



STEVEN J. HOFFMAN
CHAIRMAN

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

CANNABIS CONTROL COMMISSION

101 FEDERAL STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

CANNABIS CONTROL COMMISSION PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

November 21, 2017 10:30 a.m.

One Ashburton Place
21st Floor, Rooms 1 and 2
Boston, MA

COMMISSION MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Chairman Steven Hoffman
Commissioner Kay Doyle
Commissioner Jen Flanagan
Commissioner Britte McBride
Commissioner Shaleen Title

COMMISSIONER MEMBERS ABSENT: None

LIST OF DOCUMENTS:

1. Presentation
2. CFAO Job Description
3. Chief People Officer Job Description
4. Chief Technology Officer Job Description
5. Business and Functional Requirements for the Licensing, Tracking and Sale of Adult-Use Marijuana in Massachusetts as regulated by the Cannabis Control Commission (“CNB BFR”)
6. Licensing and Tracking (Procurement Process)

Chairman Hoffman recognized a quorum and called the meeting of the Cannabis Control Commission to order as of 10:36 a.m. on November 21st, 2017. He notified the room that the meeting was being recorded.

Chairman Hoffman provided an update that the Commission extended the public comment period for a couple of weeks due to weather issues. The Chairman described the public comment period, including public listening sessions around the state and a stakeholder listening session. At those, the Commission had approximately 150 speakers. The Commission received 280 emails and 40 documents submitted by mail. The Chairman thanked everyone who spoke, emailed or wrote to the Commission and commented on how impressed he was by how prepared people were and how thoughtful they were in their comments.

Chairman Hoffman stated that he would provide a summary of general categories that the Commission heard comments on:

- Public health: Most frequently raised issues were preventing access by minors and ensuring that our regulations with respect to advertising were not targeted toward minors. There was also a very strong request that the Commission use the funds generated by license fees and taxes to invest in public health, research, and education.
- Industry Composition & Structure: ensuring a role for craft cultivators and coops; diversity in the industry in terms of participation both in terms of employment as well as in terms of ownership, and this is not meant to be an inclusive group of every group that the Commission were told to focus on diversity, but certainly, with respect to women, minorities, veterans, the LGBTQ community.
- Prioritization: concern that prioritization in the initial application process will be given to industry participants as well as those from disproportionately harmed communities. The concern was giving current industry participants a leg up might lead to an industry dominated by big players, by current participants, by out-of-state entities, so the concern is about making sure the industry is not just populated by big players but by smaller players, both at the cultivation level as well as all the way through the value chain up to retail.
- Equity for disproportionately impacted communities –issues that were raised were ensuring full industry participation in those communities, and again, not just employment, but equity ownership opportunities for those groups, making sure that previous marijuana arrests will not prevent somebody from participating in the industry, as well as requests to expunge records for previous marijuana-related offenses.
- Regulations-- suggestions about how those regulations get written or what they should cover, including making sure that the Commission allow for home delivery, social consumption, and ensuring that the regulations – while ensuring public health and public safety – do not get so cumbersome as to become a barrier to entry for people.
- Public safety – First, driving while impaired. How do you test for it? How do you prevent it? With respect to home cultivation and home processing, the fire hazards that can be created.
- Timing--that it was more important for us to do it right than to hit legislatively mandated deadlines.
- Municipalities--There are a lot of towns and cities around the state who are having voter initiatives, having discussions about moratoria. Chairman Hoffman noted that the Commission does not control what the cities and towns do and are not going to tell them what to do. The Commission was collaborating with cities and towns to address questions and concerns. There was also concern that cities and towns might use zoning as a way to effectively prevent facilities from opening in their town, but that is addressed in the law.
- Medical Use of Marijuana -- issues with respect to medical marijuana. The Chairman reminded the meeting that medical marijuana is regulated by the Department of Public Health. The law requires that by the end of December 2018 that medical marijuana transitions from the Department of Public Health to the Commission. It could be sooner, but it has to be done no later than December 31st, 2018. People raised issues on accessibility, how many dispensaries there are and how many counties have dispensaries. There was a question about adequate supply, a concern about adequate supply. Once the Commission allows medical marijuana facilities to become recreational use facilities, would supply be diverted to recreation use, and would medical marijuana patients not have access to medical marijuana? Some issues about tainted products were raised. The Commission has shared these concerns with the Department of Public Health. The Executive Director and the Chairman are engaged

in a process where we're starting to talk to the Department of Public Health, understanding what is required to effectively make the transition from the Department of Public Health to our commission for medical marijuana. They are in the process of trying to understand the issues so they can put together a timeline.

