

# Report on NA/Refusal Status of Reported Children of Qamberkhel-A

S#	Child name	Age	HH#	Previous Vaccine H	Medical history	Current vaccination	Trend of recording	Reported the Issues in Minutes Y/N	Is UC level staff was knowing	Day of Work	CHW	AS	Data fudging?
1	<b>Shayan</b>	18	24	NO	Nil	Not Vaccinated	NA	NO	NO	D-1	Sameen	Ab. Rasheed	No, but serious lake of interest in responsibilities
2	<b>Yakhya</b>	18	11	YES	Nil	Not Vaccinated	NA	No	NO	D-1	Sameen	Ab. Resheed	No, but serious lake of interest in responsibilities
3	<b>Anas</b>	8	66	NO	Nil	Not Vaccinated	NA	No	N O	D-3	Sameen	Ab. Rasheed	No, but serious lake of interest in responsibilities
4	<b>Abdullah</b>	28	18	NO	Thalassemia	Not Vaccinated	NA	Yes	Yes	D-1	Ali Haider	Saifoor	Yes

Note please: As per UCDO UC level staff they were not informed by the area level staff that these children might be refusals but reported as NA even present at home. UCDO told that he came to know on day-6 when area level staff reported these children as refusal. Due to the same reason the children were not reported as refusals in NA sheet and Form 2B. UCDO told me that they were aware well aware about the **S# 4 child (Abdullah H# 18 age 28 Months)** that was reported as **NA** but actually the was **a refusal actually**. The area level staff is now reported in poor performing list for all 4 children as showing their negligence towards their professional responsibility, while the UC level staff may be included or otherwise. As this is showing clear negligence of CU staff that they have reported a child as refusal but reported as NA which is **DATA FUDGING**. The children are now reflecting as NA on DIIMS and DSC while in reality the children are refusals.