

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Fitness to Practise Committee**

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Wednesday 26 August 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Farrah Ayub
NMC PIN:	11H0907E
Part(s) of the register:	Nurses Sub Part 1 RNA Adult Nurse Level 1 26 September 2011 V300 Nurse Independent/ Supplementary Prescriber 3 September 2016
Relevant Location:	Hove
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Oluwasola Falola (Chair, lay member) Rashmika Shah (Registrant member) Fern Basnett (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Hala Helmi
Hearings Coordinator:	Yvonne Temah
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Raj Joshi, Case Presenter
Miss Ayub:	Present and represented by Arthur Lo, instructed by the Royal College of Nursing (RCN)
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (three months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-Off order to come into effect immediately in accordance with Article 30 (2)

Decision and reasons on application for hearing to be held in private

At the outset of the hearing, Mr Lo, on your behalf made a request that parts of the proceedings relating to your personal matters be heard in private. The application was made pursuant to Rule 19 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

Mr Joshi, behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) indicated that he supported the application to the extent that any reference to your personal matters should be heard in private.

The legal assessor reminded the panel that while Rule 19(1) provides, as a starting point, that hearings shall be conducted in public, Rule 19(3) states that the panel may hold hearings partly or wholly in private if it is satisfied that this is justified by the interests of any party or by the public interest.

Whilst the panel noted that previous hearings in this case had been conducted entirely in private it was not bound by those decisions. The panel determined to go into private session as and when such personal matters were raised in order to protect your privacy.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to replace the current suspension order with a striking off order with immediate effect.

This order will come into immediate effect in accordance with Article 30(2) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of three months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 15 May 2026.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 15 September 2026.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(1) of the Order.

The charges found proved by way of admission which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order were as follows:

'That you, a Registered Nurse:

1) In or around February 2020:

- a) Provided Person 1's [Ms Ali] details to Prospective Employer 1 as an appropriate person to provide an employment reference, when you knew they were not.*
- b) Informed Prospective Employer 1 that Person 1 [Ms Ali] was a Nurse Manager, when you knew they were a Health Care Assistant.*

2) On 21 July 2023, sent an email to Prospective Employer 2 in which you:

- a) Provided Person 1 [Ms Ali] as an appropriate person to provide an employment reference, when you knew they were not.*
- b) Provided your own email address as Person 1's [Ms Ali] point of contact.*

3) On or around 24 July 2023, submitted an employment reference to Prospective Employer 2 that:

- a) Referred to Person 1 [Ms Ali] as a Nurse Manager, when they were not.*
- b) Contained inaccurate details relating to your and/or Person 1's [Ms Ali] employment.*

4) Your conduct at charges 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 (or parts thereof) were dishonest in that you intended to mislead or misled Prospective

Employer 1 and/or Prospective Employer 2 into believing that Person 1 [Ms Ali] had been your manager, in order to secure employment.'

AND, in light of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.'

The substantive panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'The panel first considered whether any of the limbs of the Grant test were engaged as to your past conduct.

The panel considered whether your misconduct placed patients at unwarranted risk of harm. It had particular regard to the fact that the misconduct in this case concerned dishonesty in the context of seeking employment.

The panel observed that you were working in an advanced and autonomous role. It considered that prospective employers rely on accurate references in order to assess whether an applicant is suitable and safe to practise independently. However, the panel noted:

- there was no evidence before it of any concerns regarding your clinical competence, or that you were attempting to paint an inaccurate picture of your clinical skills; and*
- there was no evidence of actual patient harm as result of your misconduct.*

In these circumstances, the panel was not satisfied that your misconduct while serious, gave rise to risk of harm to patients.

Turning to limb b, the panel considered that members of the public expect nurses to act with honesty and integrity. The panel was of the view that although your motive may well have been self-preservation given the

circumstances surrounding your personal life, your conduct was capable of undermining public confidence in the profession and had the potential to bring the reputation of the nursing profession into disrepute.

With regards to limb c, the panel found that your misconduct constituted a serious breach of fundamental tenets of the nursing profession, in particular the obligation to act with honesty and integrity and to uphold the reputation of the profession. It determined that you failed to uphold these standards and values which are central to the nursing profession.

In relation to limb d, the panel considered that your misconduct was founded upon admitted dishonesty, in that you sought to deliberately mislead prospective employers by submitting inaccurate references and by identifying an individual as an appropriate referee when she was not in a position to provide an employment reference.

The panel therefore concluded that limbs b, c and d of the Grant test are engaged in respect of your conduct.

