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8. **Executive Summary:**

Data from the Ministry of Water of the United Republic of Tanzania has been made available to predict the functionality of water pumps. In order to understand this data, exploratory data analysis was conducted. To predict the functionality of the water pumps, four Algorithms have been analyzed along with their internal changes. These are logistic regression, decision tree, neural network and random forest. All of them are implemented using SAS Enterprise Miner. The insights derived from these models will enhance maintenance activities by facilitating faster repairs and tackling the water crisis in Tanzania.

1. **Methodology:**

**2.1 Data Collection Process**: The Water Pump Challenge Dataset is readily available through the UNT Canvas Website. Originally from the United Republic of Tanzania - Ministry of Water website.

**2.2 Description of Data Source**: The Water Pump Challenge Dataset consists of 47,521 Rows with the columns included and 41 columns included.

**2.3 Dataset Features Explanation**:

1. ID: A unique Identifier for every water pump
2. Status group (target): Functional state of Water Pump.
3. Amount Tsh: Total static head (the water pumping height). Which shows the Pump capacity.
4. Date recorded: The date at which water Pump is recorded
5. Funder: the funder providing installation of water pump.
6. Gps height:Height of the pump. Which makes an impact on the pump’s need for operation or environmental conditions.
7. Installer: the organization that installed the pump in place. Which might have an impact on the type or quality of the pump.
8. Longitude: The pump’s GPS longitude.
9. Latitude: The pump’s GPS latitude
10. Wpt name: The Waterpoint’s name.
11. Num private: An Num Private variable that represents a private attribute.
12. Basin: The pump’s location in the basin.
13. Sub village: The specific sub-village within the broader region where the pump is located.
14. Region: The pump’s larger geographic area.
15. Region code: The region’s numerical code.
16. District code: The district’s numerical code, denotes a smaller administrative area inside the region.
17. LGA: Local government area, which is an additional administrative division.
18. Ward: A far more localized form of government, a ward is an administrative division even smaller than a local government area.
19. Population: The local population is near the pump. This reveals how often the pump is used
20. public meeting: Boolean variable which indicates whether or not there is a public meeting happened, possibly relating to the planning, upkeep, or condition of the water pump.
21. Recorded by: attribute which records the data. This could affect the approach quality of the data.
22. Scheme management: The type of management organization in charge of the water system, may have an impact on pump functionality and maintenance.
23. Scheme name: If the pump is connected to a water scheme
24. Permit: Boolean value that indicates if the waterpoint is in conformity with regulations or has a permit,
25. construction\_year: The year the pump was built, which could be used to calculate its age and perhaps influence the probability of failure.
26. extraction type, extraction type group, extraction type class: These factors, which are grouped at various granularities to characterize the mechanical methods of extracting water.
27. Management, management group: These attributes describes the waterpoint’s management structure, which have an impact on the frequency and effectiveness of maintenance.
28. Payment, Payment type: indicates the method in which users pay for water, possibly affecting funding for maintenance.
29. Water quality, quality group: these attributes represents water quality, which have an impact on the sustainability and amount of time the pump is used.
30. quantity, quantity group: these attributes describe the pump’s water availability, which have an impact on how much is used.
31. Source, source type, and source class: these attributes indicate the water’s place of origin, which may have an impact on its quality and reliability.
32. Waterpoint type, waterpoint type group: waterpoint Types, which have an impact on its capacity and maintenance.
33. **Exploratory Data Analysis:**

**3.1. Data Cleaning of Missing Values:**
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Figure 1.0: Class Variable Summary statistics before the data cleaning process

Initially, when the statexplore node was run against the Raw data file ‘water pump challenge.csv’, there were missing values of 9,491 which were present in a column where the majority of them were categorical variables. For the data cleaning and preprocessing, we used Python and Excel to check the null values, NaN values, missing values and other irrelevant values. Next, we have removed these values using appropriate Python codes:

