Barriers to German-British Business Relations

The British Chamber of Commerce in Germany (BCCG) is committed to strengthening German-British economic relations and removing practical obstacles to cross-border business. The experiences of our member companies, which operate in Germany, the United Kingdom or both markets, highlight the additional processes and uncertainties that have arisen since Brexit, particularly in the areas of customs, product requirements, taxation, the movement of people and regulatory requirements.

Trade between Germany and the United Kingdom remains of considerable economic importance. According to the latest figures published by the UK Government, Germany is one of the United Kingdom's most important trading partners, with bilateral trade in goods and services amounting to approximately GBP 155 billion per year. A reliable and predictable framework is therefore in the mutual economic interests of both countries.

We welcome the bilateral Kensington Treaty, signed on 17 July 2025 and entering into force on 8 October 2026. By establishing institutional dialogue mechanisms, it provides a framework for deepening political, economic and security cooperation between Germany and the United Kingdom. However, it neither replaces the EU-UK trading relationship under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement nor automatically removes the customs, regulatory and mobility barriers that have existed since Brexit. Germany's obligations under EU law remain unaffected.

This paper focuses on ten cross-sectoral issues affecting German-British business relations. The recommendations are addressed to the German Federal Government and the UK Government. Where trade barriers arise from EU law, it is now essential for the German Federal Government to advocate for solutions at EU level. The recommendations set out how the identified trade barriers could be reduced and which policy and administrative measures could help mitigate their practical impact.

1. **European Sovereignty: Safeguarding Value Creation and Public Procurement with Reliable Partners**
2. **Reducing Non-Tariff Barriers to Trade Arising from Divergent Standards**
3. **Simplifying Business Establishment and Addressing Competitive Disadvantages**
4. **Product Compliance – Ensuring Legal Certainty in the Recognition of CE Conformity**
5. **Simplifying Profit Repatriation and Further Developing Double Taxation Agreements**
6. **Simplifying Transport Procedures and Customs Requirements and Providing Legal Clarity**
7. **Facilitating Business Travel, Employee Secondments and the Movement of People**
8. **Promoting and Facilitating Sustainable Student, School and Research Exchanges**
9. **Addressing New Regulatory Uncertainties**
10. **Removing Barriers in the Security and Defence Industries**

1. European Sovereignty: Safeguarding Value Creation and Public Procurement with Reliable Partners

Debates on economic security, resilience and strategic autonomy are increasingly shaping European trade and industrial policy. From the perspective of businesses operating across borders, it is essential that measures designed to strengthen European value creation do not unnecessarily create new fragmentation in closely integrated supply chains.

The United Kingdom's status must be assessed differently depending on the legal instrument in question. The UK is a party to the WTO Agreement on Government Procurement (GPA). In addition, the EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement contains specific commitments on non-discrimination and market access in certain areas of public procurement. The applicable legal framework, the procurement covered and the relevant exceptions must be considered in each case.

The European Commission's proposal for an Industrial Accelerator Act (IAA), dated 4 March 2026, and its proposal for a Public Procurement Act (PPA), dated 9 September 2026, aim, among other things, to strengthen European industrial capacity, economic security and resilience, and strategic procurement. In the BCCG's view, a distinction should be made between legitimate policy objectives and the unnecessary disadvantage of reliable trading partners. We have set out our position on this issue in a joint statement issued together with fourteen other bilateral British Chambers of Commerce across Europe.

German-British businesses are closely interconnected across many value chains. Companies in Germany and the UK need investment certainty and a predictable basis for business planning. Accordingly, clear criteria, transparent procedures, sufficient transition periods and the protection of legitimate expectations are particularly important when introducing new procurement, subsidy or rules-of-origin requirements.