Turning to the observations made by J Silber in the case of Cohen v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 581 by asking the questions that the Court set out as being 'highly relevant' to the determination of the question of current impairment:

- Is the conduct that led to the charge easily remediable?*
- Has it in fact been remedied?*
- Is it highly unlikely to be repeated?'*

The panel first considered whether your misconduct is capable of being addressed.

The panel considered that dishonesty is generally more difficult to remediate than deficiencies in clinical competencies. However, dishonesty is not necessarily incapable of remediation.

In this case, the panel was satisfied that the misconduct arose in the context of highly significant and difficult personal circumstances. The panel had regard to the testimonials you submitted which described you as a trustworthy person. Taking all the evidence available to it into consideration, the panel did not consider your misconduct to be indicative of a deep-seated attitudinal problem or entrenched dishonesty. It appeared to be out of character. The panel therefore concluded that the misconduct was capable of remediation.

The panel had sight of the documentation you presented in this case, it acknowledged the steps you have undertaken including:

- *Completion of probity and ethics related training;*
- *[PRIVATE];*
- *[PRIVATE];*
- *Expressed remorse;*
- *Positive testimonials; and*
- *Increased openness with your current employer about your well-being with check-ins approximately every two weeks. This is the same employer who was employing you throughout the events in these charges.*

The panel acknowledged that you made full admissions at the outset and did not seek to minimise the seriousness of your behaviour.

The panel accepted that you had demonstrated some insight into these events. However, the panel considered that your written reflections were largely generic and did not specifically address why your conduct was wrong, the impact of your dishonesty on employers, colleagues, the profession and the public and how you would ensure you respond differently if under significant stress in the future.

The panel concluded that although you had made meaningful progress, you had not yet fully remediated the concerns identified in this case.

The panel next considered whether the conduct is unlikely to be repeated. The panel noted that the dishonesty in this case occurred on two separate occasions, three years apart. The panel considered that charges 2 and 3 although charged separately were a continuation of the same event. Although the misconduct was linked to your personal circumstances, it had therefore been repeated.

The panel accepted that the misconduct was out of character and that the abusive relationship which you were in was a significant causal factor. However, the panel was concerned that you may still be in the process of recovering from the trauma associated with the abusive relationship and are still receiving support from your GP and other Agencies. Additionally, the panel was not satisfied that that you had developed sufficient insight to ensure that you would respond appropriately if faced with similar circumstances in the future.

The panel therefore concluded that repetition was unlikely but could not be said to be highly unlikely if you were confronted with similar stressful circumstances.

The panel was satisfied that the misconduct represented a serious and context-specific behaviour rather than evidence of risk to patients or clinical failing . The panel considered that there was no risk of direct harm to patients and concluded that a finding of impairment is not necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel bore in mind that the overarching objectives of the NMC; to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public and patients, and to uphold and protect the wider public interest. This includes promoting and maintaining public confidence in the nursing and

midwifery professions and upholding the proper professional standards for members of those professions.

The panel determined that although there is no current risk to the public, your misconduct was sufficiently serious to warrant a finding of impairment in order to mark the conduct as unacceptable. It concluded that a fully informed member of the public would be concerned if such conduct, particularly your repeated dishonest conduct over a period with the aim of deceiving prospective employers for personal gain, were not marked by a finding of impairment. The panel was mindful that it had found that there is some, albeit low, risk of repetition of your misconduct until you are able to fully remediate.

The panel concluded that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case and therefore finds your fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest in order to maintain confidence in the profession and to uphold, declare and maintain professional standards.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that your fitness to practise is currently impaired.'

The substantive panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel went on to consider whether a suspension order is appropriate in this case. The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on 'Suspension order' (Reference: SAN-2d Last Updated: 28/01/2026) in which the following factors on when a suspension order may be appropriate are set out:

- 'the impairment is very serious but not fundamentally incompatible with continuing to be a registered professional*
- an outcome less severe than strike-off would still satisfy the over-arching objective.'*

The panel also had regard to the key considerations as set out in the NMC Guidance to weigh up before imposing a suspension. It noted the following list of circumstances that may make a suspension order an appropriate sanction:

- 'the charges found proved are at the most serious end of the spectrum and call into question the professional's suitability to continue practising, either currently or at all*
- while it is possible that the professional could be fit to practise in future, only a period out of practice would be sufficient to allow them to fully strengthen their practice through reflection, the development of their professional skills and / or development of insight and remediation*
- there is a risk to the safety of people using services if the professional were allowed to continue to practise even with conditions*
- what went wrong is so serious that public confidence in the profession and professional standards could not be maintained if the professional were able to continue practising without stopping for a period of time*
- despite the seriousness of what happened, the professional has engaged in the proceedings and has shown at least some meaningful insight which evidences a realistic possibility that they will continue to develop this insight, address their concerns and return to practice.'*

The panel considered that whilst any dishonesty is serious, your conduct was at the lower end of the spectrum and primarily driven by the pressure from your personal life at the time of the incidents. It was satisfied that in this case, the misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with you remaining on the register.