Chairman Hoffman stated that the next opportunity to comment on adult use of marijuana will be a series of public hearings that the Commission will have in February once our draft regulations have been developed and posted, and so, this will not be the last time that people will have an opportunity to weigh in with their concerns, and it'll obviously have something more specific that people can react to when they see the draft regulations.

Next on the agenda is a review of minutes from previous meetings. Chairman Hoffman apologized that the Commission was behind, but thanks to Commissioner Doyle and Diane Rawding, our executive assistant, the Commission was catching up. Chairman Hoffman asked for a motion to approve the minutes from October 3, 2017. Commissioner Title moved to approve, Commissioner Doyle seconded. The Commissioners voted unanimously in favor.

Chairman Hoffman asked for a motion to approve minutes from October 17th. Commissioner Title moved to approve and Commissioner Flanagan seconded. The Commissioners voted unanimously in favor.

Chairman Hoffman asked for a motion to approve minutes for October 24, 2017. Chairman Doyle noted that she had forgotten to include the list of documents, but the Commissioners could approve them subject to that addition. Commissioner Title moved to approve and Commissioner McBride seconded. The Commissioners voted unanimously in favor.

Chairman Hoffman called for a motion to approve minutes for November 7, 2017. Commissioner Doyle cautioned that the list of documents would have to be added to these minutes as well. Commissioner Title moved to approve and Commissioner Flanagan seconded. The Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

Chairman Hoffman stated that the next agenda item would be turned over to the executive director. At the last meeting, the Commission approved a motion to delegate hiring authority for all subsequent hires to the executive director. The Commission gave him two in-process searches – one for the director of communications, one for general counsel. The Chairman asked the Executive Director Shawn Collins to update the Commission on where those stand right now and next steps.

Mr. Collins stated that the posting closed on the November 15, 2017 for the communications director. The Commission received just over 150 applications that are under review. Similarly, the Commission received just over 40 applications for general counsel, also under review.

Mr. Collins stated that he hoped to begin interviewing candidates as early as next week, and then – at least, for general counsel – and that'll put us perhaps into the second week of December to finish those interviews. The Commission will commence a second round which I will convene a panel of folks to screen the second-round candidates, which would be a handful of finalists, then

to make a recommendation to me for appointment, which could occur just before Christmas. Mr. Collins hopes they would be able to start within a few weeks. For general counsel, the timeline would be that the Commission hopefully have someone on board as early as early January. Similarly, Mr. Collins will begin the process of interviewing for director of communications probably in the second week of December as well, and then, a similar timeframe. Mr. Collins will convene a panel probably just the week before Christmas, with the hopes that they can start as well in early January.

Chairman Hoffman asked Mr. Collins to address the next agenda item. Mr. Collins stated that he had brought three job descriptions for review. The first one is chief technology officer. Given that the Commission are in our earliest days and the Commission is in the process of procuring technology, the Commission will also have to build out the technology for the commission to function as a state agency as well. The position is important and the description before the Commission acknowledges that. It does make this individual responsible for continued development of our sale and licensing systems, and it acknowledges that they are also the technology – head procuring officer for technology for the agency. Mr. Collins asked for any questions or feedback about the position. Chairman Hoffman asked if the desire to build the state agency of the future – the model state agency – which has a pretty major technology component in terms of the ease of access and constituent service, is that reflected in the job description. Mr. Collins agreed that he believed it was. He added that a survey could be passed around and thinking about how to build up the agency, being portable, being described as being virtual is a priority, and he would look for that skillset from this candidate. Chairman Hoffman asked if there were any comments or suggestions. Commissioner Doyle stated that it was a comprehensive and well-drafted job description. Commissioner Title agreed. Commissioner Flanagan moved to approve the job description. Commissioner Doyle seconded. The Commissioners voted unanimously in favor of the job description.

