

# Legislative and Regulatory Restrictions on Aversive Dog Training Equipment

*A jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction record of where electronic, prong, and choke collars are banned or restricted by law, with statutory citations, effective dates, scope, and years of operation.*

*Companion to The Scientific Case Against Aversive Dog Training Equipment and Methods.*

---

**AUTHORED BY**

**Will Bangura**

M.S., CAB-ICB, CBCC-KA, CPDT-KA, FDM, FFCP

*Certified and Accredited Canine Behaviorist*

This playbook organizes the legislative and regulatory record on aversive dog training equipment by jurisdiction. It is a reference document, with one profile per jurisdiction. The pattern across the entries is consistent: where evidence-based welfare considerations have been weighed by national, regional, or state legislative bodies, the consistent direction of policy has been toward restriction or prohibition, never toward expansion of access.

## How to Use This Playbook

---

This document is suitable for legislative testimony, public comment letters, op-ed writing, professional advocacy correspondence, and conversations with state and provincial lawmakers.

**When to use this document.** When preparing for legislative testimony or public comment. When drafting an op-ed on dog training regulation. When writing to a state legislator or animal welfare advocate. When responding to the claim that bans on aversive equipment are unprecedented or radical. When supporting a colleague who is introducing legislation in their state. When teaching in a continuing education context that includes policy or advocacy material.

**Structure of each profile.** Jurisdiction name. Statutory authority with citation. Effective date. Scope of prohibition. Enforcement mechanism and penalty structure where known. Years of operation under the ban. Notes on any post-implementation review, comparative position, or supplementary regulatory context.

**Organization.** The playbook is organized by region: Europe, Latin America, North America at the subnational level, and Australia, with New Zealand treated separately as professional and veterinary consensus rather than statutory prohibition. The United States is treated separately, with a section on existing state-level partial restrictions in the tethering context, and a section on pending United States legislation organized by legislative-design approach.

**Verification.** Statutory citations and effective dates are drawn from primary sources where available. Practitioners using these profiles for legislative or formal advocacy purposes should verify current statutory language, which may have been amended since the dates referenced here.

**A note on framing.** Where this playbook discusses the absence of harm from prohibition, the framing is deliberately literature-claim form rather than categorical. The defensible position is that no published peer-reviewed evidence of measurable public-safety harm from prohibition has been produced, not that no harm has occurred. The distinction matters for advocacy work. Categorical claims invite hostile fact-checking; literature-claim form does not.

## Table A. Comparative Jurisdictional Summary

This table consolidates the legislative and regulatory record on aversive dog training equipment by jurisdiction. It is organized by region and provides the citation, effective date, scope, and years of operation for each jurisdiction profiled in this playbook.

Jurisdiction	Statutory Authority	Effective Date	Devices Prohibited or Restricted	Years in Force (as of 2026)
<i>Europe</i>				
<b>Wales (UK)</b>	Animal Welfare (Electronic Collars) (Wales) Regulations 2010, SI 2010/943, under section 12 Animal Welfare Act 2006	March 24, 2010	Electronic collars on dogs and cats	16
<b>Gibraltar (BOT)</b>	Animals (Amendment) Act 2025, No. 5 of 2026, inserting section 5C into the Animals Act	March 23, 2026	Electronic, choke, and pronged collars on cats and dogs; separate offence to possess remote-control device while animal wears electronic collar	<1
<b>Switzerland</b>	Tierschutzverordnung, 455.1, Article 76	September 1, 2008	Spike, pinch, and electronic collars; equipment causing pain, fear, or major injury	18
Germany	Tierschutzgesetz §3 No. 11; BVerwG 3 C 14.05 (case law)	February 23, 2006 (case law)	Electronic and pain-inflicting training devices	20
Austria	Tierschutzgesetz, BGBl. I 2004/118, §5(2)(3)(a)	January 1, 2005	Spike collars, prong collars, electric and chemical training devices	21
Denmark	Bekendtgørelse nr. 607 af 25. juni 2009	June 25, 2009	Remote-controlled and automatically operating electric devices; sharp/pointed prong collars; advertising and sale of prohibited equipment	17
Finland	Animal Welfare Act 693/2023	January 1, 2024	Electric and spike collars (use and sale)	2
<b>France</b>	Arrêté du 19 juin 2025, Article 14, professional contexts only	June 19, 2025	Electric, prong, and strangling collars (without stopping buckle) in professional contexts	<1
Netherlands	Besluit houders van dieren, Article 1.3(h); Staatsblad 2021, 361	July 1, 2018 (pinch); 2021 (e-collar)	Equipment delivering electric shocks to dogs; pinch collars	8 (pinch); 5 (e-collar)

Jurisdiction	Statutory Authority	Effective Date	Devices Prohibited or Restricted	Years in Force (as of 2026)
Norway	Lov om dyrevelferd, LOV-2009-06-19-97	January 1, 2010	Electric training devices, anti-bark electric collars, invisible electric fences, prong collars	16
Slovenia	Zakon o zaščiti živali (ZZZiv)	1999 (Aug 1, 2025 cons.)	Electronic training collars under general Animal Protection Act framework	27 (1999 framework)
<b>Spain</b>	Ley 7/2023, Article 27(ñ)	September 29, 2023	Electric, impulse, punishment, and choke collars; hunting/herding/guard exempt	3
Sweden	Djurskyddslagen 2018:1192	April 1, 2019	Equipment delivering electric shocks; spike collars	7
Belgium (Wallonia)	Arrêté du Gouvernement wallon du 15 décembre 2022	April 1, 2023; transition expired April 1, 2024	Electric collars; choke and prong/spiked collars for dogs (limited derogations)	3
Belgium (Flanders)	Decree of 13 July 2018; phase-out 2021	January 1, 2027 (in force)	Remote-controlled and bark-activated electric collars (no military, police, or therapist exception)	0 (in force 2027)
<b>Latin America</b>				
<b>Colombia</b>	Ley 2480 de 2025 (Ley Kiara), Article 10; Ley 84/1989 as updated by Ley 2455 de 2025	2025	Prong and electric collars in regulated pet care services	1
<b>North America (Subnational)</b>				
<b>Quebec, Canada</b>	Règlement c. B-3.1, r. 0.1 (welfare/safety of companion animals and equines)	February 10, 2024	Collars likely to cause pain (étrangleur, à pointes, électrique, martingale). First-offense fines \$600 to \$12,000	2
<b>Australia (Federal)</b>				
Australia (Commonwealth)	Customs (Prohibited Imports) Regulations 1956	Long-standing	Import of pronged collars	Long-standing
<b>Australia (State and Territory)</b>				
Australian Capital Territory	Animal Welfare Act 1992, §13; Animal Welfare Regulation 2001; 2019 amendments	1992; 2001; 2019	Electric devices on companion animals	Long-standing
New South Wales	Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979, section 16 (added 2000)	1979; section 16 added 2000	Use, sale, and possession of electric collars; containment systems permitted only inside fence ≥1.5m high	Long-standing