It did go on to consider whether a striking-off order would be proportionate. It bore in mind that there were no public protection concerns arising from its decision and that it had found your fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest alone.

Taking account of all the information before it, and of the mitigation provided, the panel concluded that a striking off order would be disproportionate. Whilst the panel acknowledges that a suspension may have a punitive effect, it would be unduly punitive in your case to impose a striking off order. The panel was satisfied that your misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register, having given appropriate weight to the mitigating features identified and the realistic prospect of remediation. It also considered that there was a public interest in allowing a skilled and experienced practitioner to remain on the register.

Balancing all of these factors the panel has concluded that a suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate sanction.

The panel noted the hardship such an order will inevitably cause you. However, this is outweighed by the public interest in this case.

The panel considered that this order is necessary to mark the seriousness of your actions, in order to maintain public confidence in the profession, and to send to the public and the profession a clear message about the standard of behaviour required of a registered nurse.

In determining the length of the suspension order, the panel took account of all of the information before it, including balancing the aggravating and mitigating features it had identified. It concluded that a suspension order for a period of three months would be appropriate in this case.

At the end of the period of suspension, another panel will review the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order, or it may confirm the order, or it may replace the order with another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- *A robust reflective piece which specifically addresses why your conduct was wrong, the impact of your dishonesty on employers, colleagues, the profession and the public and how you would ensure you respond differently if under significant stress in the future*
- *Evidence of ongoing engagement with support services such as your GP and/or any other Agencies*
- *Evidence that you continue to maintain professional support from any employer you work for'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

Today's panel has considered carefully whether your fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) has defined fitness to practise as the ability of a professional on our register to practise as a nurse, midwife or nursing associate safely and effectively without restriction. In considering this case, the panel has carried out a comprehensive review of the order in light of the current circumstances. Whilst it has noted the decision of the last panel, this panel has exercised its own judgement as to current impairment.

The panel has had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle, and your bundle. It has taken account of the submissions made by Mr Joshi on behalf of the NMC. He reminded the panel that this was the first review of a substantive suspension order and that the persuasive burden rested on you to demonstrate that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

Mr Joshi reminded the panel that the suspension order had originally been imposed following findings of dishonesty. Since the substantive hearing, you have breached your suspension order. The breach involved you knowingly practising as a nurse prescriber while suspended, over a period of six weeks.

Mr Joshi submitted that this was not an administrative error or misunderstanding, but deliberate practice despite being aware of your suspension. The breach required the panel to consider whether your conduct represented a significant escalation in risk and whether a stronger regulatory response was now required.

Mr Joshi submitted that the breach raised serious concerns about your insight, judgement and integrity, particularly because it occurred while you were undertaking CPD and reflection intended to address your previous dishonesty. He submitted that the learning had therefore not translated into behaviour and that the risk of repetition remained high.

Mr Joshi invited the panel to consider the breach as a serious aggravating factor, alongside the original findings of dishonesty. He further submitted that your conduct created risks to patients, public protection and confidence in the profession and demonstrated a disregard for the regulatory framework.

Mr Joshi therefore submitted that the panel should consider whether the circumstances now warranted a striking-off order, rather than simply allowing or extending the existing suspension.

The panel also had regard to submissions from your representative Mr Lo. He submitted that at the substantive hearing, you admitted the allegations and explained that your actions occurred while you were [PRIVATE]. The substantive panel considered your conduct to be out of character and primarily motivated by self-preservation, with no evidence of deep-seated attitudinal concerns or financial gain.

Since the order, you have undertaken targeted training in professionalism, ethics, insight and rebuilding trust. Mr Lo referred the panel to your detailed reflection, which acknowledges that your personal circumstances did not excuse your behaviour and that professional integrity must be maintained even during difficult circumstances. Your reflective statement identifies the importance of being open with your employer, seeking advice and asking for help rather than working in isolation. Mr Lo highlighted to the panel that you also continued to receive support from your employer and [PRIVATE].

