The Cost of Being Uncertified

Karen Pendergrass · ORCID 0000-0002-2348-7259 · June 2026

Karen Pendergrass. "The Cost of Being Uncertified". https://heavymetalcertified.com/briefings/brief-4-cost-of-being-uncertified. Retrieved 2026-09-20.

THE CLAIM

TECHNICAL REPORT · HMTC STANDARDS BRIEFING 4 · JUNE 2026

Before 24 February 2026, being uncertified to a heavy-metals standard was a marketing question. After that date it is a balance-sheet question, and the cost sits in five places at once, which is why almost no brand has written it down.

Abstract

This briefing is written for the two people who decide whether a heavy-metals certificate is worth its price: the Chief Financial Officer and the General Counsel. It makes one argument, in numbers you can re-run with your own inputs: that a Supreme Court decision handed down this winter quietly created a cost most brands in this category have not yet written on any spreadsheet, and that the cost lives in five places at once.

The five costs

The premise is the thing everyone in the category knows and would rather not say: the metals are already in the food. FDA's own Total Diet Study found lead in 15% of samples, arsenic in 43%, cadmium in 33% and mercury in 10%. The question was never whether a product carries a measurable metal: it almost certainly does, and so does a competitor's. The question is what a brand can show about it when someone with a subpoena asks.

Each component below is a separate model drawing on the same balance sheet. Magnitudes are illustrative anchors, not forecasts.

#	COMPONENT	DISCIPLINE	DIRECTION AFTER PALMQUIST	ILLUSTRATIVE ANCHOR
1	Litigation differential	Civil procedure	More cases reach a full defense, and the ones that do run longer	≈$2.0m mean outside fees per major case; ≈$20,000/yr added run-rate at a 1-in-50 frequency

#	COMPONENT	DISCIPLINE	DIRECTION AFTER PALMQUIST	ILLUSTRATIVE ANCHOR
2	Settlement-value shift	Settlement theory	Longer trial shadow; the retailer is locked in as co-defendant; even a win can be unwound	A $500,000 case clears $750,000–$1.0m
3	Evidentiary asymmetry	Law of evidence	“They didn’t test” becomes available to the plaintiff as his best exhibit	Sets the other four
4	Insurance repricing	Underwriting	Premium pressure upward as the tail thickens	Directional: no published magnitude
5	Retailer-mandate risk	Retail procurement	A near-certain gate rather than a probability-weighted tail	Directional: no published magnitude

Components 4 and 5 are directional in the source briefing; no published magnitude is asserted for either.

The component that sets the other four

The evidentiary asymmetry is the largest of the five. When a heavy-metal claim reaches a jury the plaintiff need not prove that one extraordinary lot poisoned one child; he has to tell a story in which the metals were present, the company knew or should have known, and the company did not do enough. “They didn’t test” is a sentence a jury understands without an expert’s help, and it was available in the baby-food litigation because the lead defendant had not tested its finished products for heavy metals until 2019.

The defense against that story is evidence with three properties. It must be contemporaneous, generated routinely and before any complaint, so it cannot be dismissed as litigation-built. It must be independent, sampled and analyzed by parties who do not profit from a clean result, under ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation. And it must be against a published threshold, so that a result means something a third party can check.

Five models, one balance sheet

The cost of being uncertified does not resolve into a single figure, because it does not come from a single discipline. A chief financial officer who runs only the litigation model, or only the channel model, will undercount it badly. Underneath the five sits the figure that frames the whole question: a single public contamination event, recall, delisting or a serious lawsuit cluster, modelled at a one-year cost of $1.6m to $6.6m for a brand at $5m in revenue, $8m to $33m at $50m, and $57m to $187m or more at $500m.

One-year cost of a single public contamination event

THREE REVENUE TIERS · MODELLED

Small brand: $5m revenue	$1.6m – $6.6m
Mid-sized brand: $50m revenue	$8m – $33m
Large brand: $500m revenue	$57m – $187m+
Mid-brand break-even, downside-risk avoidance alone	≈$112,500 / yr

Set that against the cost of the thing that addresses all five at once. License fees are revenue-tiered and laboratory testing is an un-marked-up pass-through to an accredited lab, disciplined by the lab market rather than by the program. No single sticker price is published, because the fee scales with the brand. What is stated is the number the program has to stay under to pay for itself: for a mid-sized brand, on downside-risk avoidance alone, before a dollar of channel value and before any insurance credit, a break-even of about $112,500 a year, with all-in annual cost comfortably under $200,000.

