

# MAJOR COURSE OUTPUT #2: DATA ANALYSIS PIPELINE FOR FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

### INTRODUCTION

This major course output presents the development of a Data Analysis Pipeline that demonstrates fundamental concepts in programming paradigms and data processing. The application is designed to ingest a real-world CSV dataset on DPWH flood control projects, perform preprocessing, and generate three tabular reports to facilitate analysis of infrastructure trends, financial efficiencies, and performance metrics. A key component of this project is the use of libraries or packages to process the data.

#### **FUNCTIONAL SPECIFICATIONS**

#### MANAGING DATA INGESTION

REQ#	DETAILS					
REQ-0001	Provision to read the CSV file dpwh_flood_control_projects.csv containing 9,800+ rows of flood mitigation projects.					
REQ-0002	Provision to perform basic validation: Log total row count and detect/parse errors (e.g., invalid dates or missing values).					
REQ-0003	Provision to filter projects from 2021–2023 (exclude 2024 entries for analysis stability)					
REQ-0004	Provision to compute derived fields:					
REQ-0005	Provision to clean data uniformly:  • Convert financial fields to floats (PHP);  • parse dates or use date data types when possible;					





## DEPARTMENT OF SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY

• impute or filter incomplete rows (e.g., null lat/long via provincial averages).

### MANAGING REPORT GENERATION

REQ#	DETAILS			
REQ-0 006	Provision to generate Report 1: Regional Flood Mitigation Efficiency Summary. This table will have the following columns:  • aggregate total ApprovedBudgetForContract,  • median CostSavings,  • average CompletionDelayDays, and  • percentage of projects with delays >30 days by Region and MainIsland.  Include "Efficiency Score", which is computed as:  (median savings / average delay) * 100, normalized to 0-100.  Output as sorted CSV (descending by EfficiencyScore).			
REQ-0 007	O Provision to generate Report 2: Top Contractors Performance Ranking.  Rank top 15 Contractors by total ContractCost (descending, filter >= 5 projects), with columns for the following:  • number of projects,  • average CompletionDelayDays,  • total CostSavings,  • "Reliability Index", which is computed as (1 - (avg delay / 90)) * (total savings / total cost) * 100 (capped at 100). Flag < 50 as "High Risk".  Output as sorted CSV.			
REQ-0 008	Provision to generate Report 3: Annual Project Type Cost Overrun Trends. Group by  FundingYear and TypeOfWork, computing the following:  • total projects  • average CostSavings (negative if overrun)  • overrun rate (% with negative savings)  • year-over-year % change in average savings (2021 baseline).			





# SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY

	Output as sorted CSV (ascending by year, descending by AvgSavings).
REQ-0 009	Provision to produce a summary . j son aggregating key stats across reports (e.g., total number of projects, total number of contractors, total provinces with projects, global average delay, total savings).

### **TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION**

REQ#	DETAILS
REQ-00 10	Application should be developed / built on the following programming languages: ● R ● JavaScript ● Kotlin ● Rust
REQ-00 11	Provision for output standardization: Generate identical CSV files for each report (comma-formatted numbers, rounded to 2 decimals); one run command per language (e.g., Rscript main.R, node index.js).





DEPARTMENT OF

#### **SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY**

### **SAMPLE OUTPUT**

Select Language Implementation:

[1] Load the file

[2] Generate Reports

Enter choice: 1

Processing dataset... (9,852 rows loaded, 9,234 filtered for 2021-2023)

Select Language Implementation: [1] Load the file

[2] Generate Reports

Enter choice: 2

Generating reports...

Outputs saved to individual files...

Report 1: Regional Flood Mitigation Efficiency Summary

Regional Flood Mitigation Efficiency Summary

(Filtered: 2021-2023 Projects)

Re	egion					, .	EfficiencyScore
Co	ordillera Administrative Region		1,234,567,890			15.20	48.75
Re	egion XIII	Mindanao	987,654,321	987.65	45.2	35.40	21.85

(Full table exported to report1\_regional\_summary.csv)

Report 2: Top Contractors Performance Ranking

Top Contractors Performance Ranking (Top 15 by TotalCost, >=5 Projects)

١	Rank	Contractor	•	TotalCost	•				ReliabilityIndex	
	1	ASC CONSTRUCTION & CONCRETE PRODUCTS	- 1 -		1.				   75.20	Low Risk
i	2	GICAR CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Ĺ	400,000,000	Ĺ	12	15.2	1 1,800,000	88.50	Low Risk

(Full table exported to report2\_contractor\_ranking.csv)

Report 3: Annual Project Type Cost Overrun Trends

Annual Project Type Cost Overrun Trends (Grouped by FundingYear and TypeOfWork)

ļ	FundingYear	TypeOfWork	TotalProjects				•
¦	2021	Construction of Flood Mitigation Structure	•	•	12.50	0.00	ï
١	2021	Construction of Revetment	800	-250.75	25.30	0.00	ı
- 1	2022	Construction of Flood Mitigation Structure	I 1.100	1 1,200.00	18.20	1 -20.00	ı

(Full table exported to report3\_annual\_trends.csv)

Summary Stats (summary.json):
{"global\_avg\_delay": 45.2, "total\_savings": 15000000}

Back to Report Selection (Y/N):





### SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Criteria	Description	Points	Details
Code Simplicity	Measures how straightforward and minimal the code is.	5	<ul> <li>5 pts: Code is simple and efficient.</li> <li>3-4 pts: Mostly simple, with minor inefficiencies.</li> <li>1-2 pts: Code has unnecessary complexity.</li> <li>0 pts: Code is overly complex or unclear.</li> </ul>
Performance	Evaluates how quickly the program executes, especially with large inputs.	5	<ul> <li>5 pts: Excellent performance across all inputs.</li> <li>3-4 pts: Minor performance issues with large inputs.</li> <li>1-2 pts: Noticeable lags.</li> <li>0 pts: Poor performance.</li> </ul>
Code Readability	Assesses the clarity of the code, including formatting, variable naming, and use of comments.	5	<ul> <li>5 pts: Clean, well-organized code.</li> <li>3-4 pts: Some minor readability issues.</li> <li>1-2 pts: Difficult to follow.</li> <li>0 pts: Unreadable code.</li> </ul>
Correctness	Checks if the program produces the correct outputs and handles edge cases.	3	3 pts: Correct outputs for all cases. 2 pts: Minor mistakes in edge cases. 1 pt: Frequent errors. 0 pts: Fails to provide correct output.
User Experience	Measures how intuitive and user-friendly the program is, including clear input/output and instructions.	2	2 pts: Smooth, intuitive experience. 1 pt: Somewhat confusing interface. 0 pts: Poor user experience.