Chairman Hoffman asked Mr. Collins for a timeline. Mr. Collins said his intent was not to post the job descriptions today, but instead to report back to the Commission at a subsequent meeting if that process gets under way. Chairman Hoffman announced that the next job descriptions was for the chief people officer, the senior human resource function. Mr. Collins said the description reflects the need to staff up quickly, to develop policies internally for the agency, and to have a real professional operation when it comes to recruiting, retaining, and managing our employment processes. There is a desire to bring in and recruit an impressive and diverse workforce to meet the various functions that have been required here. He hopes that when that right person or right candidate reads this, they'll be encouraged, and they will apply. Commissioner McBride moved to approve the job description and Commissioner Flanagan seconded. The Commissioners moved unanimously in favor of the job description.

Chairman Hoffman stated the third job description was for chief financial and administrative officer. Mr. Collins described the position as a senior role in the organization and is responsible for the ongoing budgeting and management of the agency. One of the key functions as the Commission continue to seek additional funding is to really engage in a meaningful way in the budgeting process with the commonwealth, also to anticipate and start to really engage in the forecasting aspect of the agency piece, too, and to work with the various agencies in doing that. Also, as the Commission continue to build as an agency, to think about any procurements that

might be necessary, and making sure that the Commission have the budget capacity to accommodate that. It is another important role and very technical role, seeking a candidate with some technical hands-on experience.

Commissioner Title commented that it needs to be broken into words for education and experience for the last five bullet points, starting with “undergraduate degree.” Commissioner Doyle moved to approve and Commissioner McBride seconded. The Commissioners voted unanimously in favor of the job description. Chairman Hoffman expressed his gratitude to Jeff Shapiro from the comptroller’s office, who is the Commission’s acting CFAO and doing it in his spare time, which is minimal, given the number of other things that are on his plate.

Chairman Hoffman stated that the next item on the agenda is the process and a timeline for discussing and approving draft regulations, with the caveat that there are some details left to be determined.

By November 30th, 2017, the Cannabis Advisory Board subcommittees will be providing the Commission with their recommendations. Chairman Hoffman recognized their hard work, especially since it was unpaid and part-time. The Public Safety Subcommittee will be making their recommendation on December 1, 2017. Executive Director Collins, who serves as the chairperson of the Cannabis Advisory Board, is coordinating with the chairpersons for the subcommittee to have them deliver the recommendations at a meeting of the Commission during the week of December 4, 2017. Chairman Hoffman stated that they would give each subcommittee the flexibility to say whether the chairperson is going to come in and present, or whether it’s the chairperson and some subset of the subcommittee, or the entire subcommittee, but the Commission actually think it’s important not just for the Commission to receive a written recommendation, but to have a give and take in public around those recommendations, allowing the Commission to ask questions, to push back, or to try to understand why they came to the conclusions that they did.

Chairman Hoffman announced that during the entire week of December 11, 2017, the Commission will discuss the draft regulations and vote on issues of policy that will be subsequently reflected in the regulations. Once the Commission go through that process and take votes on all those policies, the Commission wanted to do a regrouping with some of the stakeholder groups that we’ve met with before. Again, the list is to be determined, but we’re going to take the decisions the Commission made with respect to these policies and sit down with all of the interest groups that have expressed an interest in this. They will not be public meetings because the Commission physically can’t do it publicly and just give them a chance to understand our thinking, push back if they disagree, but we’ll do that in the early part of the week of December 18, 2017, and our intent is at the end of the week to vote and finalize our draft regulations.

The filing date is December 29, 2017. That gives the Commission adequate time to file, allow the public to read and digest the draft regulations, and then the Commission will have public hearings on those draft regulations around the state, similar to what the Commission did with the public listening sessions. The Commission is planning for the public hearing the week of February 5th. They are not yet scheduled in terms of location. The Commission is working on that right now, as well as snow dates when possible.