Jurisdiction	Statutory Authority	Effective Date	Devices Prohibited or Restricted	Years in Force (as of 2026)
Queensland	Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, section 37A	December 12, 2022	Possession, use, and supply of pronged dog collars; e-collars regulated, not banned	3
South Australia	Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Regulations (No. 2) 2000, reg 8(1)(a)	2000	Collars designed to impart an electric shock	Long-standing
Tasmania	Animal Welfare Act 1993, section 8(2)(ja)	November 30, 2022	Pronged collars and similar pinching collars	3
Victoria	Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Regulations 2019, reg 11; Notice S 56 (2020)	2019	Pronged collars (banned); e-collars regulated under regs 23–29A	7
<b>United States (Subnational, Tethering Context)</b>				
Hawaii	Hawaii Revised Statutes §711-1109(1)(j), as amended by Act 182, SL 2021	2021 amendment	Tethering/restraining a dog by means of choke, pinch, or prong collar (criminal cruelty 2nd degree)	5
Rhode Island	RIGL §4-13-42, as substantially expanded by H 8095, Ch. 079 of 2024	June 12, 2024	Tethering with choke, head, or prong collar; tether area minimum, hours, weather scale	2
Connecticut	CGS §22-350a, P.A. 10-100 / current P.A. 22-59	Oct 1, 2010 / Oct 1, 2022	Tethering with coat hanger, choke, prong, head halter, or improperly fitted device	16
Other US states (23 + DC)	Various state statutes (Animal Legal & Historical Center, MSU)	Various	Tethering provisions; several name choke, prong, or pinch collars	Various
<b>United States (Pending Legislation, 2024–2026)</b>				
New York	S 7723 / A 6985, 2025-2026 Session	Pending	Trainer licensure under non-aversive, evidence-based, positive reinforcement standards	—
New Jersey (S 3814)	Senate Bill S 3814, 2024-2025 Session	Held by sponsor	Dog Training Licensing Board with humane training code	—
New Jersey (A 4206)	Assembly Bill A 4206, Dog Trainer Licensing Act	Pending	Board of Examiners of Dog Trainers	—
New Jersey (A 4207)	Assembly Bill A 4207, Dog Training Licensure Act	Pending	NJ Dog Trainer Licensure Board; ties standards to LIMA Policy (APDT, CCPDT, IAABC)	—

Jurisdiction	Statutory Authority	Effective Date	Devices Prohibited or Restricted	Years in Force (as of 2026)
<b>Massachusetts (H 2342)</b>	House Bill H 2342, 194th General Court	Pending (Aug 2025 favorable; Ways and Means)	Excludes electric, prong, and choke collars from court-ordered dangerous-dog plans; AVSAB and ACVB standards	—
Massachusetts (S 1459)	Senate Bill S 1459, 194th General Court	Pending (Nov 2025 favorable; Senate Rules)	Senate companion to H 2342	—
Rhode Island (H 7487)	House Bill H 7487 of 2026	Held for further study (Feb 2026)	Penalty escalation for repeat violations; expands enforcement to municipal animal control	—

*The pattern across these jurisdictions is consistent. Where evidence-based welfare considerations have been weighed by national, regional, or state legislative bodies, the consistent direction of policy has been toward restriction or prohibition, never toward expansion of access or normalization of use. Bolded entries indicate jurisdictions most useful for United States legislative testimony.*

## The Comparative Pattern at a Glance

Multiple jurisdictions on five continents have enacted legislative or regulatory restrictions on aversive dog training equipment. The pattern across these jurisdictions is consistent. Where evidence-based welfare considerations have been weighed by national, regional, or state legislative bodies, the consistent direction of policy has been toward restriction or prohibition, never toward expansion of access or normalization of use.

The earliest comprehensive restrictions date to the 2008 Swiss Animal Protection Ordinance and the 2010 Welsh Statutory Instrument banning electronic collars. More than fifteen years of regulatory experience in these jurisdictions has not produced peer-reviewed evidence of measurable public-safety harm attributable to the prohibitions. The defensible reading of that record is literature-claim form: no published study has attributed measurable public-safety harm to electronic collar prohibition in any jurisdiction that has banned the equipment.

### Jurisdictions Covered in This Playbook

**Europe.** Wales, Gibraltar, Switzerland, Germany, Austria, France, Spain, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Belgium (Wallonia, in force 2023), and Belgium (Flanders, electric-collar prohibition effective 2027).

**Latin America.** Colombia (2025).

**North America (subnational).** Quebec, Canada (2024).

**Australia (federal).** Commonwealth import prohibition on pronged collars.

**Australia (state and territory).** Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria.

**New Zealand.** Long-standing veterinary and professional opposition under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 framework.

**United States (subnational, partial restrictions in tethering context).** Hawaii, Rhode Island, Connecticut, plus 23 states and the District of Columbia with tethering laws.

**United States (pending legislation, 2024 to 2026 period).** New York Senate Bill S 7723 / Assembly Bill A 6985; New Jersey Senate Bill S 3814, Assembly Bill A 4206, Assembly Bill A 4207; Massachusetts House Bill H 2342 and Senate Bill S 1459; Rhode Island House Bill H 7487.

*Deployment line: "Wales has banned shock collars since 2010. Switzerland banned aversive collars years before that. Fifteen years of regulatory experience in those jurisdictions, and no published study attributes measurable public-safety harm to the prohibition. The necessity-from-public-safety claim has been put before the regulatory experience of more than a dozen jurisdictions, and the published case for harm from prohibition has not been made."*

## Wales (United Kingdom)

**Statutory authority.** Animal Welfare (Electronic Collars) (Wales) Regulations 2010, Welsh Statutory Instrument 2010 No. 943 (W. 97), made under section 12 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

**Effective date.** March 24, 2010.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use of electronic collars on dogs and cats. The prohibition covers remote-controlled, bark-activated, and containment electronic collars. Use is the prohibited act; possession is not directly criminalized but use is enforceable as a welfare offense.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under the Animal Welfare Act 2006 framework. Conviction can result in fines and, for serious or repeated welfare offenses, imprisonment.

**Years of operation.** Sixteen years as of 2026. The longest-running comprehensive electronic collar prohibition among English-speaking jurisdictions.

**Notes.** Wales was the first United Kingdom nation to enact a comprehensive electronic collar ban. Scotland and England have not enacted comparable legislation, though England has had repeated parliamentary discussion of similar bans, and a coalition of British Veterinary Association, Kennel Club, RSPCA, Battersea, Blue Cross, and Dogs Trust has called publicly for an England ban. The Welsh Government published a 2017 review of the welfare implications of electronic collars that supports the regulatory framework.