Mr Lo submitted that you subsequently admitted breaching your suspension order by undertaking two nursing shifts in July 2026. He explained that you were [PRIVATE]. Mr Lo submitted that you accepted that, regardless of the circumstances, you had bypassed the regulatory requirements and undermined public and professional trust.

Mr Lo submitted that the panel's primary consideration remained whether your practice remained impaired in relation to the original allegations, while taking the admitted breach into account as part of the overall circumstances. He submitted that you have made extensive efforts towards remediation and developing insight and was well on the way to addressing the original impairment.

Mr Lo submitted that the two shifts were isolated incidents, [PRIVATE]. He invited the panel to consider these circumstances alongside your overall remediation and insight and, if it considered that your suspension could not lapse, to apply the principle of proportionality when deciding whether and for how long it should be extended.

The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and performance.

The panel considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the substantive panel found that whilst you admitted the charges, you had limited insight and incomplete remediation, particularly in relation to your conduct.

Today's panel considered whether you had demonstrated sufficient insight, strengthened practice and remediation since the substantive hearing. It noted that you had engaged with these proceedings, attended the hearing and provided detailed reflective statement and training certificates in your bundle together with testimonial from Dr Riaz Gulab (General Practitioner). Although you have undertaken relevant training and produced detailed reflections demonstrating an understanding of your dishonesty, professional integrity and

public confidence, the panel found a significant disconnect between your stated insight and your subsequent behaviour.

The panel noted that Mr Joshi was not asking it to make a finding of facts on the basis of the evidence that the NMC had so far obtained regarding the breach, because the NMC's position was that it would need further evidence for a fact-finding decision. However, the panel found that you knowingly practised while suspended on two occasions (6 July 2026 and 17 July 2026) on the basis of your admissions. This was despite understanding the regulatory requirements and the importance of honesty and integrity. This was not an isolated misunderstanding but a deliberate breach which demonstrated that your learning has not translated into practice.

The panel was particularly concerned that the breach occurred during a period when you were undertaking remediation and reflecting on the original dishonesty. It noted that you had breached the suspension order within three weeks of your practice being restricted and that your reflection which was dated 26 July 2026, was written after you knowingly breached the order. The panel noted that you did not refer to your breaches in this reflection, and you only dealt with them in a second reflection dated 24 August 2026 after your breach had been discovered by the organisation with whom you were working. This has raised significant concerns about the genuineness and embedding of your insight, your professional judgement, and your ability to comply with regulatory requirements.

The panel therefore considered that there remained a real risk of repetition, together with concerns relating to professional standards, public confidence and the integrity of the regulatory process. While there was no evidence of actual patient harm, the deliberate practice while suspended created a potential risk to patients and demonstrated a failure to comply with the standards expected of a registered nurse.

The panel therefore considered that the concerns identified by the previous panel along with your current breach of your suspension order, taken together, has resulted in your original dishonesty being compounded by your dishonesty in working for an employer when you are not entitled to do so, for personal gain.

In its consideration of whether you have taken steps to strengthen your practice, the panel noted that you had undertaken some training, submitted a detailed reflection on the incident and developing your understanding of the factors that contributed to your behaviour and how you should have acted differently.

The substantive panel determined that you were liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved.

Today's panel has received your reflective statement and training certificates in your bundle. The panel noted that the persuasive burden is upon you to persuade it that your fitness to practice is no longer currently impaired. The panel decided that you have not discharged that burden and there is insufficient evidence that you can now practise safely and effectively as a nurse without restriction.

In light of this, this panel determined that you are liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. That you knowingly practised as a nurse while suspended, including undertaking clinical work and prescribing. Although there was no evidence of actual patient harm, your conduct placed patients at risk and demonstrated a failure to comply with a clear regulatory restriction. The panel was concerned that this raised questions about your ability to comply with professional and regulatory requirements in future practice.

The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel has borne in mind that its primary function is to protect patients and the wider public interest which includes maintaining confidence in the nursing profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance.

The panel noted that a suspension order is a clear regulatory restriction and compliance with it is fundamental to maintaining confidence in the regulatory process. Your deliberate decision to disregard the order represented a serious departure from the standards of honesty, integrity and professional accountability expected of a registered nurse.

The panel considered that a reasonable member of the public would expect a nurse who had been suspended to comply with that restriction. The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is required.