* We have found out that there are a lot of NaN values for the scheme\_management, permit, public\_meeting that are replaced by unknown values as these are categorical variables.
* ID variable has no predictive power because they are unique to each observation. Hence it is highly unlikely that we find any patterns associated with the unique values.
* Just like the ID variable, we have found a lot of unique values associated with the wpt\_name, subvillage, scheme\_name and funder variables. We have dropped these variables’ columns as we felt these are ineffective for the predictive analysis.
* The longitude variable column has a lot of 0 values. As Tanzania’s latitude and longitude are 35 degrees east, these 0 values present in the longitude column do not correctly represent values. Hence, 0’s and NaN values are replaced by their mean.
* As there are 33,331 null or 0 values present in the amount\_tsh column, we have dropped the amount\_tsh column. We have dropped the other inefficient columns such as num private, date recorded, recorded\_by, region code, district code and ward columns.
* There are around 17,048 zero values for the variable column population. imputed the zeros with the mean.
* There are around 16,503 zero values for the construction year variable, those Null values have been imputed with the median value
* If two or more same types of predictors have the same unique values, we are considering the predictor which is having consistent values.
* If two or more same type of predictors have different unique values, we are considering the predictor which has more unique values.
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Figure 1.1: Class Variable Summary statistics after the data cleaning process
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Figure 1.2 Distribution of class Target and segment variables

Figure 1.2 shows the number of observations that were distributed between the functional and non functional levels under the status group target column. Approximately 54.30% of the observations are marked as functional and the remaining are marked as non functional.
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Figure 1.3: Variables – File Import Node

Figure 1.3 shows the edited variables in the file import node after performing the cleaning process to overcome the errors that are occurring due to the missing values present in the data. These are the final list of variables used for predicting the target variable:

1. 'longitude',
2. 'latitude',
3. 'gps\_height',
4. 'region',
5. 'basin',
6. 'lga',
7. 'public\_meeting',
8. 'scheme\_management',
9. 'permit',
10. 'construction\_year',
11. 'population',
12. 'extraction\_type',
13. 'management',
14. 'payment\_type',
15. 'water\_quality',
16. 'quantity',
17. 'source',
18. 'waterpoint\_type',
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Figure 1.4: Variable Worth

The construction\_year variable has the highest variable importance relative to the other variables followed by water point type, population, payment\_ type, region, basin, water quality, GPS height, management, scheme management, public meeting and permit variable.
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Figure 1.5: Interval Variable Summary Statistics

Three interval variables have been used for building the predictive models. They are construction\_year, gps\_height and population. the mean value for construction\_year is 1996.419, the mean value for gps\_height is 1014.766 and for population, it is 315.1123. construction\_year has the highest mean among the other variables.

The gps\_height variable has the highest standard deviation relative to the other variables which means that the data points of the gps\_height variable are more spread out or far away from its mean. A higher standard deviation indicates that there is a greater variability in the data. Construction\_year is more closer to their mean as it has a relatively lower standard deviation and less variability.

The population variable is positively skewed when compared to the other variables, which means that it has a higher asymmetry around its mean. construction\_year, gps\_height, latitude, and longitude variables are negatively skewed. The gps\_height variable is more symmetrical in comparison to other variables as it is much closer when compared to other variables.

Kurtosis measures the peakedness of the data distribution. population variable has more extreme values as it has the highest kurtosis value in comparison to other variables and also it has heavier tails and a sharper peak than a normal distribution. The population variable is leptokurtic as it has a kurtosis greater than 3. The other 3 variables have kurtosis lower than 3 which indicates that it is platykurtic and the the distribution has lighter tails and a flatter peak than a normal distribution.
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Figure 2: Model Diagram – SAS Enterprise Miner
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Figure 2.1: Distribution of Class Target and Segment Variables.

Selected the default random seed in SAS EM (12345) while running predictive models during the data partition. In the given training Dataset, there are 25,802 records with the functional level for Functional or Not which means that the water pumps are functional and 21,718 records belong to the non functional level, the water pumps that are not functional. Hence 54.2971 % of the water pumps are functional.

As we are dealing with the binary classification where we are predicting whether the water pumps are functional or not which is discrete. In the case of binary classification, they range between only 0 and 1 and residuals are not normally distributed. Linear regression assumes the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables is linear which may not be the case with the binary classification. Linear regression assumes that the target variables are continuous and normally distributed. Errors in binary classification may not be constant near the boundaries of their outcome near 0 and 1 which violates the Homoscedasticity assumption. Hence it is better not to go with linear regression for this data set.

1. **Models:**

**4.1 Logistic Regression Model -1: Default Selection Model**

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated

Figure 3: Likelihood Ratio Test and Type 3 Analysis of effects results for the default method.

Likelihood Ratio Test tells us whether the overall model is significant or not. P- value is less than 0.05, hence the model is significant.