---

## Gibraltar (British Overseas Territory)

**Statutory authority.** Animals (Amendment) Act 2025 (Gibraltar), enacted as No. 5 of 2026, inserting section 5C into the Animals Act. Gazetted 23 March 2026.

**Effective date.** 23 March 2026 (gazetted).

**Scope of prohibition.** Section 5C makes it a summary offence in Gibraltar to attach an electronic collar, choke collar, or pronged collar to a cat or dog, to cause one to be attached, or to have one's cat or dog wear such a collar. It is a separate summary offence to possess in Gibraltar a remote-control device designed or adapted to activate and control an electronic collar while a cat or dog is wearing such a collar. The Act defines "collar" to include a collar, harness, or any item that may be worn by a cat or dog.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Summary conviction. Fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale.

**Years of operation.** Less than one year as of the date of this playbook.

**Notes.** Gibraltar is the most recent enacted statutory prohibition in Europe and the second jurisdiction within the United Kingdom and its overseas territories to enact a comprehensive statutory prohibition on aversive collars after Wales, 2010. The Gibraltar framework is structurally distinctive in three respects. First, the prohibition covers electronic, choke, and pronged collars together. Second, the statute creates a separate possession offence for remote-control devices. Third, the definition of "collar" extends to harnesses and to any item that may be worn by a cat or dog.

---

## Switzerland

**Statutory authority.** Animal Protection Ordinance (Tierschutzverordnung, TSchV), 455.1, Article 76, of 23 April 2008. Underlying Animal Protection Act (Tierschutzgesetz, TSchG) of 16 December 2005.

**Effective date.** September 1, 2008.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use of spike collars (collars with inward-facing prongs), pinch collars, and electronic collars. Article 76 also broadly prohibits equipment causing pain, fear, or major injury. Use is the prohibited act; the language reaches both training and routine handling contexts.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under the Federal Animal Protection Act framework. Cantonal veterinary authorities have enforcement responsibility.

**Years of operation.** Approximately eighteen years of operation as of 2026.

**Notes.** Switzerland's Animal Protection Ordinance is one of the most comprehensive in Europe, covering pinch, prong, and electronic collars together with broader categorical language on equipment causing pain. The Swiss legislative model is frequently cited as the comprehensive standard against which other jurisdictions are compared.

---

## Germany

**Statutory authority.** Animal Welfare Act (Tierschutzgesetz, TierSchG), §3 No. 11, originally 1972 and consolidated 18 May 2006; interpreted to cover electronic training devices by Federal Administrative Court judgment of 23 February 2006, BVerwG 3 C 14.05.

**Effective date.** Statutory framework long-standing; case-law interpretation in force from 23 February 2006.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use of electronic collars and equipment causing pain. The Federal Administrative Court decision interpreted the statute to cover electronic training devices on the basis of their design and function, regardless of how an individual user might attempt to apply them.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under the Animal Welfare Act framework, with state-level veterinary authority responsibility.

**Years of operation.** Approximately twenty years of restriction as of 2026.

**Notes.** Germany's framework is interpretive rather than explicitly enumerated; the federal Animal Welfare Act's general prohibition on causing avoidable pain has been applied to electronic training devices on the basis of design and function. This makes German legislation slightly less direct as a citable model than the Swiss ordinance, but the practical effect is comparable.

---

## Austria

**Statutory authority.** Federal Animal Protection Act (Tierschutzgesetz), §5(2)(3)(a), BGBl. I 2004/118, of 28 September 2004.

**Effective date.** In force 1 January 2005.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use on animals of spike collars, prong collars, electric and chemical training devices, and other equipment causing fear, pain, or harm.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under federal animal protection framework, with provincial-level (Bundesländer) veterinary authority responsibility.

**Years of operation.** Approximately twenty-one years of operation as of 2026.

**Notes.** Austrian law is part of the broader Central European pattern of comprehensive welfare-based restrictions.

---

## Denmark

**Statutory authority.** Bekendtgørelse nr. 607 af 25. juni 2009 om forbud mod brug af visse aggregater, halsbånd mv. til dyr, under the Danish Animal Welfare Act (Dyreværnsloven), lov nr. 386 af 6. juni 1991.

**Effective date.** In force from 25 June 2009.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits remote-controlled and automatically operating electric devices, sharp or pointed prong collars, and the advertising and sale of prohibited equipment.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under animal welfare framework.

**Years of operation.** Long-standing.

**Notes.** Denmark's prohibition is part of a broader Nordic regulatory pattern restricting aversive training equipment.

---

## Finland

**Statutory authority.** Animal Welfare Act 693/2023.

**Effective date.** In force 1 January 2024.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use and sale of electric collars and spike collars on animals.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under Animal Welfare Act framework.

**Years of operation.** Two years as of 2026; the 2023 Act is the first Finnish statute to contain an explicit prohibition on electric and spike collars.

**Notes.** Part of the Nordic regulatory pattern.

---

## France

**Statutory authority.** Arrêté du 19 juin 2025 fixant les règles sanitaires et de protection animale auxquelles doivent satisfaire les activités liées aux animaux de compagnie d'espèces domestiques, Article 14, under Code rural et de la pêche maritime.

**Effective date.** Published 19 June 2025; provisions in force on publication.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits electric, prong, and strangling collars (without stopping buckle) in professional contexts: educators, breeders, kennels, refuges, presenters. Private use by individual guardians is not yet covered; the broader Assembly proposition de loi (passed 16 January 2023) covering private use remains pending in the Senate.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under domestic animal welfare framework with administrative and criminal penalties for violation.

**Years of operation.** In force from publication on 19 June 2025; one year as of 2026.

**Notes.** France's 2025 arrêté is one of the most recent national-level prohibitions in Europe and demonstrates the continuing legislative trajectory toward restriction. The regulation was supported by the French Order of Veterinary Surgeons and major French animal welfare organizations.

---

## Netherlands

**Statutory authority.** Besluit van 26 april 2018 amending Besluit houders van dieren, Article 1.3(h), under the Wet dieren, Article 2.1; further strengthened by Staatsblad 2021, 361.

**Effective date.** Pinch collar prohibition in force 1 July 2018; electric stimulation device prohibition initially with professional exception, later closed by the 2021 amendment.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use of equipment delivering electric shocks to dogs and pinch collars.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under the Animals Act framework.

**Years of operation.** Approximately eight years for the pinch collar prohibition; five years under the 2021 closure of the e-collar professional exception.

**Notes.** The Netherlands enacted its prohibition following sustained advocacy by Dutch veterinary and welfare organizations.

