a separate packager	Qualified label name, and a final establishment run by a third company	Role-supported only if each record supports its role, else unresolved
Own products plus distributor products	Company number 90210 appears as basic registrant and as suffix	Mixed-role
Old labels after a transfer	Basic registration moved, distributor filing not yet found	Unresolved
Facility on the active list	Active establishment, no product link	Unresolved

The outcomes follow the evidence pattern, not the size of a brand. The next paragraphs explain each case.

Three brands, one basic product (Hypothetical Example)

A screen finds three differently named sanitizers sold by two sellers. Two carry the three-part numbers 90001-12-90210 and 90001-12-90344. The third is 90001-12 with no suffix. The identifier logic reads the basic registrant as the company holding company number 90001, and the other two as sellers under it. Outcome for the two distributor brands: **dependent-portfolio-evidence**, with supply terms unresolved.

Distributor and contract packager distinct from registrant (Hypothetical Example)

The 90210 label reads "Distributed by Harbor & Pine Supply" and lists a final establishment operated by a third company, Pine Ridge Fill. The qualified name signals a non-producer (www.ecfr.gov), and the establishment identifies a site where packaging may be the only activity (www.law.cornell.edu). The three entities stay as three nodes. Outcome for Pine Ridge: **role-supported** as a packaging site only if its own record supports it, otherwise **unresolved**.

A mixed company with some own products (Hypothetical Example)

Harbor & Pine also holds a two-part registration, 90210-3, for a floor cleaner, in addition to its distributor products. Company number 90210 then appears as both basic registrant and distributor. The classification is **mixed-role**. Nothing in the record says which products drive sales, and a portfolio share by product count must not be restated as revenue.

Old labels after a transfer (Hypothetical Example)

A 2025 label shows Harbor Pine Sanitizer under 90001-12-90210. A registration transfer record shows 90001-12 moved to Larkspur Chemical with a stated agency approval date. Under EPA's manual, the distributorship does not move with it, and the new basic registrant must file again to continue it. A marketplace label may reflect stock released earlier, but EPA describes its 18-month allowance for termination of a supplemental distribution, not for a registration transfer, so whether any sell-off period applies is not established here. Outcome: **unresolved** until a current distributor record is found. The announcement date, approval date and retrieval date are kept in separate fields.

A facility with no verified current production (Hypothetical Example)

A site appears on the active establishment list. A negative annual report is enough to maintain registration (www.ecfr.gov). Outcome: the site is **unresolved** as a production role. Activity needs a label, a product link or an authorized disclosure.

Illustrative dependent share (Hypothetical Example)

A fictional sample dated on a named day resolves 12 unique product records for one seller and leaves 2 labels unresolved. Nine of the 12 carry three-part numbers under other companies' basic registrations. The observed dependent-product share is 9 of 12, or 75%, of resolved product records, with a denominator of 12 and the 2 unresolved labels excluded and reported. This is not revenue concentration.

Implications and Future Directions

For mandate decisions, the useful distinction is between an own-registration, own-formulation business and a distribution or private-label model. A distributor-heavy portfolio is not a negative finding. It is a different asset: the brand and channel may be owned while the authorization to sell sits with a separate registrant. EPA treats the distributor as the registrant's agent, and a registration transfer does not carry the distributorship. Chemical-company diligence on registrations should therefore ask for the distributor notice, the current supply terms and

the registrant's transfer plans through authorized channels. One 2014 law-firm newsletter recommends that contracts give distributors significant advance notice of a potential transfer (wiley.law), which confirms that these terms are commercial and not public.

For acquisition of a registrant, the FIFRA registration transfer path matters. A 2014 law-firm newsletter describes registrations as licenses and assets that are bought, sold and transferred when product lines change hands (wiley.law). EPA's rule allows a transfer to another person (www.ecfr.gov), and California's rule shows that a state registration can restart on an ownership change (www.cdpr.ca.gov). A deal announcement is a lead. It does not show that every registration, data right or distributorship was part of the transaction.

Several items need rechecking before any wider use: EPA manual and eCFR text, update dates, source coverage, company-number changes, accepted label and transfer status, device, minimum-risk and state-only exceptions (www.ecfr.gov), and physical production roles. Several pages used here carry dates in late 2026 and may change. Public filings may not disclose formulation ownership, full supply agreements, customer mix or activity. The main residual uncertainty is the commercial dependency behind the public product relationship. A future extension could extract a real public sample from the national list and the PPIS files, but this report did not do so.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Can the same EPA registration number appear under different brand names?

