

Why positive lists are more effective than negative lists



+ Positive list

List only animals that have been evaluated and that satisfy all required criteria

Applies to all animal species

Animal welfare a key consideration

Precautionary

Consumer safety guaranteed

Easy to enforce, low level of expertise required

Easy to understand, no expertise needed

People who want to keep, sell or otherwise exploit animals have to do the work to prove animals satisfy all criteria for inclusion on list

Comprehensive criteria used to determine suitability of animals for keeping as pets

Considers capacity of shelters and rescues when rehoming is required

Considers capacity and knowledge of enforcement agencies and government

Transparent, accessible and fair process

Protects native wildlife and natural ecosystems

- Negative list

Lists mostly animals that pose a significant physical safety threat to humans

Applies to relatively small number of animal species, with a disproportionate emphasis on mammals

Animal welfare not considered

Reactionary

Lacks consistent consumer safety criteria

Difficult to enforce, high level of expertise required

Difficult to understand, some level of expertise required

Governments, humane societies and other organizations have to do the work to prove animals should be on list

Physical safety threat animals posed to humans is often the only criterion

Does not consider capacity of shelters and rescues when rehoming is required

Does not consider capacity and knowledge of enforcement agencies and government

Process unfair due to lack of scientific foundation, and key issues not being considered

Does not protect native wildlife and natural ecosystems