---

## Norway

**Statutory authority.** Animal Welfare Act (Lov om dyrevelferd), LOV-2009-06-19-97, of 19 June 2009. The predecessor 1974 Animal Welfare Act also restricted training collars.

**Effective date.** Act in force 1 January 2010.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits electric training devices, anti-bark electric collars, invisible electric fences, and prong collars.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under Animal Welfare Act framework.

**Years of operation.** Long-standing.

**Notes.** Part of the Nordic regulatory pattern. The Norwegian Council on Animal Ethics has supported broader restriction.

---

## Slovenia

**Statutory authority.** Zakon o zaščiti živali (ZZZiv), of 18 November 1999, published Uradni list RS št. 98/99 of 3 December 1999; most recent amendment ZZZiv-G in force 1 August 2025.

**Effective date.** Original Act 1999; current consolidation in force from 1 August 2025.

**Scope of prohibition.** Restricts electronic training collars under the general Animal Protection Act framework.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under Animal Protection Act framework.

**Years of operation.** Long-standing; twenty-seven years under the 1999 framework as of 2026.

---

## Spain

**Statutory authority.** Ley 7/2023, de 28 de marzo, de protección de los derechos y el bienestar de los animales, Article 27(ñ).

**Effective date.** September 29, 2023.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use of electric, impulse, punishment, and choke collars; hunting, herding, and guard dogs are exempt.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Administrative and criminal penalties for violation; serious-infraction penalties of €10,001 to €50,000 under Article 76.

**Years of operation.** Approximately three years of operation as of 2026.

**Notes.** Spain's 2023 national animal welfare law is one of the most comprehensive in southern Europe.

---

## Sweden

**Statutory authority.** Animal Welfare Act (Djurskyddslagen) 2018:1192, supplemented by the Animal Welfare Ordinance 2019 and Jordbruksverket regulations.

**Effective date.** In force 1 April 2019.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits equipment delivering electric shocks and spike collars on animals.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under Animal Welfare Act framework.

**Years of operation.** Seven years under the 2018 Act as of 2026.

**Notes.** Part of the Nordic regulatory pattern.

---

## Belgium (Wallonia)

**Statutory authority.** Arrêté du Gouvernement wallon du 15 décembre 2022 portant sur l'interdiction ou la restriction de l'utilisation d'accessoires ou de produits causant aux animaux des douleurs, des souffrances ou des lésions évitables, adopted under the Walloon Animal Welfare Code, Article D.40. Published in the Moniteur belge on 22 February 2023 under Numac 2023040666.

**Effective date.** April 1, 2023. A one-year transition period applied to certain contexts. Those transition provisions expired April 1, 2024.

**Scope of prohibition.** Wallonia prohibits the use of accessories or products causing animals avoidable pain, suffering, or injuries. Article 2 expressly prohibits, for dogs or cats, accessories that deliver electric shocks, including electric collars; accessories that emit unpleasant sound signals; and accessories that act through chemical substances. The order also prohibits the use of choke collars and prong or spiked collars for dogs.

**Exceptions and derogations.** The order is broad, but not exception-free. Electric collars may be used for official utility dogs used by Civil Security, federal and local police, Defense, and Customs, only within their missions. Electric stimulation may not be used on dogs under six months, pregnant or lactating bitches, or dogs unable to respond because of age or health. Choke collars may be used for adult dogs when necessary for reasons related to behavior, welfare, or public safety, but only with a veterinarian's certificate, behavioral diagnosis, and proof that the veterinarian explained the functioning of the collar. The certificate is valid for six months and renewable.

**Sale and commercialization.** The Walloon rule should not be described as a sale ban. The official Walloon FAQ states that the order regulates use, not commercialization, because commercial regulation belongs to Belgian federal authority.

**Enforcement and penalty.** The order is made under the Walloon Animal Welfare Code. Second-category offenses under Book I of the Walloon Environmental Code can carry criminal penalties of 8 days to 3 years imprisonment and/or fines from 100 euros to 1,000,000 euros, and administrative fines from 150 euros to 200,000 euros.

**Years of operation.** Approximately three years as of 2026.

**Notes.** Wallonia must be listed separately from Belgium-Flanders. Wallonia has a broader current regional restriction, while Flanders has a future electric-collar prohibition taking effect January 1, 2027. The Belgian example is useful in legislative testimony because it shows why subnational jurisdictional accuracy matters.

---

## Belgium (Flanders)

**Statutory authority.** Decree of 13 July 2018 establishing principle prohibition under the federal Animal Welfare Act of 14 August 1986; phase-out scenario set in 2021.

**Effective date.** Full prohibition in force 1 January 2027.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits remote-controlled and bark-activated electric collars on dogs in the Flemish region, with no exception for military, police, or behaviour therapists; invisible-fence collars remain permitted.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Will be enforced under regional animal welfare framework once in force.

**Years of operation.** Enacted but not yet in force as of 2026.

**Notes.** Flanders is the first of the three Belgian regions to enact a comprehensive electronic collar prohibition. The Flemish framework is notable for not exempting military, police, or behaviour therapists, which closes a carve-out commonly found in other European frameworks.

---

## Latin America

### Colombia

**Statutory authority.** Ley 2480 de 2025 (Ley Kiara), Article 10, regulating professional pet care services; complemented by general anti-cruelty framework Ley 84 de 1989 as updated by Ley 2455 de 2025 (Ley Ángel) of 18 April 2025.

**Effective date.** In force in 2025 (Ley Kiara); Ley Ángel signed 18 April 2025.

**Scope of prohibition.** Ley 2480 (Ley Kiara) prohibits prong and electric collars in regulated pet care services, including kennels, training centres, transport, grooming, and spas. Private-use scenarios are addressed under the general anti-cruelty provisions.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under national animal welfare and consumer protection framework.

**Years of operation.** Approximately one year of operation as of 2026.

**Notes.** Colombia is the first Latin American country to enact a national-level prohibition on aversive training equipment, demonstrating that the regulatory trajectory extends beyond Europe and the English-speaking world. The Colombian law explicitly addresses both sale and use, providing a more comprehensive consumer-protection model than legislation that addresses use alone.

---

## North America (Subnational)

### Quebec, Canada

**Statutory authority.** Règlement sur le bien-être et la sécurité des animaux domestiques de compagnie et des équidés, chapter B-3.1, r. 0.1, made under the Loi sur le bien-être et la sécurité de l'animal (CQLR c. B-3.1), replacing the earlier P-42, r. 10.1 framework.

**Effective date.** February 10, 2024.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits collars likely to cause pain, specifically identified by the Quebec Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAPAQ) as étrangleur (choke), à pointes (prong), électrique (electric), and martingale collars. The regulation builds on a 2013 principle that an animal's collar must not interfere with breathing or cause pain or injury.