Commissioner Doyle clarified that the Commission may file the draft regulations before December 29, 2017 after it has voted. The Commission plans to file the final regulations by March 9th, which would then be published on March 23, 2017.

Commissioner Title asked that the stakeholder meetings be in public. Commissioner Flanagan expressed concern that it would be difficult to discuss the draft regulations with all those groups. The ability to do it would depend on the kinds of things that we're looking for in those discussions, whether it's a hearing or whether they're actual one-on-one meetings. Commissioner Doyle agreed with Commissioner Flanagan and clarified that the meetings were not supposed to be a public hearing on the draft regulations. That happens in February. Instead these meetings are to split up the stakeholders so that the Commission can get feedback from each of them and before the Commission actually make that final vote. Commissioner Doyle expressed concern that the timing is such that the Commission wouldn't be able to fit everybody in or the Commission would have to cut them off if the Commission did it in a public session, whereas if the Commission split it up amongst us, the Commission might actually be able to have more substantive discussions over the course of the same period of time. Commissioner Flanagan added that she received feedback about the last stakeholder session the Commission had that not everybody was included, and there were some people who felt that they should have been, that were not. Commissioner Title commented that her concern is about transparency if we're having private meetings the week before the Commission vote.

Commissioner McBride said that she could appreciate the concern of Commissioner Title. The way that the regulatory process works is that there are these places along the way where there's just give and take, and ultimately, the public hearings that we're going to have in February are going to eat up the big piece where people can come and testify, but prior to that, there remains opportunity for stakeholders, members of the public – everyone – to weigh in on it. She said that because the Commission are so time-constrained, she has a preference for dividing and conquering as much as the Commission can during that week to get the explicit feedback on the specific draft of the regulations, getting specific feedback on the draft regulations. Commissioner McBride asked if the draft regulations would be posted online by then. Commissioner Doyle said they have to figure out the timing of that, because she couldn't commit to that yet in terms of when in that process, the regulations will be posted because it can only be pulled together so quickly.

Commissioner McBride expressed concern that the stakeholders have a document to view. Commissioner Doyle responded that they would be reacting to the policy decisions made the week of December 11, 2017. Chairman Hoffman agreed and stated that the decisions would be posted and public.

Commissioner McBride said that she would love to be able to be in every single one of the stakeholder meetings to hear with my own ears what people have to say, but she was not sure that the Commission was going to have the capacity to have the five of us be engaged in all of those conversations, and she would like to be able to try to get back that specific input and feedback from people, and then be able to synthesize it and move along, and hope that people continue to be part of the process as the Commission get the regulations drafted, and then filed, and then as part of the public hearing process.

Commissioner Title said she could see that point, and if the Commission can split it up, then the Commission can take more stakeholder meetings. She proposed that to address both the concerns, the Commission either record the meetings, or the Commission have detailed minutes that the Commission release to the public, or both? Chairman Hoffman and Commissioner McBride agreed, but Commissioner Doyle expressed concern that it would inhibit candid conversation. Chairman Hoffman said detailed minutes might be a better way to do it and no one in the marijuana industry seems to be shy. Commissioner Flanagan asked for clarification as to whether the proposal was that the Commission was asking that the private meetings the Commission hold with stakeholders are recorded? Commissioner McBride affirmed that is what was being proposed and Chairman Hoffman stated he supported the idea, because they were private not because they're private, they're private because the Commission didn't have the time or the wherewithal to do all of these in terms of public commission meetings. He doesn't think any feedback we're getting from interest groups should be private. He doesn't see the logic to that.

Commissioner McBride stated that as the Commission was responsible for synthesizing what the Commission are hearing from everyone, she agreed with Commissioner Doyle that candor is important in this process, and she thought it needs to be balanced. She asked if there is a way for the Commission to call out where there are particular ideas that are reflected in the regulations that come from a particular stakeholder. She did believe people should have the opportunity to be candid and then allow the Commission to determine how to react to particular comments.