Type 3 Analysis of Effects tells us whether the individual predictor variables are significant. All the variables are significant.
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Figure 3.1 Fit statistics of Logistic regression -Default

Figure 3.1 shows the Fit statistics of the Default Logistic regression model. This model has a misclassification rate of ~21.70% for the training dataset and ~22.05% for the Validation dataset. There’s only little difference between the misclassification rate for the training data and validation data which means that it has a good generalization capability for the unseen data. This model has an Average squared error of ~15.03% for the validation dataset.
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Figure 3.2: Event Classification Table for the Logistic Regression -Default.

Accuracy for Training data = (15462+10581)/(4621+15462+2598+10581) = 0.7830 (~78.3%)

Accuracy for Validation data = (6594+4520)/(1996+6594+1148+4520) = 0.7795(~77.95%)

**4.2 Logistic Regression Model -2: Stepwise Selection Model:**

The stepwise classification method is an automated way to identify which variables are most important to the model and only include them in the model. It is a process where the variables are added and removed until the best combination of variables is identified.
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Figure 4.0: Likelihood Ratio Test and Type 3 Analysis of effects results for the Stepwise method.

As per the final Likelihood Ratio Test of the Stepwise selection model, the P-value is less than 0.05, hence the model is significant.

The following 15 variables have been included in the final output of the logistic regression using the stepwise selection model: basin, extraction\_type, lga, management, payment type, permit, public meeting, quantity, scheme management, source, water quality, waterpoint type, construction\_year, GPS height, population. All the variables as per the Type 3 Analysis of Effects are significant.
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Figure 4.1 Fit statistics of Logistic regression – stepwise

Figure 4.1 shows the Fit statistics of the stepwise Logistic regression model. This model has a misclassification rate of ~21.70% for the training dataset and ~22.05% for the Validation dataset. There’s only little difference between the misclassification rate for the training data and validation data which means that it has a good generalization capability for the unseen data. This model has an Average squared error of ~15.03% for the validation dataset. Stepwise logistic regression generated the same results as the default logistic regression.
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Figure 4.2: Event Classification Table for the stepwise method.

Accuracy for Training data = (15634+8585)/(6617+15634+2426+8585) = 0.7281 (~72.81%)

Accuracy for Validation data = (6653+3652)/(2863+6653+1089+3652) = 0.7228(~72.28)

**4.3. Full Decision Tree**:
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Figure 5.0: Properties table of Full Decision Tree

Figure 5.0 depicts values selected for the Full Decision tree properties. For the full decision tree model, below mentioned properties have been changed in comparison to the default values:

* Splitting rule - Normal Target Criterion: Entropy (Used entropy for quantifying the randomness in the distribution of the classes to measure the uncertainty in the dataset)
* Splitting rule - Maximum Depth: increased the Maximum depth to 25.
* Subtree Method: selected largest value for generating the full decision tree.
* The rest are default values.
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Figure 5.1: Variable importance output results for the Full Decision Tree

Figure 5.1 depicts the Variable importance or worth and shows how much each independent or predictor variable has an impact on the dependent variable or the target variable. Lga is involved in 129 splitting rules which makes it the most important variable used in the full decision tree model used for the decision-making process. Followed by the quantity variable which is involved in 78 splitting rules makes it the second most important variable for the decision-making process. Even though the 3rd, 5th and 6th are involved in a relatively higher number of splitting rules, they are less influencing variables when compared with the first 2 variables. Other variables’ importance progressively decreases.
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Figure 5.2: Fit statistics for Full Decision Tree

Figure 5.2 shows the depiction of Fit statistics for the Full Decision Tree Model. This model has the lowest Misclassification rate of 0.0698(~6.98%) for the training data. However, this model generates a Misclassification rate of 0.1457(~14.57%) for the validation dataset. As there is a variation between the Misclassification rate of the training dataset and the validation dataset, it overfits the training dataset and fails to give a similar performance to the validation dataset relative to the training dataset.

The Average squared error for train data is just 0.046. However, for the validation dataset, it is 0.113 indicates that relatively it generates more average squared errors with the validation dataset. The higher the average squared errors, the lower will be the model performance.
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Figure 5.3: Event Classification table for the Full Decision Tree

Figure 5.3 depicts the Event Classification table from which we can derive Accuracy, sensitivity, and other related metrics.