**Enforcement and penalty.** First-offense fines range from \$600 to \$12,000, with tripled penalties for repeat offenses. Enforcement by MAPAQ.

**Years of operation.** Two years of operation as of 2026.

**Notes.** Quebec is currently the only Canadian province with comprehensive prohibition on prong, electric, choke, and martingale collars under animal welfare regulation. The MAPAQ identification of these specific collar types as falling within the breathing-or-pain-or-injury language is the operative regulatory standard for enforcement purposes. Quebec's framework is the closest North American analog to the European regulatory model and is a useful citable precedent for United States state legislation.

---

# Australia (Federal, State, and Territory)

## Australia (Commonwealth)

**Statutory authority.** Federal customs law (Customs (Prohibited Imports) Regulations 1956, as amended).

**Effective date.** Long-standing import prohibition; specific regulatory listing of pronged collars dates from federal review.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the import of pronged collars into Australia. Sale and use within Australia are regulated at the state and territory level.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced by Australian Border Force at the federal level for import offenses.

**Years of operation.** Long-standing.

**Notes.** The federal import prohibition does not, on its own, prohibit possession or use of pronged collars already in the country. State and territory legislation handles the in-country prohibition. The combination of federal import prohibition and state-level use prohibition is a useful regulatory model for jurisdictions where federal authority over training equipment is constitutionally limited.

---

## Australian Capital Territory

**Statutory authority.** Animal Welfare Act 1992 (ACT) §13, with prescribed permitted electric devices listed in Animal Welfare Regulation 2001; further strengthened by Animal Welfare Legislation Amendment Bill, passed 26 September 2019.

**Effective date.** Act 1992; regulation 2001; 2019 strengthening amendments.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use of electric devices on companion animals; electronic training collars are not on the prescribed-permitted list. The 2019 amendments also recognised animal sentience.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under ACT animal welfare framework.

**Years of operation.** Long-standing.

---

## New South Wales

**Statutory authority.** Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979 (NSW), section 16 (electric collar prohibition added by 2000 amendment).

**Effective date.** Act 1979; section 16 prohibition added 2000.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use, sale, and possession of electric collars on dogs; containment systems permitted only inside a fence at least 1.5 metres high.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced by RSPCA NSW and state authorities under the prevention of cruelty framework.

**Years of operation.** Long-standing.

**Notes.** The NSW framework includes a narrow exception for containment systems under specified conditions. The exception is narrower than the general permissive treatment that would apply absent regulation.

---

## Queensland

**Statutory authority.** Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 (Qld), section 37A, as inserted by Animal Care and Protection Amendment Act 2022.

**Effective date.** Amendment Act passed 2 December 2022; section 37A in force 12 December 2022.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the possession, use, and supply of pronged dog collars. Electronic collars in Queensland are regulated rather than banned.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced by RSPCA Queensland and state authorities.

**Years of operation.** Approximately three years of operation as of 2026 for the prong collar prohibition.

**Notes.** Queensland's 2022 amendment is one of the more recent expansions of an Australian state framework and demonstrates the continuing legislative trajectory at the subnational level.

---

## South Australia

**Statutory authority.** Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Regulations (No. 2) 2000 (SA), regulation 8(1)(a), under the Animal Welfare Act 1985 (SA).

**Effective date.** Regulations 2000.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits placing on an animal a collar designed to impart an electric shock.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced under Animal Welfare Act framework.

**Years of operation.** Long-standing.

---

## Tasmania

**Statutory authority.** Animal Welfare Act 1993 (Tas), section 8(2)(ja), inserted by Act No. 36 of 2022.

**Effective date.** In force 30 November 2022.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use of pronged collars and similar pinching collars on animals.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced by RSPCA Tasmania and state authorities.

**Years of operation.** Approximately three years of operation as of 2026.

---

## Victoria

**Statutory authority.** Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Regulations 2019 (Vic), under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1986; technical specifications for any conditionally permitted electronic collar use set out in Ministerial Approval Notice S 56, Victorian Government Gazette, 6 February 2020.

**Effective date.** Regulations 2019; technical specifications notice 6 February 2020.

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits the use of pronged collars under regulation 11. Electronic collars are heavily regulated under regulations 23 to 29A, conditionally permitted only under the technical-specifications standards in Ministerial Notice S 56.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Enforced by RSPCA Victoria, state authorities, and local government.

**Years of operation.** Seven years under the 2019 framework as of 2026.

**Notes.** Victoria's framework demonstrates a tiered approach: full prohibition on prong collars combined with conditional regulation of electronic collars. This is a useful comparative reference for jurisdictions considering tiered legislative approaches.

---

## New Zealand

### **New Zealand (Professional and Veterinary Consensus, Not Statutory Prohibition)**

**Statutory authority.** Animal Welfare Act 1999 framework, with position guidance from the New Zealand Veterinary Association and the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee.

**Effective date.** Long-standing framework; specific positions on electronic collars from professional bodies.

**Scope of prohibition.** Electronic collars are not subject to a formal national-level prohibition, but the New Zealand Veterinary Association does not support their use, and the Association of Pet Dog Trainers New Zealand has issued a position statement that the use of electronic training collars is not only unnecessary but a form of cruelty.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Animal Welfare Act 1999 framework provides general welfare-based enforcement authority.

**Years of operation.** Long-standing professional opposition; statutory framework allows enforcement on welfare grounds.

**Notes.** New Zealand is included here because the professional consensus position closely parallels formal regulatory prohibition in other jurisdictions, even though New Zealand has not enacted explicit equipment-specific legislation. The NZVA and APDTNZ positions are useful citations for jurisdictions weighing professional consensus alongside statutory frameworks.

---

## United States (Subnational, Tethering Context)

United States state-level legislation on aversive training equipment is, at the time of writing, limited to partial restrictions in the tethering context rather than comprehensive prohibitions on sale and use. These statutes are useful as evidence that United States legislatures have already recognized welfare concerns associated with aversive equipment and have begun legislating accordingly, though the existing statutes do not yet meet the comprehensive standard adopted in Europe and Australia.

## Hawaii

**Statutory authority.** Hawaii Revised Statutes §711-1109(1)(j) (cruelty to animals in the second degree), as amended by Act 182, Session Laws 2021.

**Effective date.** 2021 amendment.

**Scope of prohibition.** Makes it a criminal offense of cruelty to animals in the second degree to tether or restrain a dog to a stationary object by means of a choke collar, pinch collar, or prong collar, unless the dog is engaged in an activity supervised by its owner or an agent of its owner.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Criminal prosecution under the cruelty to animals statute.