Commissioner Flanagan explained that she was not trying to say that this shouldn't be a transparent process. From the start, the Commission have been very transparent given the constraints it has had. She has many people from the prevention world coming to talk to her about a lot of different things, and for me, if they want to present at a public hearing, they have the ability to do that. If they want to sit down and talk to her as a commissioner who's handling public health issues, they have the ability to do that as well. Commissioner Flanagan asked who would be transcribing all these meetings and who would be keeping the minutes—if she was meeting with people, how was she to compile that for other people. She referenced that Commissioner Doyle was weeks behind in our minutes for our public meetings, because she had so much going on. How was the Commission going to do that and get the regulations done at the same time without staff? She expressed concern about the end goal and the workload in this short amount of time so that the Commission can get the regulations done. She added that the one thing she has heard is that Franklin County would like to have a hearing out their way. They've asked twice now. Commissioner Flanagan reiterated that she has heard that people want this done on time, and I think that the Commission have to balance transparency with productivity, and that's just something that she is concerned about, that doing both is going to be very difficult given the time constraints on paper.

Commissioner Title said she was totally open to whatever the Commission decide is the best way, whether it's perhaps to make a balance between people being candid and us being transparent. Maybe the Commission record it, but the Commission don't release the recording, the Commission just use the recording to make sure that it's in the minutes. Chairman Hoffman said he didn't think that could be done. Commissioner Title said she remained concerned about timing. She didn't mean to suggest that every single meeting get recorded, but it's the fact that this is coming after our policy discussion and before the regulation date that makes it a very important week, and she

thought there was a much higher level of transparency that's required for those particular meetings. In terms of capacity, if the Commission have to get some help with data entry assistance or minutes-taking, I don't think that's a significant resource load for one week.

Chairman Hoffman asked that if the Commission record and allow other commissioners to read the transcripts of the recording, it would be public. Commissioner Doyle agreed. Chairman Hoffman states doing that gets at not just the efficiency standpoint, but also the argument about candor. Commissioner Doyle reminded the Commission that the transcript turnaround time has not been what the Commission would like it to be. With everybody working very hard and having the best of intentions, it's still not quick. So, with having a numerous meetings and then trying to read all the transcripts, the Commission won't make the deadline. The Commission wouldn't get the transcripts back in time, and then, everybody would have to read all the transcripts, which she didn't see how the Commission would do. Commissioner Title said that not everybody had to read the transcripts.

Chairman Hoffman said that the thought the issue was just that the transcripts will not be done. If the Commission meet in the week of December 18th, by the time the Commission try to vote at the end of that week, the Commission have to operate under the assumption that the transcripts will not be done. So, if the Commission want to share – which is a big “if” in my opinion – it has to be taped. People would have to run the tape because he didn't think we're going to get transcripts done in time, just based upon our experience to date. Commission Flanagan said the only experience has been Commissioner Doyle and Diane Rawding transcribing the meetings. Chairman Hoffman explained that they had actually been using an outside services and the turnaround time would not work. He didn't want to make a decision based upon what I believe is an unrealistic assumption in terms of turnaround time on transcript development.

Commissioner Title said that she didn't think that it's an absolute statement that it would miss the deadline if the Commission try and have transcripts. There's a lot of different resources available to the Commission and they could have a contractor sit in the room and take minutes, right? Commissioner Flanagan said from the legislative standpoint, what money do the Commission have left? She questioned the use of resources because the Commission had to be cognizant of how much money being used. That is why she was getting interns versus other people. The Commission had to be cognizant of how much money the Commission actually have to spend, and she didn't know what that number is.

Commissioner McBride said she was trying to figure out about where in the process the Commission can create some bridges and to talk that through a little bit, she had questions for Commissioner Doyle. Her understanding of the process is that the Commission are going to have these policy discussions, and that we're going to take a vote based on recommendations that we're all putting together. So, the Commission as a commission will go through this slate of things, and take a vote on that, and decide what direction we're going to go in with regard to particular policy matters. The Commissioners will take the policy decisions to the stakeholders for feedback on the policy direction that the Commission has chosen. The draft regulations, however, for the most part, are going to based on what the Commission vote on the week before.

