



Sir Chris Bryant MP
Minister of State for Trade
Department for Business and Trade
Old Admiralty Building
Admiralty Place
Whitehall London
SW1A 2DY

29 April 2026

Dear Chris,

Thank you very much for your letter dated 31 March 2026, containing the Government's response to my Committee's report on the UK-India Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement. We welcome, as always, the Government's engagement with our recommendations in full. Our Committee also enjoyed the thoughtful and collaborative relationship with your officials throughout the negotiations and through the ratification process. It is a welcome acknowledgement of the importance of serious and thorough scrutiny of significant agreements, particularly those which may have long-term policy implications for the UK.

In this spirit, we wish to draw attention to areas of the Government's response to our recommendations we felt were informationally thin and lacking in substance. In several areas, the response to our report did not offer any analysis or explanation where we had explicitly asked for such. I draw attention to these areas in this letter, in the hope that we can together improve the quality of information available to the public and Parliament about important decisions the Government takes in the national interest.

For example, our letter asked for:

- A cumulative assessment of successive trade agreements on the UK agricultural sector, and an assurance that future trade agreements take account of any sensitivities (paragraph 87). The Government responded that DEFRA does take account of the cumulative impact of FTAs on domestic agriculture, but offered no further explanation of whether these analyses are publicly available. We were unable to find any publicly available evidence of such analyses, although note that such practice appears to be routine for trade partners such as the European Union.
- An assessment of the impact and consequences of trade displacement, particularly in the textiles sector, on countries such as Bangladesh, Pakistan and Indonesia (paragraph 97). The Government offered no analysis of what the consequences of this displacement might be, although we welcome its assurance that the impact will continue to be monitored.



- Further information about Government support for the services sector (paragraph 146). The Government's response reiterated almost verbatim what is already contained in Annex 8A of the Agreement, with no additional information provided.
- Further clarity around fly-in, fly-out rules and arbitration fees for legal services (paragraph 171). The Government's response provides no information whatsoever on whether clarity has been sought, or when the legal profession might expect some clarity.
- A specific impact assessment of the fiscal implications of the Double Contributions Convention (DCC) (paragraph 186). The Government's response declined to offer any assurance that a separate impact assessment will be conducted.

These are just some of the areas in which the Government's response failed to offer substantive engagement with the Committee's work. This was all the more frustrating given that the Committee's report welcomed the Government's achievement in reaching a Free Trade Agreement with India. We request that you respond substantively to the points raised above.

We would be happy to liaise further with the Department to improve our communication, and look forward to a fruitful relationship as the Agreement is implemented.

With best wishes,

Lord Dominic Johnson of Lainston

Chair, International Agreements Committee