

From: [Marco Troiani](#)
To: cac@Cannabis
Cc: [Digamma Administration](#); [Marc Whitlow](#)
Subject: Public Comment for CAC Meeting 2024-03-07
Date: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 6:19:58 PM

[EXTERNAL]: marco@digammaconsulting.com

CAUTION: THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT OF CANNABIS CONTROL!

DO NOT: click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

NEVER: provide credentials on websites via a clicked link in an Email.

Hello Cannabis Advisory Committee,

I am submitting our public comments for the CAC Meeting on 2024-03-07 regarding Item 5: Report from the Scientific Advisory Committee with regards to SB544 implementation and standardized cannabinoid method.

I work with Digamma, a firm that has been performing cannabis analysis since 2011. During this time, we have worked with 48 cannabis labs in 16 US States, helping them acquire and maintain their state licenses, the largest number of which are in California.

The standardized test method was implemented to stop widespread cannabinoid data manipulation by California laboratories, something which it is not well suited to do in its current form. Laboratory audits are essential to address the cannabinoid inflation enforcement problem. Even when a standardized method is enforced uniformly, such as California's DCC required in 2023, the labs can still manipulate data to produce inflated results for their clients in

ways that can only be detected by a direct audit. The mandate for the use of state reference labs is included explicitly in the SB544 language. This independent data from the state reference lab is essential to implement fair and equal enforcement of regulations on cannabis analysis laboratories in California.

The major issue with the standard method is that it limits the number of analytes, detection limits, and adjustments for matrix-specific issues that all analytical labs, such as those regulated by the EPA, are allowed and required to perform to generate the most accurate and legally defensible data. What is needed are performance metrics that a cannabinoid method must meet to be allowable, which would remove the obstacle to innovation and optimization that the current standardized method imposes. Additionally, since this approach is ineffective in addressing the purpose of this standardized method, we have included our thoughts on stopping cannabinoid inflation in California.

Solution 1: Suspect Product Checks (Secret Shopper): We propose the adoption of an affordable "Suspect Product Checks (Secret Shopper)" plan whereby any sample can be run for a very low-cost laboratory to periodically and randomly sample the products of licensed distributors and test them for inflated cannabinoid values.

Solution 2: Chemical Analysis Laboratory Audits: Audits by chemical analysis experts are needed to regulate the issues in cannabinoid inflation, whether performed by state auditors or

3rd party organizations contracted by the government. Such audits would give the state information to know if the data inaccuracy was intentional, or if other government regulatory action is appropriate.

This concludes our public comment, thank you.

Cheers,

Marco Troiani
CEO & Co-Founder
Digamma Consulting
marco@digammaconsulting.com

Marc Whitlow
CFO

Debby Goldsberry
Chief Administrator