Recommendations for Action:

- The priority now is for the German Federal Government to advocate at EU level for proportionate and clearly defined criteria for public procurement and support measures that take account of the economic and strategic importance of reliable international partners, insofar as this is compatible with EU law. This should include providing the UK with planning certainty by recognising it as a partner whose origin status is equivalent to that of EU-origin goods, where legally permissible.

- We recommend that the EU institutions and Member States ensure that affected third countries and economic operators are informed at an early stage and appropriately consulted when significant changes to procurement, support and rules-of-origin requirements are being considered.

- The German Federal Government and the UK Government should now make use of existing bilateral and EU-UK dialogue mechanisms to identify at an early stage the impact of new EU requirements on German-British supply chains and agree on practical solutions within the existing legal framework.

BE Berlin comments
This is a helpful intervention making clear calls at the maximalist end of 'treating the UK as European for everything'. It would be worthwhile stressing that businesses need the inclusion of the UK to come on 'day one' of the law being agreed, not down the line. Missing from BCCG ask, but important to note that inclusion in CADA should be pushed here as well.

2. Reducing Non-Tariff Barriers to Trade Arising from Divergent Standards

Planning and investment certainty are essential for German and British businesses in strengthening German-British economic relations. Diverging or different regulatory requirements can give rise to additional testing, documentation obligations and compliance costs. From the BCCG's perspective, it is therefore particularly important that, where new trade-related regulations are introduced, differences in

requirements are identified at an early stage, responsibilities remain clearly defined and unnecessary duplication of testing is avoided.

A current example is the carbon border adjustment mechanisms. The EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) entered its definitive phase on 1 January 2026. The UK is introducing its own CBAM on 1 January 2027. The UK mechanism currently covers, in particular, aluminium, cement, fertilisers, hydrogen, and iron and steel, and therefore does not fully align with the EU system. Differences in product coverage, data requirements and calculation methodologies may create additional burdens for businesses operating across borders.

Differences in health and phytosanitary standards, food regulations, medicinal products and other regulated goods can also increase the cost of trade or cause delays due to differing authorisation and inspection procedures. Existing EU-UK specialised committees provide a basis for identifying such divergences at an early stage and addressing them in a targeted manner wherever possible.

Recommendations for Action::

- We recommend that the German Federal Government and the UK Government make systematic use of existing EU-UK specialised committees and bilateral dialogue mechanisms to identify new trade-related regulations at an early stage and assess their impact on cross-border value chains.

- The relevant British and German authorities should use comparative implementation assessments and joint technical discussions in areas of trade-related regulation to reduce unnecessary duplication of requirements and avoidable divergences.

- We recommend that the EU, Germany and the UK strengthen their exchange of information on CBAM requirements, including data requirements, reporting formats, thresholds and potential interoperability between the respective systems. The German Federal Government should advocate at EU level for the avoidance of unnecessary duplicate reporting obligations.

- To ensure that German-British trade operates as smoothly as possible, it is essential that the German and UK Governments provide sufficient transition periods, publish new regulatory requirements well in advance and issue clear, accessible official implementation guidance.

- The EU and the UK should advance their planned linking of emissions trading systems to enable mutual exemptions from the respective CBAM obligations, thereby avoiding additional costs and administrative burdens on EU-UK trade in goods.

BE Berlin comments
We agree with the BCCG's recommendations and the need to conclude agreements on CBAM, ETS and SPS by 20 November at the UK-EU summit. The paper could go further by highlighting emerging barriers in medicines, particularly Made in Europe requirements that risk excluding UK companies from German supply chains and procurement opportunities.

3. Simplifying Business Establishment and Addressing Competitive Disadvantages

Since Brexit, British companies wishing to establish a permanent presence in Germany are no longer covered by the EU rules on freedom of establishment applicable to companies from EU Member States. Depending on their business model, they may therefore need to consider different structures, such as a German company or a branch, each of which entails its own legal and administrative requirements. Conversely, German companies establishing a permanent presence in the UK are also subject to the UK rules applicable to foreign companies.