Yes. A distributor's product name may differ from the registrant's, and FIFRA allows additional names to attach to one registered pesticide (www.law.cornell.edu). The brand alone therefore cannot count authorizations.

What is the difference between an EPA establishment number and a registration number?

The registration number identifies the product and its company (www.canr.msu.edu), and the establishment number identifies the site where the product was produced (pubs.ext.vt.edu). The label shows the final establishment at which the product was produced (www.law.cornell.edu).

Does a transfer of a basic registration move the distributors?

No. EPA's manual states that supplemental distributorships do not transfer with the registration. A new filing is needed to continue them.

Does an active establishment mean the company produces products there?

Not by itself. The list does not signify compliance, and reports are required even when no products are produced.

Can the public record show who owns a company?

No. Registration, company and establishment numbers identify filers and sites. Ownership needs corporate evidence, and a company-number sale is a separate regulatory event.

Conclusion

The central finding is procedural. A brand, a registration number, a distributor suffix, an establishment number and a corporate owner are five different facts, and each public source supports only one or two of them. A three-part number shows that a company sells under another company's basic registration, and the label's establishment shows a producing site that may only package. Neither shows ownership, formulation or revenue.

The four outcomes follow from evidence, not from impression. **Role-supported** requires a record that fits the claimed role. **Dependent-portfolio-evidence** requires products whose three-part numbers point to a separate basic registrant, counted on a declared denominator and date. **Mixed-role** applies when one company number appears in more than one role. **Unresolved** applies whenever identifiers, status or dates are missing or in conflict. A source packet for the next reviewer should hold the raw strings, the record URLs, the dates and the open questions. Commercial agreements, consent and legal effect remain for authorized diligence with qualified regulatory counsel, since this report offers no legal instruction.

For teams that adopt the worksheet, three habits keep results defensible. Record every date as its own field, whether it is a label stamp date, an agency approval date, an announcement date or a retrieval date. Keep product authorization edges and ownership edges in separate layers so that neither can be inferred from the other. Report the denominator and the unresolved count beside any dependent-product share, and describe it as a count of product records. These habits do not remove the main uncertainty, which is the commercial arrangement behind a public product relationship, but they make clear what the public record can and cannot carry into a mandate decision.

Source links

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

1. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/pesticide-registration-manual-chapter-9-supplemental-distribution-registered
2. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/section-152.132
3. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/40/152.132
4. https://www.epa.gov/compliance/pesticide-establishment-registration-and-reporting
5. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/pesticide-registration-manual-chapter-16-transfer-product-registrations-and
6. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/pesticide-registration-manual-chapter-14-how-obtain-epa-company-or
7. https://www.epa.gov/compliance/national-list-active-epa-registered-foreign-and-domestic-pesticide-andor-device
8. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2021-05-10/html/2021-09795.htm
9. https://public-inspection.federalregister.gov/2023-03050.pdf
10. https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/7/136
11. https://www.pa.gov/agencies/pda/plants-land-water/plant-industry/pesticide-programs/pesticide-product-registration
12. https://ordspub.epa.gov/ords/pesticides/f?p=PPLS:1
13. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/section-152.25
14. https://texasagriculture.gov/Regulatory-Programs/Pesticides/Pesticide-Product-Registration

15. https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/7/136a
16. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/section-156.10
17. https://agr.wa.gov/Departments/Pesticides-and-Fertilizers/Pesticides/Pesticide-Registration/Product-Registration/Section-3-Pesticide
18. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/pesticide-registration-manual-chapter-2-registering-pesticide-product
19. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/40/167.3
20. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/section-167.20
21. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/40/156.10
22. https://www.canr.msu.edu/news/why-and-how-to-read-a-pesticide-label
23. https://pubs.ext.vt.edu/ENTO/ENTO-390/ENTO-390.html
24. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/section-152.3
25. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/40/152.30
26. https://wiley.law/newsletter-5147
27. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/section-152.135
28. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/40/152.135
29. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/40/167.20
30. https://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/manual/guidance.pdf
31. https://www.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/how-search-information-about-pesticide-ingredients-and-labels
32. https://npic.orst.edu/NPRO/index.html
33. https://texasagriculture.gov/Regulatory-Programs/Pesticides/Pesticide-Product-Registration/Product-Section-3-Registration
34. https://npic.orst.edu/health/readlabel.html
35. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/section-152.10
36. https://omb.report/icr/201611-2070-001
37. https://omb.report/icr/201611-2070-001/doc/69432301.pdf
38. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2019-11-26/html/2019-25592.htm
39. https://omb.report/icr/202309-2070-002
40. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2020-09-29/html/2020-21524.htm
41. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/section-167.3
42. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/section-162.150

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.