What the number is not

> Certification does not make a brand safe, and a serious program will refuse to let a licensee say it does. The mark is a compliance signal under continuous surveillance, not a safety guarantee, and a credible program will not shield a licensee from a regulator. It does not eliminate contamination endemic to the food supply, and it does not turn a bad lot into a good one.
>
> What it changes is the evidence a brand holds when the contamination sitting in everyone's supply chain turns up in theirs. That is a narrower claim than "safe", it is the honest one, and it is the only one worth a chief financial officer's signature.

One word in the argument does quiet work: *credible*. A certificate frozen at the four metals of the 2021 congressional report, arsenic, lead, cadmium, mercury, is silent on the nickel, aluminum, tin and hexavalent chromium that regulators from Brussels to Beijing to California already limit or list. A four-metal mark is therefore an uncovered exposure in its own right: a blind spot a brand pays for without being told it is there. That is why the standard underlying this analysis certifies against eight metals, expressed as ten analytes once the species that matter are split out.

References

Works cited in this briefing's text, in first-appearance order. This is not the full evidence base for the underlying standard; it is only what the prose above draws on. Every range in the briefing is a model built on one of these published anchors. Where a work carries a DOI or a public URL, its title and

domain link to it; primary legal documents and published standards are named but not linked to a corpus record.

[1] CASE

Hain Celestial Group, Inc. v. Palmquist

607 U.S. ___ (2026) (No. 24-724), decided Feb. 24, 2026; below, *Palmquist v. Hain Celestial Group, Inc.*, No. 23-40197 (5th Cir.).

NO SOURCE RECORD — PRIMARY LEGAL DOCUMENT, NOT CORPUS LITERATURE

[2] DATASET

Total Diet Study, FY2018–2020

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (toxic-element detection frequencies).

[3] GOVERNMENT

Litigation Cost Survey of Major Companies

Federal Judicial Center / U.S. Courts, 2008 (mean outside legal fees approximately $2.0M per major case; discovery costs frequently exceeding $600,000).

[4] CASE

People v. Promix Nutrition

Consent Judgment, Proposition 65 settlement, California Office of the Attorney General ($28,000 total; $25,000 attorneys' fees and related costs; $3,000 civil penalty).

NO SOURCE RECORD — PRIMARY LEGAL DOCUMENT, NOT CORPUS LITERATURE

[5] GOVERNMENT

Baby Foods Are Tainted with Dangerous Levels of Arsenic, Lead, Cadmium, and Mercury

U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy, Staff Report, Feb. 4, 2021.

[6] LEGISLATION

California Assembly Bill 899 (2023)

Baby-food heavy-metal testing and public disclosure; California Attorney General enforcement advisory, Mar. 6, 2026.

[7] STANDARD

ISO/IEC 17025:2017, General Requirements for the Competence of Testing and Calibration Laboratories

International Organization for Standardization.

NO SOURCE RECORD — PUBLISHED STANDARD, NOT CORPUS LITERATURE

[8] HMTc Infant and Child Foods Program Manual REPORT

K. Pendergrass, 2026 Edition, the Institute of Contaminant Standards (ICS), 2026. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.20270512. · doi.org

[9] The Cost of Operating Without Credible Third-Party Heavy-Metal Certification JOURNAL

K. Pendergrass, *Journal of Food Metallomics*, 2026. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.18903738. Recall-economics and market-impact anchors (GMA/Covington/EY; Allianz; Thomsen & McKenzie; Pozo & Schroeder) are documented there; this briefing updates the argument for the post-*Palmquist* forum. · doi.org

Bibliographic record

The fields an indexing service reads. Title, named first author and year are the three that carry the record; a briefing missing any one of them is treated as carrying no metadata at all.

Title	The Cost of Being Uncertified
Subtitle	Why *Palmquist* Moved Heavy-Metal Certification From the Marketing Budget to the Balance Sheet
Author	Pendergrass, Karen
ORCID	0000-0002-2348-7259
Author institution	Heavy Metal Tested & Certified, Institute of Contaminant Standards (ICS)
Publisher	Institute of Contaminant Standards (ICS)
Series	HMTc Standards Briefing 4
Document type	Technical report
Publication date	June 2026
Language	en
DOI	not yet assigned
License	CC BY 4.0 (prose)

NO DOI ON THIS SERIES

The three peer-track preprints are deposited with DOIs; the briefing series is not. Depositing the briefings would make each independently resolvable after any URL change: worth doing for the documents most likely to be cited.

Cite this briefing

REUSE THIS BRIEFING

Pendergrass, K. (2026). The Cost of Being Uncertified: Why *Palmquist* Moved Heavy-Metal Certification From the Marketing Budget to the Balance Sheet (HMTc Standards Briefing 4). Institute of Contaminant Standards (ICS).