```
Overview
Build two command-line tools that read JSON on stdin and write JSON on stdout. No extra prints or
logs. Deterministic results for identical inputs.
CLI Contract & Performance
  factory < input.json > output.json
  belts < input.json > output.json
    Each case must complete in \leq 2 seconds on a normal laptop.
A) Factory Steady State (with cycles)
Goal
Given:
• Machines with base speed
• Recipes with inputs, outputs, and craft time
• Optional modules per machine type (speed, productivity)
• Limits on raw inputs and on machine counts
• A target item with a required production rate (items/min)
Compute non-negative crafts per minute x r for each recipe so that:
1. The target item is produced at the requested rate (exact match).
2. All intermediates are perfectly balanced (steady state).
3. Raw items are net-consumed only and never exceed their supply caps.
4. Machine caps per type are respected.
If multiple solutions exist, choose one that uses the fewest total machines. If infeasible, return the
maximum feasible target rate and brief bottleneck hints.
Units
 items/min for item flows; crafts/min for recipe completions.
Effective speed with modules
Modules apply per machine type (not per-recipe). All recipes run on the same machine type inherit the
same speed and productivity modifiers.
For recipe running on machine type m:
• Base machine speed: machines[m].crafts per min

    Module speed multiplier: 1 + modules[m].speed (default 0 if no module)

• Recipe time: time s(r) seconds
Effective crafts/min for ::
  eff_crafts_per_min(r) = machines[m].crafts_per_min * (1 + speed) * 60 / time_s(r)
Productivity
Productivity multiplies outputs only (not inputs). It applies uniformly to all output items of the recipe.
If recipe r has out r = { item A: 2, item B: 1 } and module on machine m has prod =
0.2:
• Effective outputs per craft: { item_A: 2 * 1.2, item_B: 1 * 1.2 }
Conservation (steady state)
Let x_r ≥ 0 be crafts/min for recipe r . For each item i :
  \sum_{r} [out_r[i] * (1 + prod_m) * x_r] - \sum_{r} [in_r[i] * x_r] = b[i]
Where:
• For the target item t: b[t] = target rate (exact production required)
• For intermediates (items produced by some recipe and consumed by others, excluding raw and target):
    b[i] = 0 (perfect balance)
• For raw items with supply caps: b[i] ≤ 0 (net consumption) and |b[i] | ≤ raw_cap[i]
Cycles & Byproducts: Recipes may form cycles (A \rightarrow B \rightarrow A) or produce byproducts. The steady-state
conservation equations handle these naturally—set b[i] = 0 for all intermediates, including cyclic ones.
If a recipe produces more than it consumes, accumulate the surplus; if it consumes more, draw from
elsewhere (or from raw supply).
Machine usage constraints
For each recipe r on machine m:
  machines_used_by_r = x_r / eff_crafts_per_min(r)
Per-type cap:
  \sum_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} \{r \text{ uses m}\} \text{ machines\_used\_by\_r} \leq \max_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} \{r \text{ uses m}\} \}
Objective (Tie-break)
Minimize total machines used:
  minimize: \sum_{m} \sum_{r} \{r \text{ uses } m\} \times_{r} / \text{ eff\_crafts\_per\_min(r)}
When multiple feasible solutions exist (e.g., alternative recipes), prefer the one using fewer total machines.
This is a secondary objective after feasibility; use a two-phase approach:
1. Phase 1: Find any feasible solution satisfying conservation, caps, and target rate.
2. Phase 2: Reoptimize within the feasible region to minimize total machines.
Alternatively, formulate as a single linear program with the objective weighted appropriately.