Accuracy for Training data = (17109+13831)/(1371+17109+951+13831) = 0.9302(~93.02%)

Accuracy for Validation data = (6837+5349)/(1167+6832+910+5349) = 0.8547(~85.47%)

**4.4. Decision Tree 2 Misclassification:**
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Figure 6.0: Properties table of Decision Tree model 2

Figure 6.0 depicts values selected for the Decision Tree 2 model properties. For the decision tree 2 model, below mentioned properties have been changed in comparison to the default values:

* Splitting rule - Normal Target Criterion: Entropy (Used entropy for quantifying the randomness in the distribution of the classes to measure the uncertainty in the dataset)
* Splitting rule - Maximum Depth: increased the Maximum depth to 25.
* Subtree Method: Selected assessment method for the Subtree to enable SAS EM to automatically choose the best assessment value with the smallest tree.
* The rest are default values.

A table of numbers with text

Description automatically generated with medium confidence  
Figure 6.1: Variable importance output results for the Decision Tree model 2

Figure 6.1 depicts the Variable importance or worth and shows how much each independent or predictor variable has an impact on the dependent variable or the target variable. Lga is involved in 89 splitting rules which makes it the most important variable used in the decision tree 2 model used for the decision-making process with an importance score of 1. Followed by the quantity variable which is involved in 28 splitting rules makes it the second most important variable for the decision-making process. Even though the GPS height variable was involved in the highest number of the splitting rules which is 141 splitting rules, it still has the Validation importance score of 0.2476. Other variables’ importance progressively decreases.
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Figure 6.2: Fit statistics for Decision Tree Model 2

Figure 6.2 shows the depiction of Fit statistics for the Decision Tree 2 Model. This model has a Misclassification rate of 0.0973 (~9.73 %) for the training data and this model generates the relatively lowest Misclassification rate of 0.1181 (~11.81%) for the validation dataset. The Misclassification rate for both the training dataset and validation data set is relatively low indicating that it performs well in classifying observations.

The Average squared error for train data is just 0.0725. However, for the validation dataset, it is 0.0959 indicates that relatively it generates more average squared errors than the validation dataset.
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Figure 5.3: Event Classification table for the Decision Tree Model 2

Accuracy for Training data = (17032+12993)/(2209+17032+1028+12993) = 0.9027(~90.27%)

Accuracy for Validation data = (7167+5406)/(1110+7167+575+5406) = 0.8818(~88.18%)

**4.5. Decision Tree 3 Misclassification:**
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Figure 7.0: Properties table of Decision Tree model 3

Figure 7.0 depicts values selected for the Decision Tree 2 model properties. For the decision tree 2 model, below mentioned properties have been changed in comparison to the default values:

* Splitting rule - Normal Target Criterion: ProbChisq (based on the Chi-squared test which measures the independence between the predictors and the target variable)
* Subtree Method: Selected assessment method for the Subtree to enable SAS EM to automatically choose the best assessment value with the smallest tree.
* The rest are default values.
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Figure 7.1: Variable importance output results for the Decision Tree model 3

Figure 7.1 depicts the Variable importance or worth and shows how much each independent or predictor variable has an impact on the dependent variable or the target variable. Quantity variable involved in 3 splitting rules and makes it the highest important variable used in the decision tree 3 model used for the decision-making process with an importance score of 1. Followed by the Lga variable which is involved in 8 splitting rules makes it the second most important variable for the decision-making process with an importance score of 0.9421. Waterpoint type and construction year variables also exhibit significant influence on the target variable. Other variables’ importance progressively decreases.
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Figure 7.2: Fit statistics for Decision Tree Model 3

Figure 7.2 shows the depiction of Fit statistics for the Decision Tree 3 Model. This model generates almost the same miscalculation rate of approximately 20% for both the training dataset and the validation dataset.

This model generates almost similar Average squared error and Root Average squared error for both the training and validation datasets. Which indicates that the model is performing similarly or consistently for both datasets.
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Figure 7.3: Event Classification table for the Decision Tree model 3

Accuracy for Training data = (16229+10359)/(4843+16229+1831+10359) = 0.7994 (~79.94%)

Accuracy for Validation data = (6934+4414)/(2102+6934+808+4414) = 0.7959 (~79.59%)

**4.6. Autoneural**:
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Figure 8.0 Iteration Plot of Misclassification Rate for the Autoneural

Figure 8.0 depicts the Misclassification rate iteration plot in the Auto Neural network. The misclassification rate for both the training dataset and validation dataset decreases rapidly with the first training step. After the steep decline, a convergence between the misclassification rate of the training dataset and the validation dataset can be seen near the training step 4. By starting of the training step 10, there is a stable pattern between the datasets in terms of learning and we see only minor improvements or minor adjustments from here on. By the end of the training set 30, the Misclassification rates for both datasets seem to be very close to each other at the lowest misclassification rate for the validation dataset. This indicates that the model performs similarly for both the seen and unseen data.
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Figure 8.1: Fit Statistics for Autoneural

Figure 8.1 shows the depiction of Fit statistics for the Autoneural Model. This model has a misclassification of 13.78% for the training data and 14.63% for the validation dataset. There is only a 1% difference in the misclassification rate between the training dataset and the validation dataset. Which indicates that it has good generalization capability for the unseen data.