For these reasons, the panel finds that your fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found your fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel noted that its powers are set out in Article 30 of the Order. The panel has also taken into account the 'NMC's Sanctions Guidance' (SG) and has borne in mind that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, though any sanction imposed may have a punitive effect.

The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to take no further action.

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict your practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The SG states that a caution order may be appropriate where *'the case is at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened was unacceptable and must not happen again'* The panel considered that your misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum and that a caution order would be inappropriate in view of the issues identified. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on your registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the substantive hearing, your current breach of your suspension order and concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel was not able to formulate

conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns relating to your misconduct.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel noted that although you have shown remorse for your misconduct and in your reflections, you write extensively about the importance of honesty and integrity in the nursing profession. However, your dishonest actions in breaching your suspension order and working when you were restricted directly contradicts your reflections. It considered your deliberate breach of your suspension order to be a significant aggravating factor, that you knew that you were suspended but nevertheless undertook nursing shifts and practised clinically. You therefore knowingly disregarded a clear regulatory requirement. This was not an error, misunderstanding or administrative oversight.

The panel also considered the breach in the context of the original dishonesty. Your original misconduct involved dishonesty in relation to employment. You have now engaged in further dishonest conduct by knowingly practising while suspended. The panel considered this to represent a significant escalation and to demonstrate a continuing concern regarding honesty, integrity and compliance with regulatory requirements.

The panel had regard to SAN-4 of the NMC's Sanctions Guidance (SG), which identifies deliberate breaches of professional duties, personal or financial gain, direct risk to people receiving care and premeditated or systematic conduct as factors relevant to the seriousness of dishonesty. The panel considered that several of these factors were engaged. In particular, the breach was deliberate, involved financial benefit and resulted in you undertaking clinical work when you had no lawful authority to practise.

The panel gave limited weight to your mitigation. It accepted that you [PRIVATE]. However, the panel considered that this did not justify knowingly breaching a suspension order. Of particular importance was that your own reflection identified alternative courses of action which had been available to you.

The panel also considered all the documents submitted on your behalf. While these demonstrated an understanding of honesty, integrity and professional standards, the panel found a significant disconnect between the written insight and your behaviour. The

reflection relied upon by you was produced after the relevant shifts had taken place. The panel therefore concluded that the learning had not translated into sustained behavioural change.

The panel considered whether a further period of suspension would provide an opportunity for you to demonstrate that you could comply with regulatory requirements. However, the panel was concerned that you had already been given an opportunity to remediate and had nevertheless knowingly breached the order. A further suspension would therefore not provide sufficient reassurance that the risk of repetition had been addressed.

The panel carefully considered whether striking-off would be disproportionate. It recognised the seriousness of this sanction and took into account the absence of evidence of actual patient harm and the fact that your clinical competence had not been the primary concern. However, the concerns in your case went beyond clinical competence. They related to honesty, integrity, professional judgement, regulatory compliance and whether you could be trusted to comply with restrictions placed upon you.

The panel considered your deliberate breach of your suspension order, the financial motivation related to personal gain in respect of the breaches which was similar to the motivation of the original dishonesty, and which is indicative of deep-seated attitudinal concerns. Additionally, the lack of sufficient behavioural change and the continuing real risk of repetition made this a particularly serious case. It considered that a lesser sanction would not adequately protect the public or maintain confidence in the regulatory process.

The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that you no longer posed a risk to the public. The panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances. The panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent you from practising in the future and concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order.

The panel also considered whether the striking-off order should take effect immediately rather than on expiry of the existing suspension order. It had regard to *REV-2C – Exceptional cases: changing orders with immediate effect at a standard review*.

The panel noted that this hearing had commenced as a standard review and that, ordinarily, a change to the order would take effect at the end of the existing order. However, *REV-2C* permits the panel to use its early-review powers where exceptional circumstances justify immediate action.

The panel noted that:

- the hearing had commenced as a standard review;
- the exceptional circumstances of your deliberate breach of your suspension order, compounded by further dishonesty, together with the concern that you remained likely to repeat such conduct; and
- the panel considered it necessary to take immediate action to protect the public, maintain public confidence and prevent the registrant from continuing to practise during the remaining period of the suspension.

The panel considered that the deliberate nature of your breach, its repetition of the concerns underlying the original misconduct, and the fact that you had continued to practise despite knowing you were suspended amounted to exceptional circumstances. The panel therefore determined that the striking-off order should take immediate effect.

This striking-off order will replace the current suspension order with immediate effect in accordance with Article 30(2)

This decision will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.