1. Working group name:

*Consumer Safety, Education, and Health*

1. Individual sponsor(s):

*Dr. John DiMuro, Chief Medical Officer DHHS*

*Dr. Shane Johnson, SJ3D Holdings, Inc.*

*Jen Solas, WECAN*

1. Describe the recommendation:
2. *Uniform labeling requirement mandating at least THC% and the commensurate quantification in a milligrams/gram equivalent.*
3. *Empower the Department of Taxation to amend packaging and labeling requirements commensurate with research*

*Discussion: We recommend that there be uniform requirements for the prominent printing of THC content on packaging / labeling SEPARATE from the labels that carry all of the mandated lab test result data, etc. These latter labels are confusing because they contain so much information, the typical consumer will not necessarily understand what they are consuming. Further, The THC variance (currently discussed among the various work groups as +/- 15%) must be adopted as standard (and should also be required to be printed on the packages and/or labels) otherwise ANY variance (in THC) makes this measure cost prohibitive.*

*With the understanding that products containing THC entail differing routes of administration and are found in different form factors, the following is proposed in terms of initial required uniform potency labeling.*

*For flower, concentrates, topicals, and tinctures:*

*XX% THC (+/- relative 15%) (e.g., if % is 20%, should state, “20% THC (+/- 3%)*

*XX mg/g THC (+/- 15%) (e.g., 200 mg/g +/- 15%)*

*Total mg THC per container (package, jar, vial, cartridge, etc)*

*For edibles or other discrete units (e.g., capsules, suppositories, lozenges):*

*XX mg THC per serving or unit (specify name of unit type) +/- 15%*

*YY servings or units per container (package, blister pack, vial, etc.)*

*Total mg THC per container (package, blister pack, vial, etc.)*

*We further recommend that the aforementioned be initial requirements only, and that the Department of Taxation should be empowered to amend as policy the packaging / labeling requirements related to potency once experience based on market actuals becomes available.*

1. Which guiding principle(s) does this recommendation support?

*Guiding Principle 1 - Promote the health safety and well-being of Nevada’s communities.*

*Guiding Principle 2 - Be responsive to the needs and issues of consumers, non-consumers, local governments and the industry.*

*Guiding Principle 4- Propose efficient and effective regulation that is clear and reasonable and not unduly burdensome.*

*Guiding Principle 6- Establish regulations that are clear and practical, so that interactions between law enforcement, consumers, and licensees are predictable and understandable.*

1. What provision(s) of Question 2 does this recommendation apply to?

*Provide regulation for packaging requirements to address public health and public safety*

1. What issue(s) does the recommendation resolve?

*It supports public safety and consumer awareness*

1. Was there dissent in the group regarding this recommendation? If yes, please provide a

summary of the dissenting opinion regarding the recommendation.

*No*

1. What action(s) will be necessary to adopt the recommendation? Will statute, policy, regulations, etc. need to be addressed?

*Regulations related to packaging and labeling will need to be modified.*

1. Additional information (cost of implementation, priority according to the recommendations, etc).

*Not known.*