It's going to reflect what the Commission have voted on in terms of policy, and we'll be getting

the feedback from stakeholders, but it is going to be out there that this is what we're doing, and then, as the Commission move through the process into January and into February, and convene those public hearings and have the regulations out there as a whole, the same people – public, stakeholders, everyone – will have an opportunity to sit in front of us in six, eight, however many hearings the Commission decide to have and give us feedback, which the Commission then be taking and incorporating into the regulations prior to those being final regulations, which the Commission will be voting on as a commission.

That it is still a long process, and that there are many places where there's going to be an ability not just for this or that stakeholder group, but anybody to come sit in front of us and give us very specific and explicit feedback on the regulations well before they're finalized regulations.

Chairman Hoffman added that the Commission will have a public meeting and discuss and vote to approve draft regulations. So, to the extent that any changes from what the Commission discussed and approved the week of the 11th go into the draft regulations, it's going to be a public discussion. So, whatever comes out of these stakeholder meetings is not going to be secret to the extent that it has any impact on the draft regulations. Commissioner McBride noted that the public hearing on the week of December 18, 2017 may require multiple days if there is changes as a result of stakeholder feedback. Chairman Hoffman stated that the Commission would start Thursday and finish when the Commission finishes.

Commissioner Flanagan commented that stakeholder conversation would already be incorporated into the policy discussion the week before and private meetings might not be needed. Commissioner McBride said that the basis for any changes to the draft regulations could be explained during the public hearings on the week of December 18, 2017. Commissioner Title said she believed that there should be some record from every private or stakeholder meeting during those days that would explain any decision change from the week before.

Chairman Hoffman explained that if there is a decision change from the week before, it's going to have to be discussed and voted on in public. He presumed that if he met with some stakeholders and come back with a totally different policy recommendation than the Commission voted on in the previous week, he'd have to explain why.

Commissioner McBride said she thought that Commissioner Title's point was a very valid and fair point and thought that a record of the meeting and describing the change in recommendation would address it. Chairman Hoffman asked for a decision on self-reporting or a formal process of recording stakeholder meetings. Commissioner McBride suggested that Commissioners take personal notes and that those notes be used when the Commission have the meeting later on in the week, and that they be reflected in those meetings. Commissioner Doyle agreed. Commissioner Title said she thought they were getting close, but she was concerned about any changes coming in the last week and that the Commission would have to move fast. She suggested that in those private meetings, if the Commission annotate every single change that the Commission make with what was said and why it was making that change to review, she would be fine with that.

Commissioner McBride said she had a high degree of faith in the other four people that serve on this commission that the Commission are going to document that information and do it well, and

that the Commission are going to have an open conversation where it's going to be expected and respected if there is a back-and-forth about particular changes. She has faith that the four other people that she serves with are going to make sure that the Commission accurately reflect the conversations that are happening in those meetings.

Chairman Hoffman said the Commission will come back and review this process next week with the changes the Commission just talked about. The Commission will try as hard as possible to get more specific in terms of dates on this process, and we'll just keep the public informed on that as the Commission go forward.

Chairman Hoffman said the next topic is key performance indicators and what he has done is put together a set of metrics that he believes Commission should publish, measure itself against and hold itself accountable against.

Chairman Hoffman asked to discuss whether he had the right categories and within each category that the Commission have the best set of metrics. He erred on the side of being overly inclusive. His intent is this will be on the Commission website and would be discussed at weekly Commission meetings.

Chairman asked for thoughts about the categories he created and are there categories that he missed or categories that people believe should not be included in this conversation? He noted that medical marijuana will be part of this once the Commission have a timeline for bringing medical marijuana into the commission, but for the time being, he didn't think the Commission should devote too much time to the medical marijuana key performance indicators. He also stated that the Department of Public Health has a pretty good dashboard of key performance indicators for medical marijuana, so the Commission will work on that at the appropriate point in the future, but not today.

Commissioner Title said she thought it was a really great list, really thoughtful, really complete, but she would add employee job satisfaction. Chairman Hoffman agreed to add it. Chairman Hoffman recommended that the metrics within each category could be reviewed by the Commissioners next week. Commissioner Title recommended that not every metric be discussed weekly and some be reserved for annual review. Chairman Hoffman agreed that not every metric would be reviewed weekly, as they may not change.