Output schema
Success
    "status": "ok",
    "per_recipe_crafts_per_min": {
      "recipeA": 123.0,
      "recipeB": 0.0
    "per_machine_counts": {
      "assembler_1": 10.5,
      "chemical": 8.0
    "raw_consumption_per_min": {
      "iron_ore": 240.0,
      "copper_ore": 360.0
Infeasible
    "status": "infeasible",
    "max_feasible_target_per_min": 980.0,
    "bottleneck_hint": [
      "assembler_1 cap",
      "iron_ore supply"
Sample (input → output)
Input
    "machines": {
      "assembler_1": {"crafts_per_min": 30},
      "chemical": {"crafts_per_min": 60}
    },
    "recipes": {
      "iron_plate": {
        "machine": "chemical",
        "time_s": 3.2,
        "in": {"iron_ore": 1},
        "out": {"iron_plate": 1}
      "copper_plate": {
        "machine": "chemical",
        "time_s": 3.2,
        "in": {"copper_ore": 1},
        "out": {"copper_plate": 1}
      "green_circuit": {
        "machine": "assembler_1",
        "time_s": 0.5,
        "in": {"iron_plate": 1, "copper_plate": 3},
        "out": {"green_circuit": 1}
    },
    "modules": {
      "assembler_1": {"prod": 0.1, "speed": 0.15},
      "chemical": {"prod": 0.2, "speed": 0.1}
    },
    "limits": {
      "raw_supply_per_min": {"iron_ore": 5000, "copper_ore": 5000},
      "max_machines": {"assembler_1": 300, "chemical": 300}
    "target": {"item": "green_circuit", "rate_per_min": 1800}
Output
    "status": "ok",
    "per_recipe_crafts_per_min": {
      "iron_plate": 1800.0,
      "copper_plate": 5400.0,
      "green_circuit": 1800.0
    "per_machine_counts": {
      "chemical": 50.0,
      "assembler_1": 60.0
    "raw_consumption_per_min": {
      "iron_ore": 1800.0,
      "copper_ore": 5400.0
Numeric Tolerance
• Conservation equations: |balance[i]| < 1e-9 (absolute tolerance).
• Raw consumption feasibility: consumption ≤ cap + 1e-9.
• Machine usage: usage ≤ max + 1e-9.
• Determinism: Use consistent floating-point arithmetic; if using a solver, seed it for reproducibility.
Acceptance & Determinism
• Exact conservation within tight tolerances (no "almost zero" leaks).
• Raw consumption ≤ caps; machine counts ≤ caps.
• If multiple solutions exist with identical machine count: output is deterministic (e.g., tie-break by recipe
  name lexicographically).
• Output is deterministic given identical input.
B) Belts with Bounds and Node Caps
Goal
On a directed conveyor graph:
• Each edge (u → v) has lower lo and upper hi flow bounds (items/min).
• Certain nodes have throughput caps on total in or out.
• Multiple sources with fixed supplies; a single sink with demand equal to total supply.
Decide feasibility while respecting all bounds and caps; if feasible, produce one valid flow. If infeasible,
provide a clear certificate.
Concepts
• Edge flow: lo ≤ f_e ≤ hi.
• Node conservation: inflow + supply = outflow + demand (only sink has demand).
• Node caps: enforce via node-splitting or constraint.
• Sources: provide fixed supply (no incoming edges).
• Sink: single node receiving all flow (no outgoing edges).
Method (high level)
1. Node Capacity Handling
For each capped node v (not source or sink):
• Split into two nodes: v_in (receives all incoming) and v_out (sends all outgoing).
• Add edge v_in → v_out with capacity cap(v).
• Redirect all incoming edges to v_in, all outgoing to v_out.
2. Lower Bounds via Transformation
For each edge (\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}) with lo, hi:
• Reduce the edge capacity to hi - lo.
• Accumulate imbalance: +lo at v (demand), -lo at u (supply).
• After solving, add lo back to the computed flow to recover original values.
3. Feasibility Check (Lower Bounds)
• Create a super-source s* and super-sink t* .
• For each node with positive imbalance (demand), connect s* to it with that demand.
• For each node with negative imbalance (supply), connect it to the with that supply.

    Run max-flow from s* to t* with adjusted capacities.

• If max-flow saturates all required edges, lower bounds are feasible.