**Years of operation.** Five years of operation as of 2026.

**Notes.** Hawaii's 2021 amendment is one of the more direct United States statutory references to choke, pinch, and prong collars by name. The supervised-activity exception narrows the scope to the tethering context, but the legislative recognition of these specific tools as cruelty-relevant is a useful precedent.

---

## Rhode Island

**Statutory authority.** Rhode Island General Laws §4-13-42, as substantially expanded by H 8095, Chapter 079 of the 2024 Public Laws of Rhode Island, in force 12 June 2024.

**Effective date.** Original tethering provisions long-standing under the General Laws framework; substantial expansion in force 12 June 2024.

**Scope of prohibition.** The 2024 expansion of §4-13-42 prohibits tethering a dog with a choke-type collar, head collar, or prong-type collar. It additionally restricts permanent tether area to no less than 113 square feet (or a six-foot trolley radius at ground level), prohibits tethering for more than ten hours in any twenty-four-hour period, prohibits tethering between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. (with a fifteen-minute exception), and incorporates the Tufts Animal Care and Condition Weather Safety Scale.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Civil and criminal penalties under the General Laws framework.

**Years of operation.** Two years under the 2024 substantial expansion as of 2026.

**Notes.** The 2024 expansion is one of the more comprehensive United States state-level tethering statutes by virtue of incorporating the Tufts Weather Safety Scale and the time-of-day prohibition. Rhode Island H 7487 of 2026 is pending and would further escalate penalties for repeat violations and expand enforcement authority to municipal animal control officers.

---

## Connecticut

**Statutory authority.** Connecticut General Statutes §22-350a, as amended by Public Act 10-100 (effective 1 October 2010) and subsequently amended; current version under Public Act 22-59 (effective 1 October 2022).

**Effective date.** October 1, 2010 (P.A. 10-100); current version effective October 1, 2022 (P.A. 22-59).

**Scope of prohibition.** Prohibits tethering a dog by means of a coat hanger, choke collar, prong-type collar, head halter, or any other collar, halter, or device that is not specifically designed or properly fitted for the restraint of the dog.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Civil and criminal penalties under the General Statutes framework.

**Years of operation.** Sixteen years under P.A. 10-100 as of 2026.

**Notes.** Connecticut's statute is notable for naming choke, prong, and head halter collars by category as inappropriate tethering equipment, alongside the catch-all language for any device not specifically designed or properly fitted for the restraint of the dog.

---

## Other United States States with Tethering Statutes

**Statutory authority.** Various state statutes catalogued by the Animal Legal and Historical Center, Michigan State University College of Law (2022).

**Effective date.** Various.

**Scope of prohibition.** Twenty-three states and the District of Columbia have enacted laws regulating the tethering of dogs. Several states explicitly name choke, prong, or pinch collars as prohibited tethering equipment. Specific statutory language varies.

**Enforcement and penalty.** Varies by state.

**Years of operation.** Varies by state.

**Notes.** Practitioners considering legislative work in a specific state should consult the Animal Legal and Historical Center's table of state dog tether laws for the current statutory language in their jurisdiction. The cumulative effect of these state statutes is that aversive equipment has already been recognized in United States law as welfare-relevant, even if the recognition is currently limited to the tethering context.

---

## United States Pending Legislation (2024 to 2026)

Pending United States legislation in the 2024 to 2026 period reflects three distinct legislative-design approaches to aversive equipment and aversive methods, beyond the enacted tethering statutes already discussed. The first approach is professional licensing of dog trainers tied to non-aversive standards. The

second approach is restriction of aversive equipment within specified behavior-modification contexts. The third approach is enhancement of existing tethering and care statutes. None of the proposals catalogued in this section had been enacted as of the date of this paper. Collectively, however, they establish that United States state-level legislative interest in regulating aversive training equipment, aversive methods, and the dog training profession itself is active across multiple states and across multiple legislative-design models.

### **Approach 1. Trainer Licensure Under Non-Aversive Standards**

The trainer-licensure approach addresses the dog training regulatory vacuum at the state level by adopting force-free methodology as the standard of professional practice and using state licensure to enforce that standard. This is the same regulatory model used for veterinary medicine, mental health counseling, and social work in the United States. New York and New Jersey have introduced parallel proposals under this approach.

#### **NEW YORK SENATE BILL S 7723 / ASSEMBLY BILL A 6985**

**Statutory authority.** New York State Senate Bill S 7723 / Assembly Bill A 6985, 2025-2026 Regular Session. An act to amend the agriculture and markets law, in relation to requiring the commissioner of agriculture and markets to establish licensing and educational standards for individuals providing canine training for non-service and non-police dogs.

**Effective date.** Pending.

**Scope.** Would add Agriculture and Markets Law section 113-a, requiring licensing and educational standards for individuals providing canine training to non-service and non-police dogs, with the statutory language explicitly mandating non-aversive, evidence-based, positive reinforcement techniques as the basis of those standards.

**Procedural status.** Assembly Bill A 6985 had its enacting clause stricken on 20 February 2026. Senate Bill S 7723 remains in the Senate Agriculture Committee.

**Notes.** The licensure approach is structurally significant: rather than legislating against specific tools, it adopts force-free methodology as the standard of professional practice and uses licensure to enforce that standard.

---

## **NEW JERSEY SENATE BILL S 3814 (2024-2025 SESSION)**

**Statutory authority.** New Jersey Senate Bill S 3814, 2024-2025 Session. Establishes Dog Training Licensing Board to license and regulate dog trainers.

**Effective date.** Held by sponsor.

**Scope.** Would have established a Dog Training Licensing Board with an evidence-based humane training code precluding aversive methods.

**Procedural status.** Introduced 24 October 2024. Held by sponsor following committee testimony in early 2025 and not advanced from committee.

**Notes.** The withdrawal of S 3814 in early 2025 was followed approximately one year later by the introduction of two parallel Assembly bills (A 4206 and A 4207) on 19 February 2026, indicating that the New Jersey legislative interest in the licensure approach did not end with the withdrawal of S 3814 but is being carried forward through the Assembly.

---

## **NEW JERSEY ASSEMBLY BILL A 4206 (DOG TRAINER LICENSING ACT)**

**Statutory authority.** New Jersey Assembly Bill A 4206, 2026-2027 Session. Dog Trainer Licensing Act, introduced by Assemblywoman Carol A. Murphy.

**Effective date.** Pending.

**Scope.** Would establish a Board of Examiners of Dog Trainers under the Dog Trainer Licensing Act.

**Procedural status.** Introduced 19 February 2026; referred to the Assembly Regulated Professions Committee.

**Notes.** A 4206 is one of two parallel Assembly bills introduced on the same day. The two bills represent slightly different licensure-board structures under closely related statutory frameworks.