Chairman Hoffman announced that the next agenda item is three required pieces of technology development that the Commission have. One is the seed-to-sale tracking, second is a licensing system, and the third is a revenue collection system. The Commission has a contractor, Luella Wong, who has been driving this process for us, and what she has done is read the law, spoken to each of the commissioners about the areas for which they have responsibility, learned from other states' experiences, learned from other departments in the Massachusetts state government, including the Gaming Commission, which has their own licensing system, the Department of Public Health, which has some experience with seed-to-sale tracking, and has developed a spec for each of these pieces of technology.

Chairman Hoffman said the Commission would talk about two today: the seed-to-sale and the

licensing. With respect to the revenue collection technology, the Commission are partnered with the Department of Revenue. They have their own tax system and their outside vendor that they've been working with for a long time on that, and they have agreed to take the lead on making sure that they can collect revenue from the licensees. The Commission is involved in it to make sure the Commission can provide the data that DOR needs from our systems and vice versa. For some of our systems, the Commission need input from the Department of Revenue systems. That will be discussed in a future meeting.

Luella Wong has developed for the seed-to-sale tracking and the licensing tracking. The document will be posted, but was not printed for each Commissioner for the meeting. The Chairman asked Mr. Collins to lead the discussion with input from Ms. Wong. The Chairman thanked them both for their work. Mr. Collins explained that this has been a work in progress for some time now. The specifications that are before you and the systems that they will ultimately lead to are the backbone for implementation and the ability for the commission to license entities and establishments, and to – in an effort for compliance with the Cole Memo at the federal level, that will allow us to track products as they move – plants and products – as they move throughout the licensed system. Ms. Wong pointed out that typically, on a system, when you ask people to sign off on requirements, they're locked in, and after that, you have no control. That is not our process today. The Commission can't do that. Regulations won't be set until March. Mr. Collins agreed, stating that this process is happening on a parallel with the regulatory development process as well, and also some policy decisions that the commission is going to be wrestling with. And so, in the process of identifying the two systems that the Commission will ultimately need, the Commission is really looking for partners to work with us in that, and to make sure that the Commission are agile in our development, and have the ability to be flexible based on the commission's ultimate regulations and policies, and some of the workflow decisions as well. The licensing system is really going to allow us to manage that process as well.

Chairman Hoffman asked if the objective in this conversation was to approve and finalize the specifications. Mr. Collins agreed that it was. Commissioner Doyle asked if there was a time constraint which compelled doing it today, because she had given Ms. Wong substantive feedback on the licensing process and she was wondering about process. Mr. Collins said there was a time constraint, but this was the first opportunity for the full commission to identify or to see this document, so he thought the Commission could theoretically push it or continue this conversation into next week, but everything will just take a subsequent week to complete. There would be a two-part conversation: one is going to be on the specs, and requirements, and the functional requirements of this system, and the other is part of the procurement, and how the Commission take these specs and turn it into a procurement document, ultimately.

Commissioner McBride clarified that the Commission is not agreeing as a commission yet that this is what our system is going to look like. The purpose of this is so that it can be turned into an RFR or whatever it's called for procurement purposes to go out to a vendor or a set of vendors who can respond back and it could move along. Mr. Collins said the substantive feedback was welcome and necessary.

Ms. Wong explained that in response to Commissioner Doyle's comment, she had taken a stab at outlining the application process but needed to reconfigure it but it was not locked in. Chairman

Hoffman said if it would be more productive to have this substantive conversation in a week, to move on and talk about the procurement process, that the Commission can at least give guidance to Mr. Collins about how to drive the procurement process and put this on the agenda for next Tuesday with the explicit request that people are completely prepared, that Luella can spend time with people, even emailing before next Tuesday to incorporate feedback, it sounds like that would be a more efficient use of everybody's time. In the meantime, this version would be made public, but it would be made clear that it is not a final document.