From the BCCG's perspective, the main issue is not the existence of different legal structures as such, but the additional administrative complexity involved in establishing a cross-border market presence. For businesses, particularly small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), registration, reporting and disclosure requirements, as well as differing procedural routes, can make market entry more difficult. The

UK Government most recently updated the relevant requirements for overseas companies in September 2026.

Recommendations for Action:

- To improve investment and planning certainty, we recommend that the German Federal Government consolidate administrative procedures for British companies operating in Germany, make them more accessible digitally, and improve transparency regarding the responsible authorities and the status of applications.

- We recommend that the UK Government ensure that the registration process and ongoing compliance obligations for overseas companies are governed by clear, digital and predictable procedures, while avoiding unnecessary duplicate reporting requirements.

- The German and UK Governments should now make effective use of existing bilateral business and governmental dialogue mechanisms to systematically identify recurring administrative barriers to business establishment, setting up a permanent presence and investment, and implement concrete simplifications within their respective areas of responsibility.

BE Berlin comments
The ask could be more specific about the practical barriers facing UK companies establishing in Germany. Although we have found a workaround, Germany should provide clearer, more joined-up guidance on registration, banking and acceptable business address requirements. Greater digitalisation would also be welcome.

4. Product Compliance – Ensuring Legal Certainty in the Recognition of CE Marking

The UK's decision to continue recognising CE marking across a wide range of product sectors has provided greater planning certainty. However, recognition does not apply uniformly across all sectors. The UK Government last updated its sector-specific guidance on 31 March 2026, explicitly highlighting differences between Great Britain, Northern Ireland and the relevant EU rules.

Regulatory divergences may mean that products, technical documentation and conformity assessments have to be planned differently for the EU and UK markets. Although harmonised EU standards may be used in certain circumstances for CE-marked products in Great Britain, this does not automatically confer general legal equivalence with UK product requirements.

Recommendations for Action:

- To provide greater certainty for product compliance planning, we recommend that the UK Government establish a clear legal basis for the continued recognition of CE marking in the product sectors concerned and introduce processes to announce changes to sector-specific requirements sufficiently in advance.

- The German Federal Government should advocate at EU level for the expansion of mutual recognition arrangements or procedures facilitating the use of conformity assessments with the UK, wherever legally permissible and consistent with safety requirements.

- We recommend that the relevant EU-UK specialised committee on technical barriers to trade identify priority sectors, address regulatory divergences at an early stage and publish coordinated guidance on marking, testing and documentation well in advance.

- The UK should recognise EU vehicle type-approvals as comprehensively as possible and enable their conversion into UK national approvals without additional technical testing or duplicate certification. A recognition arrangement modelled on the Swiss approach could be explored in this context.

BE Berlin comments
The UK already takes a comparatively open approach by recognising CE marking across many product categories in Great Britain and allowing businesses flexibility between CE and UKCA markings. We would welcome the BCCG pressing this case with the German Government and encouraging it to support greater reciprocity and practical cooperation on conformity assessment at EU level.

5. Simplifying Profit Repatriation and Further Developing the Double Taxation Agreement

Since Brexit, the EU Parent-Subsidiary Directive has no longer applied to the UK. Consequently, where German subsidiaries distribute dividends to UK shareholders, German withholding tax rules may apply in conjunction with the German-UK Double Taxation Agreement.

Under the current Double Taxation Agreement, withholding tax on dividends is capped at 5% in certain cases where the beneficial owner is a company that directly holds at least 10% of the capital of the distributing company. Higher maximum rates apply in other circumstances. It would therefore be inaccurate to state that a general withholding tax rate of 5% applies across the board.

German-UK corporate structures may also give rise to VAT issues relating to management services, cost-sharing arrangements, financing transactions and the recovery of input VAT by holding companies. Since Brexit, EU rules apply only to a limited extent in relations with the UK, which may result in additional compliance and review requirements.