---

## **NEW JERSEY ASSEMBLY BILL A 4207 (DOG TRAINING LICENSURE ACT)**

**Statutory authority.** New Jersey Assembly Bill A 4207, 2026-2027 Session. Dog Training Licensure Act creating the New Jersey Dog Trainer Licensure Board.

**Effective date.** Pending.

**Scope.** Would establish a New Jersey Dog Trainer Licensure Board under the Dog Training Licensure Act and would expressly tie licensure standards to professional codes of ethics that incorporate the Least Intrusive, Minimally Aversive Effective Behavior Intervention Policy adopted jointly by the Association of Professional Dog Trainers (APDT), the Certification Council for Professional Dog Trainers (CCPDT), and the International Association of Animal Behavior Consultants (IAABC).

**Procedural status.** Introduced 19 February 2026; referred to the Assembly Regulated Professions Committee.

**Notes.** A 4207 is structurally significant because it ties the licensure standard to a specific named professional standards document, the LIMA Effective Behavior Intervention Policy, rather than leaving the standard to be determined by regulation. This is a useful citable precedent for any state legislature considering trainer licensure with substantive standards-of-practice requirements built into the enabling statute.

---

### **Approach 2. Restriction of Aversive Equipment in Behavior-Modification Plans**

The equipment-restriction-in-behavior-modification-plans approach addresses aversive equipment use in a specific high-stakes context: court-ordered or regulatory behavior modification plans for dogs that have been deemed dangerous. Massachusetts has introduced parallel House and Senate bills under this approach in the 194th General Court.

## MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE BILL H 2342

**Statutory authority.** Massachusetts House Bill H 2342, 194th General Court, 2025-2026 Session. An Act Relative to Dangerous Dogs.

**Effective date.** Pending.

**Scope.** Would require that any dangerous-dog behavior modification plan ordered under the proposed dangerous-dog statute use exclusively evidence-based training techniques that do not result in pain, discomfort, fear, or anxiety, and would explicitly exclude electric, prong, and choke collars from such plans, with required adherence to the principles of the American Veterinary Society of Animal Behavior (AVSAB) and the American College of Veterinary Behaviorists (ACVB).

**Procedural status.** Reported favorably by the Joint Committee on Municipalities and Regional Government and referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means on 14 August 2025.

**Notes.** The Massachusetts approach is narrower than full equipment prohibition, but it operates in a high-stakes context (dangerous-dog behavior modification) where the choice of method directly affects public safety as well as canine welfare. The explicit incorporation of AVSAB and ACVB principles is structurally similar to the LIMA reference in NJ A 4207 and is a useful citable precedent for states considering equipment-restriction language tied to professional standards.

---

## MASSACHUSETTS SENATE BILL S 1459

**Statutory authority.** Massachusetts Senate Bill S 1459, 194th General Court, 2025-2026 Session. An Act Relative to Dangerous Dogs.

**Effective date.** Pending.

**Scope.** Senate companion to H 2342, with the same equipment exclusions and standards-of-practice requirement.

**Procedural status.** Reported favorably by the Joint Committee on Municipalities and Regional Government and referred to the Senate Committee on Rules on 19 November 2025.

**Notes.** The favorable Joint Committee report on both H 2342 and S 1459 indicates substantive legislative momentum in the 194th General Court, even if neither bill has yet reached a floor vote.

---

## Approach 3. Enhancement of Existing Tethering and Care Statutes

The third pending-legislation approach is enhancement of existing tethering and care statutes, increasing penalties or expanding enforcement authority without changing the categorical scope of the underlying prohibition. Rhode Island has introduced legislation under this approach.

## RHODE ISLAND HOUSE BILL H 7487

**Statutory authority.** Rhode Island House Bill H 7487, 2026 January Session. Penalty escalation and expanded enforcement authority for the existing dog care and tethering statute.

**Effective date.** Pending.

**Scope.** Would increase penalties for repeat violations of the existing dog care and tethering statute (Rhode Island General Laws §4-13-42, as substantially expanded by H 8095 in 2024) and would expand enforcement authority to include city and town animal control officers.

**Procedural status.** Introduced 4 February 2026; referred to the House Judiciary Committee (held for further study).

**Notes.** H 7487 is the second pending Rhode Island bill in two years (following the 2024 substantial expansion of §4-13-42 by H 8095, Chapter 079 of 2024). The 2024 expansion added the substantive scope; H 7487 of 2026 would add the penalty escalation and the enforcement-authority expansion. Together, the two bills represent sustained legislative attention to the tethering-statute framework rather than a single one-time enactment.

*Cross-state pattern. Pending legislation in the 2024 to 2026 period spans four states (New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Rhode Island) and three legislative-design approaches (trainer licensure, equipment restriction in behavior-modification plans, tethering-statute enhancement). The pattern indicates active United States state-level legislative interest in this regulatory space, distributed across multiple design models, even though no single comprehensive prohibition has yet been enacted at the United States state level.*

## Deployment Notes

### For Legislative Testimony

The most powerful argument from this jurisdictional record is the absence of published evidence of measurable public-safety harm from the existing prohibitions. Wales has banned shock collars since 2010. Switzerland since 2008. Multiple Australian states for over a decade. Quebec since 2024. France since June 2025. The Netherlands since 2018 (pinch) and 2021 (electronic). Colombia since 2025. No published study attributes measurable public-safety harm in any of these jurisdictions to the prohibition. The defensible framing is literature-claim form, not categorical: the published case for harm from prohibition has not been made.

Citing two or three specific jurisdictions by name, with effective dates and years of operation, anchors the testimony in concrete regulatory precedent rather than in abstract policy argument. The Welsh, Swiss, and Quebec examples together cover Anglo-American, Continental European, and North American

legislative traditions, which makes them particularly useful for United States audiences.

### **For Op-Eds and Public Comment**

The strongest framing for general audiences is comparative. Most of the developed world has restricted or banned this equipment, and the United States is increasingly the outlier. Use the Wales, Gibraltar, Switzerland, Germany, France, Netherlands, Quebec, and Australia examples to establish that the regulatory direction is global and consistent, not novel or radical.

### **For Conversations with State Legislators**

State legislators considering action will want a model to follow. Three operative legislative-design models are now in active circulation in the 2024 to 2026 period: (1) trainer licensure under non-aversive standards (NY S 7723 / A 6985, NJ S 3814, NJ A 4206, NJ A 4207); (2) equipment restriction in court-ordered behavior modification plans (MA H 2342, MA S 1459); and (3) penalty escalation and enforcement expansion for tethering statutes (RI H 7487, building on the 2024 substantial expansion of RI §4-13-42). The three models are complementary, not alternative.