Chairman Hoffman stated there were two new business items that were not known to him when he posted the agenda. One is the procurement process, but before the Commission get to the procurement process for technology, he wanted to make an announcement of the survey that the Commission was going to conduct.

The Commission has developed a survey for people who may be interested in a cannabis equity program to promote and encourage the inclusion of people from disproportionately harmed communities into the regulated industry. The Commission is collecting data about their backgrounds and what type of assistance would be most helpful for the commission in order to create pathways from the unregulated cannabis market into the regulated market. For confidentiality, the survey will be administered by the community group Equitable Opportunities Now, who will deliver anonymous data to the commission. The Commission is partnering with several community groups to distribute the survey around the state, and it will be posted it publicly. Commissioner Flanagan asked if the Commission is going to know what cities or towns were included in the survey. Someone answered in the affirmative.

Chairman Hoffman stated that the other agenda item that was not known to him at the time of the posting of the agenda was that the Commission were going to be ready to have a discussion about the procurement process for the technology – for the seed-to-sale and the licensing technology. He turned the discussion over to Mr. Collins and Ms. Wong.

Mr. Collins stated that related to the technology needs and the specifications is also the need to acquire and procure those relevant systems. Given the time constraints that the commission is confronting and the typical procurement process, those two paths do not match, and they do not meet well, so this – the information you have before you, the memo – outlines what would essentially be an emergency procurement process in that it tracks very closely to a typical procurement in that publication will be made, responses will be accepted, but the timelines are really condensed to accommodate the need to develop these systems very quickly, and our goals are ultimately the same, which is to procure a partner or identify a partner to assist us in developing two really key software or technology programs. Mr. Collins explained that the Commission was seeing the draft timelines that suggest the urgency of this, which is if procurement were to kick off tomorrow, the Commission would look at receiving deadlines as early as December 5th, and then really start to get under way with evaluating those responses. One opportunity that the Commission would like to pursue is the chance for folks to come in and demonstrate their product or prove their concept to us, and really show that they understand what the Commission need out of a system, and that they would serve as a real partner with us in working collaboratively with the Commission as it develops regulations, and how the Commission implement those in a technology solution.

Chairman Hoffman asked if the outcome of the conversation earlier required the moving back of the timeline by a week. Mr. Collin said yes. Ms. Wong said due to the holidays, it may push the timeline out two weeks.

Chairman Hoffman expressed appreciation for the week Mr. Collins and Ms. Wong had done and pointed out that this has not been completely reviewed by the comptroller's office and the general counsel. The Commission has an opportunity and the Commission will modify or finalize it based on their review, but I would like the commission to agree that this process as written here – subject to review and modification by the counsel and the comptroller's office – is something the Commission is comfortable going forward with for these two pieces of technology development.

Commissioner McBride asked how long does the Commission anticipate it will take for any given vendor to build a system. Is the Commission going to be putting in some very specific timelines, and are the Commission going to be selecting vendors based on their ability to meet that specific timeline? Ms. Wong answered in the affirmative, saying that one of the things asked is to give us that timeline. It depends on their solution. If they have a product that requires configuration – they're already using it in other states and it's a matter of changing specifics for our state – they're probably going to have a faster implementation than somebody who's trying to build a licensing system from scratch. Both can be done in this timeline, but the Commission will what it thinks is a higher likelihood of success to deliver what the Commission need.

Commissioner McBride if it is possible for someone to build something out if the process is not finalized until the end of January. Chairman Hoffman said the timeline would not likely accommodate custom development. The Commission would have to use something that already is in place with the kind of configuration and modification. Chairman Hoffman added that the budget would not support a custom development auditor. Ms. Wong said she didn't want to say no before the proposals are in. Commissioner Title moved to approve the process as presented, subject to finalization after legal review. Commissioner Flanagan seconded. The Commissioners voted unanimously in favor.

Commissioner Title reminded the meeting that the Commission has a twitter account at MA_Cannabis and that people should follow it closely for meeting announcements and things like that.

Chairman Hoffman stated that the next meeting would be on November 28, 2017 and wished everyone a happy Thanksgiving. He adjourned the meeting at 12.11 p.m.