From the BCCG's perspective, it is worth examining whether the existing tax rules and administrative procedures governing relations between the two countries remain fit for purpose and competitive. In particular, the distinction between the substantive tax burden and the administrative burden is relevant to the conditions for investment.

Recommendations for Action:

- We recommend that the German and UK Governments further develop the Double Taxation Agreement, particularly with regard to cross-border shareholdings and the competitiveness of investment structures.
- We recommend that the German Federal Government examine whether procedures for obtaining relief from German withholding tax on dividends for qualifying UK shareholders could be further simplified and/or make greater use of relief at source, insofar as this is compatible with requirements to prevent tax abuse.
- To avoid administrative delays, it is essential that the German and UK tax authorities further digitise and simplify their cooperation on certificates of tax residence, evidence of beneficial ownership and tax refund procedures.
- Germany and the UK should intensify the exchange of information on VAT issues affecting holding companies and their recovery of input VAT, using this cooperation to enhance legal certainty for cross-border investment structures.
- We recommend that the tax authorities in both countries examine how binding rulings and consultation procedures for cross-border VAT issues could be made more efficient and accessible.

BE Berlin comments
Previous assessment of the Double Taxation Agreement suggested that reform could be helpful if it addressed withholding tax on dividends. However, repeated attempts to raise this with the Federal Ministry of Finance, including during the Kensington Treaty negotiations, have not secured progress. The Ministry considers the matter closed, while HMT and HMRC are not currently pursuing it. If the BCCG

regards this as a significant market-access issue, if they are welcome to raise the case directly with the Federal Ministry of Finance.

6. Simplifying Transport Procedures and Customs Requirements and Providing Legal Clarity

Customs clearance between Germany and the UK has become more complex and more documentation-intensive since Brexit. In practice, gaps in knowledge or unclear allocations of responsibilities between exporters, importers, freight forwarders and customs representatives can lead to delays. This affects both sides: British businesses must comply with EU customs requirements, while German businesses must comply with UK customs procedures and evidentiary requirements.

For consignments from Germany to Great Britain, German exporters are sometimes asked in practice to provide a UK EORI number. However, a UK EORI number is not generally required for every German exporter. The relevant factors include the company's role in the customs procedure, the specific declaration and who acts as the importer or customs declarant. UK requirements link the obligation to hold an EORI number to the relevant customs role and activity.

Cross-border e-commerce also entails additional obligations. For shipments to private consumers in the UK, UK VAT and customs obligations may arise depending on the consignment value, the sales model and the delivery arrangements. From the BCCG's perspective, clear and consistent official guidance on the procedures applicable in each case is particularly important.

By contrast, a general claim that the UK customs authorities are 'unreachable' cannot be substantiated as a structural barrier. HMRC provides telephone and digital contact channels. General enquiries concerning imports and exports are normally handled from Monday to Friday, 8 am to 6 pm, while urgent queries concerning goods held at the UK border can be addressed around the clock. The National Clearance Hub handles ongoing customs operations and applications. For businesses, the key issue is therefore now less the existence of contact channels than the speed and reliability of case-specific solutions to time-critical problems.

Authorised Economic Operator (AEO) status can reduce the likelihood of checks and lead to priority treatment. However, it does not automatically exempt businesses from carrying out an inspection that has been ordered. Clear procedures for escalating urgent cases with the relevant authorities are therefore also important for time-critical supply chains.

The application of the preferential rules of origin under the EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement creates further significant burdens. Although the Agreement generally provides for tariff-free treatment of goods meeting the relevant preferential origin requirements, determining origin, obtaining appropriate supporting evidence and documenting complex supply chains entail considerable administrative effort. This particularly affects small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

Further challenges arise in connection with re-exports, temporary imports, repair and processing operations, and the use of different electronic customs systems. Technical interface problems and the need to enter data multiple times can delay clearance and increase the cost of cross-border trade in goods.