State legislators may also want to know that comparable regulatory frameworks already exist for adjacent professions: veterinary medicine, mental health counseling, social work, and others. State licensure of dog trainers is not a novel regulatory category; it is an extension of existing welfare-affecting professional regulation to a profession that currently lacks it. NJ A 4207 in particular ties the licensure standard to a specific named professional standards document (the LIMA Effective Behavior Intervention Policy adopted jointly by APDT, CCPDT, and IAABC), and is a useful citable precedent for any state legislature wanting substantive standards-of-practice requirements built into the enabling statute.

### **For Conversations with Animal Welfare Advocates in Other States**

Practitioners working with state-level animal welfare advocates who are considering legislative work in their state can use this playbook to identify the closest existing precedent for the legislative model under consideration. The advocacy community sometimes works in isolation; pointing to the comparative jurisdictional record helps locate any state-level effort within a larger international pattern. The 2024 to 2026 pending-legislation record across four states (NY, NJ, MA, RI) is particularly useful because it establishes that legislative interest in this space is active and distributed across multiple design models, not concentrated in a single state's effort.

### **For Responding to the "Radical" or "Unprecedented" Framing**

Aversive equipment proponents sometimes frame any United States legislation as radical or unprecedented. The jurisdictional record refutes that framing directly. The policy is not novel and it is not radical. It is the policy that has been adopted, in some cases for more than fifteen years, by jurisdictions across Europe, the United Kingdom, Australia, North America, and Latin America. The United States legislative trajectory described in the policy paper is conservative in the technical sense: it follows established international regulatory practice.

*Closing line for legislative use: "The United States is not being asked to do something novel. It is being asked to do what most of the developed world has already done. The convergent welfare science, the international veterinary consensus, and the regulatory experience of more than a dozen jurisdictions all point in the same direction. The case is conservative, not radical."*

## Table B. Quick-Reference Deployment Summary

This table is built for legislative testimony, op-ed writing, and conversations with policymakers. It is denser and shorter than Table A, designed to fit the comparative jurisdictional record into a format that can be scanned in seconds. Use this table to pick which two or three jurisdictions to cite for a specific argument.

Jurisdiction	Effective	Scope (One-Line)
<b>Europe</b>		
<b>Wales (UK)</b>	2010	Electronic collars on dogs and cats
<b>Gibraltar (BOT)</b>	March 2026	Electronic, choke, and pronged collars; remote-control device possession also offence
<b>Switzerland</b>	2008	Spike, pinch, electronic collars; equipment causing pain or fear
Germany	c. 2006	Electronic and pain-inflicting training devices
Austria	2005	Spike, prong, electric, chemical training devices
Denmark	2009	Electric devices, prong collars; advertising and sale prohibited
Finland	2024	Electric and spike collars (use and sale)
<b>France</b>	June 2025	Electric, prong, strangling collars in professional contexts
<b>Netherlands</b>	2018 (pinch); 2021 (e-collar)	Equipment delivering electric shocks; pinch collars
Norway	2010	Electric devices, anti-bark collars, invisible fences, prong collars
Slovenia	1999	Electronic training collars under general framework
<b>Spain</b>	2023	Electric, impulse, punishment, choke collars (Article 27(ñ))
Sweden	2019	Equipment delivering electric shocks; spike collars
Belgium (Wallonia)	April 2023	Electric collars; choke and prong collars (limited derogations)
Belgium (Flanders)	Jan 2027 (in force)	Electric-collar prohibition; invisible-fence exception
<b>Latin America</b>		
<b>Colombia</b>	2025	Sale and use of electric and prong collars in pet care services

Jurisdiction	Effective	Scope (One-Line)
<b>North America</b>		
Quebec, Canada	Feb 2024	Choke, prong, electric, martingale collars. Fines \$600 to \$12,000
<b>Australia</b>		
Australia (Cmwlth import)	Long-standing	Import of pronged collars
ACT, NSW, SA	Long-standing	Electronic collars (NSW with limited containment exception)
Queensland	Dec 2022	Pronged collars (e-collars regulated)
Tasmania	Nov 2022	Pronged collars
Victoria	2019	Pronged collars; electronic conditionally permitted
<b>United States (Subnational, Tethering Context)</b>		
Hawaii	2021	Tethering w/ choke, pinch, prong (criminal cruelty 2nd deg.)
Rhode Island	June 2024	Tethering w/ choke, head, prong; tether area, hours, weather scale
Connecticut	Oct 2010 / Oct 2022	Tethering w/ choke, prong, head halter, or improperly fitted device
<b>United States (Pending Legislation, 2024-2026)</b>		
<b>New York (S 7723 / A 6985)</b>	Pending	Trainer licensure under non-aversive, evidence-based, +R standard
New Jersey (S 3814)	Held by sponsor	Dog Training Licensing Board with humane training code
New Jersey (A 4206)	Pending (Feb 2026)	Board of Examiners of Dog Trainers, Dog Trainer Licensing Act
<b>New Jersey (A 4207)</b>	Pending (Feb 2026)	NJ Dog Trainer Licensure Board; ties standards to LIMA policy
<b>Massachusetts (H 2342)</b>	Pending (Aug 2025 favorable)	Excludes electric, prong, choke from dangerous-dog plans; AVSAB/ACVB standards
Massachusetts (S 1459)	Pending (Nov 2025 favorable)	Senate companion to H 2342
Rhode Island (H 7487)	Held for further study (Feb 2026)	Penalty escalation; expand enforcement to municipal animal control

*Bolded entries indicate the most useful citations for legislative testimony in the United States: long-standing comprehensive bans (Wales, Switzerland), recent enactments demonstrating active legislative trajectory (France, Netherlands, Spain, Quebec, Colombia, Hawaii, Rhode Island), and the most active and structurally significant pending United States bills (NY S 7723 / A 6985 for the licensure model, NJ A 4207 for licensure tied to LIMA, MA H 2342 for equipment exclusion in dangerous-dog plans).*

## About the Author

**WILL BANGURA, M.S., CAB-ICB, CBCC-KA, CPDT-KA, FDM, FFCP**

Will Bangura is a Certified and Accredited Canine Behaviorist with more than 35 years of experience specializing in severe aggression, fear, anxiety, reactivity, phobias, and compulsive disorders in dogs. His work is grounded in behavioral psychology, applied behavior analysis, learning theory, affective neuroscience, and evidence-based animal behavior science.

This Jurisdiction Playbook is a companion document to *The Scientific Case Against Aversive Dog Training Equipment and Methods* and is intended for use in legislative testimony, public comment, op-ed writing, and professional advocacy correspondence.

---

End of Jurisdiction Playbook. Companion to Bangura (2026), *The Scientific Case Against Aversive Dog Training Equipment and Methods*.

© 2026 Will Bangura. All rights reserved.