This model generates almost consistent results with an average squared error of around 0.10 for both the training and validation datasets.
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Figure 8.2: Event Classification Table for Autoneural

Accuracy for Training data = (16164+12514)/(2688+16164+1896+12514) = 0.8622(~86.22%)

Accuracy for Validation data = (6861+5311)/(1205+6861+881+5311) = 0.8537(~85.37%)

**4.7. Random Forest:**
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Figure 9.0 depicts the iteration plot of the Misclassification rate for the random forest. The blue colored line represents the misclassification rate for the training dataset. The red colored line represents the out-of-bag error and the green line represents the misclassification rate for the validation data set. There is a maximum 100 number of trees that are constructed for the random forest analysis. There is a steep decline in the misclassification rate for both the training and validation datasets within the initial building of 4 to 5 trees. By the start of building the 20 trees, there is a stable pattern between the datasets in terms of learning and we see only minor improvements or minor adjustments from here on. This indicates that further adding more trees will not impact the overall performance.

At around 90 trees, the misclassification rate for the validation dataset is 0.137 which is equal to the value mentioned in the fit statistics. That’s where stop building more trees.
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Figure 9.1: Fit Statistics for Random Forest

Figure 9.1 shows the depiction of Fit statistics for the Random Forest Model. This model has a misclassification of 12.09% for the training data and 13.73% for the validation dataset. Which indicates minor overfitting of the training dataset. This model has the second lowest misclassification rate after the Decision Tree 2 model.

This model has the second lowest average squared error for the validation dataset which is 0.0995.
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Figure 9.2: Event classification table of Random Forest

Accuracy for Training data = (17072+12170)/(3032+17072+988+12170) = 0.8791(~87.91%)

Accuracy for Validation data = (7222+5079)/(1437+7222+520+5079) = 0.8627(~86.27%)

1. **Model Comparision**:

**A close-up of a document

Description automatically generated**

Figure 10.0: Fit Statistics of model comparison node

Figure 10.0 shows the Fit Statistics of the model comparison node.

1. Decision Tree 2: The Decision Tree2 model performs best relative to the other models by generating the lowest Miscalculation rate of ~11.82% as well as the Average Squared error of ~9.59% for the validation dataset. This indicates that this model has the highest accuracy of ~88.18% and also model’s predictions are close to the actual values.
2. HP Forest: This model has the second lowest misclassification rate of ~13.73%(or an accuracy of 86.27%) and the second lowest Average Squared error of ~9.95 % for the validation dataset. This indicates that this model’s predictions are slightly farther in comparison to the Decision Tree 2 model.
3. Full Decision Tree: This model has a higher Misclassification rate of ~14.57% for the validation data in comparison to the previous two models and a higher average squared error in comparison to the previous models and also the auto-neural model. It is also observable that this model has the lowest Misclassification rate for the training dataset in relation to all the other models. There is a significant difference between the accuracy of the training dataset and the validation data set. This indicates that the model overfits the training dataset and has lower performance with the unseen data set or the validation dataset.
4. AutoNeural: This model has an almost similar misclassification rate of ~14.63% in comparison to the Full decision tree model. This model has a lower Average squared error in comparison to the full decision tree model, Decision 3, stepwise regression, and the default regression model.
5. Rest of the models: The other 3 models have higher misclassification rates and Average squared errors in comparison to the previous models. Both the stepwise logistic regression and default logistic regression model give the same results in terms of the Misclassification rate and the average squared error.

**5. Conclusion:**

After running seven models, it was observed that the Decision Tree 2 model exhibits higher performance in terms of accuracy and misclassification rate. The best accuracy generated from all the models is approximately 88.18% by the Decision Tree 2 model, followed by the HP Forest method. The accuracy difference between the top model and the next is less than 2%. The accuracies of both Regression models for the validation dataset were the lowest among all models analyzed in this project. Nearly all improvements in accuracy were achieved through preprocessing steps during the data cleaning process. We can conclude that with an accuracy of approximately 88.18%, the Decision Tree 2 model can predict whether water pumps are functional in the validation dataset.
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