In addition to customs requirements, businesses regularly have to comply with VAT registration, reporting and evidence requirements. Correctly distinguishing between imports, exports, chain transactions and warehousing arrangements can, in particular, create additional administrative burdens.

German businesses frequently face substantial documentation requirements when providing evidence to support the VAT exemption for export supplies. Incomplete or delayed export evidence can give rise to significant tax risks. In practice, uncertainty over the roles of the importer and indirect customs representative, as well as the contractual terms governing deliveries under the Incoterms rules, often leads to delays and tax risks. Clear official guidance and better coordination between the authorities involved could help minimise these risks and reduce the administrative burden.

Recommendations for Action:

- We recommend that the German and UK customs authorities provide clear, consistent explanations of the respective responsibilities of exporters, importers, customs representatives and declarants for key procedures and supporting documentation, particularly with regard to the circumstances in which an EORI number is required in each jurisdiction.

- To simplify customs clearance, we recommend that Germany, the UK and the relevant EU bodies systematically review recurring procedural barriers to trade through the existing EU-UK customs committees and, wherever permitted by the applicable legal framework, simplify and further standardise data requirements and procedures.

- HMRC, the National Clearance Hub and the German customs authorities should establish a clear escalation process for time-critical customs operations or cases blocked by technical issues, ensure that responsibilities are transparent and, wherever possible, set clear response times for urgent cases.

- For goods held at the border pending the completion of customs procedures, we recommend that existing out-of-hours contact channels be maintained on a permanent basis and coordination between the relevant authorities be strengthened.

- It is essential that the relevant authorities provide clear, accessible and coordinated guidance on VAT, import duties and the applicable customs procedures, particularly for cross-border e-commerce. Businesses need clear and consistent guidance on the VAT treatment of cross-border supply chains between Germany and the UK. This should cover, in particular, evidence of export, import VAT, registration requirements and the role of the importer.

BE Berlin comments
Although customs policy is largely an EU competence and therefore difficult to address bilaterally. We recommend the BCCG push on interventions that focus more on what Germany can deliver directly, particularly clearer and more accessible guidance on German customs websites for UK businesses exporting to Germany.

7. Facilitating Business Travel, Employee Secondments and the Movement of People

Entry for the purpose of visiting business partners must be distinguished from entry for the purpose of working or providing certain services. Since Brexit, businesses have had to assess which entry requirements, visas and work permits apply to a wide range of activities. The practical challenge arises particularly in the case of short-term, project-based and recurring assignments, where it is important to distinguish between permitted business visits and activities requiring specific authorisation.

The UK's Electronic Travel Authorisation (ETA) scheme is mandatory for eligible visa-free travellers from Europe, while the EU's European Travel Information and Authorisation System (ETIAS) is scheduled to launch in the final quarter of 2026. Both systems provide travel authorisation and do not replace work permits. In the UK, certain activities are permitted for business visitors, while others require a work visa.

The Kensington Treaty includes specific initiatives to facilitate mobility, including improvements to access to e-gates for eligible travellers. This represents progress, but does not remove the immigration and employment law requirements applicable to the actual provision of services.

Recommendations for Action:

- We recommend that the German and UK Governments make use of the Business Mobility project provided for under the Kensington Treaty to systematically identify recurring problems affecting business travel, employee secondments and short-term assignments, and agree on practical measures to simplify these arrangements.

- Simplified procedures, such as longer-validity multiple-entry arrangements, could provide significant benefits for German and UK businesses undertaking clearly defined short-term activities, intra-company assignments and cross-border services.

- We recommend that the competent authorities on both sides align their official guidance to clearly distinguish between business visits, permitted activities, visas, Electronic Travel Authorisation (ETA) or European Travel Information and Authorisation System (ETIAS) requirements, and work permits.

- The UK and German authorities should continue to implement the arrangements already agreed to facilitate travel for frequent business travellers and reduce unnecessary manual border checks where security requirements permit.

BE Berlin comments
German government may be difficult on this as scope for bilateral action is limited by EU competence. Germany could provide a clearer and more reciprocal list of permitted business activities as well as improving visa processing times and providing clearer guidance to help UK businesses send their workers to Germany for short periods of time. Emphasise that the Kensington Treaty should also be used to accelerate automatic e-Gate access for eligible British travellers and simplify EasyPASS registration in the interim.

8. Promoting and Facilitating Sustainable Student, School and Research Exchanges

Strong relations between two countries are widely recognised as being particularly sustainably fostered through interactions between young people at school and university. The mutual cultural understanding developed during these formative years promotes international cooperation across all areas of society, politics and the economy. Exchanges between school pupils and university students are therefore a key pillar of German-British relations.

The United Kingdom's re-association with Erasmus+ from 2027 marks an important step forward for German-British cooperation in education and research. The EU and the UK have reached a legal agreement on the UK's participation in the programme from 2027. However, differing national requirements and immigration rules continue to affect cross-border educational and research activities.

UK entry requirements for organised school groups have been eased in recent years. Nevertheless, requirements relating to travel documents and permission to stay still differ between the two countries. Reliable and better-aligned mobility arrangements are important to enable young people to undertake educational stays, gain work experience and engage in intercultural exchange, thereby strengthening German-British relations in the long term.

The planned Youth Experience Scheme is also expected to be advanced at the next EU-UK Summit in November 2026. Negotiations are ongoing, with the number of participants, visa requirements and permitted length of stay among the issues under discussion.

Recommendations for Action:

- We recommend that the EU and the UK swiftly develop the practical arrangements for the UK's participation in Erasmus+ from 2027, ensuring that administrative and immigration requirements for cross-border educational projects are aligned. At the same time, opportunities to undertake full degree programmes in the UK and the EU should be promoted, and tuition fees adjusted accordingly.

- The German and UK Governments should identify recurring administrative barriers affecting research stays and joint projects and, within their respective areas of responsibility, establish simplified and better-coordinated procedures.

- It is essential that the German Federal Government, together with its EU partners, support the conclusion and practical implementation of an EU-UK youth mobility agreement and work towards transparent rules governing length of stay, study, training and employment. The UK Government

should, for its part, work towards concluding the agreement swiftly and ensuring that it is practical to implement.

- We recommend that entry and documentation requirements for organised school groups be reviewed jointly on a regular basis and that any remaining practical asymmetries be specifically addressed.

BE Berlin comments
This aligns with the Kensington Treaty commitments on school travel and wider people-to-people links. We agree the need to delivering on visa-free school-group travel, increasing exchanges for young people from lower socio-economic backgrounds, and the revitalised Cultural & Education Commission to resolve mobility barriers faced by educational, scientific and cultural organisations.

9. Addressing Emerging Regulatory Uncertainties

Businesses continue to face a wide range of developments in sustainability, supply chains, reporting and artificial intelligence. In 2026, the regulatory framework has already become more clearly defined in several areas. The central challenge is therefore often less a matter of complete uncertainty than of differing timelines, scopes of application and implementation requirements on either side of the Channel.

In the area of European supply chain regulation, amendments to the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD) were adopted in 2026. Among other things, the revised provisions extend the national transposition and corporate application deadlines: under the current legal framework, Member States must transpose the Directive by 26 July 2028, while it is generally due to apply to companies from 26 July 2029.

The EU and the UK also take different regulatory approaches to artificial intelligence. The EU AI Act establishes a horizontal, risk-based legal framework, whereas the UK continues to pursue a more sector-specific approach. This can result in differing compliance requirements for businesses operating internationally.

The Windsor Framework governs specific aspects of the movement of goods between Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The 'Not for EU' labelling requirement applies to certain flows of goods and product categories and should therefore not be presented as a general labelling obligation across the entire UK market.

The review provided for under the EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement in 2026 offers an opportunity to raise specific implementation challenges and proposals for improvement. In the BCCG's view, this review should be used to address existing practical barriers to trade in a targeted manner, rather than allowing a broad call for comprehensive renegotiation to detract from the focus on achievable, tangible improvements.

Recommendations for Action:

- To strengthen trade relations between Germany and the UK, we recommend that the German and UK Governments establish a systematic exchange on the timelines, scope and practical implications of new regulatory initiatives, making consistent use of existing EU-UK bodies and mechanisms.

- In particular, in the areas of sustainability, supply chains and artificial intelligence, we recommend providing clear and accessible implementation guidance, allowing sufficient transition periods and promoting interoperable technical requirements.

- In relation to the Windsor Framework, the competent authorities should communicate changes and their scope of application clearly and well in advance, and avoid specific requirements for particular flows of goods being misunderstood as general rules governing all trade with the UK.

- It is essential that the German and UK Governments use the review of the EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement to resolve documented implementation problems and secure targeted improvements in customs procedures, technical barriers to trade, mobility and other relevant areas.

BE Berlin comments
We welcome the BCCG's intervention for clearer guidance for UK business looking to export to Germany/EU, and welcome a push from them to get the German government to provide clearer English language guidance on their official website when the EU makes regulatory changes.

10. Removing Barriers in the Security and Defence Industry

German-British security and defence cooperation has gained considerable institutional depth since 2024. The Trinity House Agreement, signed on 23 October 2024, commits both sides to deepening bilateral defence cooperation and explicitly identifies collaboration between defence industries, research and technology, and cooperative equipment programmes as key elements of this partnership.

The Kensington Treaty, which entered into force on 8 October 2026, builds on this cooperation. The current agreements between the two Governments include closer collaboration in security, defence, technology and industry. Further initiatives agreed on the same day demonstrate that bilateral cooperation is also expanding into industrial policy and technology-focused projects.

In the BCCG's view, the trade barriers outlined above also affect German-British cooperation in the security and defence sector. Additional customs formalities, regulatory differences, export controls and requirements governing the mobility of skilled personnel can delay supply chains, joint development projects and the exchange of specialists. Reliable coordination of procedures is therefore particularly important for time-critical projects in the security and defence industries.

These obstacles sit uneasily alongside the political commitment to deepen German-British security and defence cooperation. The BCCG therefore believes that existing dialogue mechanisms should be examined to determine how they can be used more effectively to remove practical barriers without lowering security, export control or other protective standards. Particular consideration should be given to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and start-ups, which are often disproportionately affected by additional administrative burdens.

Recommendations for Action:

- We recommend that the German and UK Governments make targeted use of the dialogue mechanisms established under the Trinity House Agreement and the Kensington Treaty to systematically identify and progressively remove practical barriers affecting businesses in the security and defence industry.

- We advocate the establishment of a joint working group on customs, export controls, authorisations, end-use documentation and cross-border mobility, with a particular focus on joint development, procurement and production programmes.

- The competent authorities should consider providing clear points of contact, coordinated procedures and, where legally permissible, expedited processing routes for time-critical projects involving trusted businesses with a strong compliance record, without lowering security or export control standards.

- We recommend that the German and UK Governments review the proportionality of administrative requirements in public procurement and cooperation programmes, particularly for SMEs and start-ups, and ensure that these businesses have clear access to the relevant government cooperation and procurement structures.

BE Berlin comments

We welcome the BCCG's intervention and agree that the BCCG should emphasise that Germany should ensure the UK is treated as a trusted partner in defence procurement and export control processes. This is essential to support closer UK–German defence-industrial cooperation and avoid unnecessary barriers for UK suppliers.

Kontakt:

Ilka Hartmann
Managing Director, British Chamber of Commerce in Germany e.V.
Heidestraße 58, 10557 Berlin
info@bccg.de
T: 030 206 70 80