4. Main Flow (Supplies to Sink)
• Connect each source to the actual sink with its supply.
• Run max-flow from source side to sink.
• Reconstruct original flows by adding lo back on each edge.
Output schema
Success
    "status": "ok",
    "max_flow_per_min": 1500,
    "flows": [
      {"from": "s1", "to": "a", "flow": 900},
      {"from": "a", "to": "b", "flow": 900},
      {"from": "b", "to": "sink", "flow": 900},
      {"from": "s2", "to": "a", "flow": 600},
      {"from": "a", "to": "c", "flow": 600},
      {"from": "c", "to": "sink", "flow": 600}
Infeasible
    "status": "infeasible",
    "cut_reachable": ["s1", "a", "b"],
    "deficit": {
      "demand_balance": 300,
      "tight_nodes": ["b"],
      "tight_edges": [
          "from": "b",
          "to": "sink",
          "flow_needed": 300
   cut_reachable : Nodes reachable from source in the residual graph when flow is maximal (defines
   the bottleneck).
    demand balance: Unsatisfied demand on the source side of the cut.
    tight nodes: Nodes at capacity limits within the cut.
    tight edges: Edges at capacity limits crossing the cut (from reachable to unreachable).
Numeric Tolerance
• Edge flow: lo \le f \le hi + le-9.
• Node conservation: | imbalance | < 1e-9 .
• Determinism: Tie-break augmenting paths lexicographically or use consistent solver configuration.
Submission Package
Organize your repo as:
  part2_assignment/
   — factory/
                                # executable: reads JSON from stdin, writes JSON to stdout
      └ main.py
     belts/
                                # executable: reads JSON from stdin, writes JSON to stdout
      └ main.py
     tests/
      — test_factory.py
      └ test_belts.py
     verify_factory.py
                                # (optional) validation helper
    verify_belts.py
                                # (optional) validation helper
     gen_factory.py
                                # (optional) test case generator
    - gen_belts.py
                                # (optional) test case generator
    - run_samples.py
                                # design note (1-2 pages)
    - README.md
  └─ RUN.md
                                # exact run commands
Rules
• Read JSON from stdin; write a single JSON object to stdout.
• No extra prints, logs, or debug output.
• Deterministic output for identical inputs.
• ≤ 2 seconds per case.
README.md must cover
Factory modeling choices:

    How item balances and conservation equations are enforced.

• Raw consumption and machine capacity constraints.
• Module application (per-machine-type).
• Handling of cycles, byproducts, and self-contained recipes.
• How ties in machine count are broken.
• Infeasibility detection and reporting (binary search for max rate vs. linear program relaxation?).
Belts modeling choices:
• Max-flow with lower bounds: transformation steps and order of operations.
• Node-splitting for capacity constraints.

    Feasibility check strategy.

• How infeasibility certificates (min-cut) are computed and reported.
Numeric approach:
• Tolerances used ( 1e-9 , etc.).
• Linear programming solver or hand-rolled algorithm (and why).
• Tie-breaking strategy for determinism.
Failure modes & edge cases:
• Cycles in recipes.
• Infeasible raw supplies or machine counts.
• Degenerate or redundant recipes.
• Disconnected graph components (belts).
RUN.md example
  # Run sample tests
  python run_samples.py "python factory/main.py" "python belts/main.py"
  # Run pytest
  FACTORY_CMD="python factory/main.py" BELTS_CMD="python belts/main.py" pytest -q
Deliverables checklist
       factory and belts directories with main.py executable.

    V Provided tests pass locally.

    V JSON output matches schemas exactly.

    V No extraneous output (only final JSON).

 • V Deterministic results.

    ✓ ≤ 2 seconds per test case.

• V README and RUN.md complete.
Packaging
1. Create a GitHub repository named factorio-assignment-<yourname> with public access.
2. Place top-level folder at repo root: part2_assignment/
3. Include a top-level SUBMISSION.txt with:

    Name, email

   • OS, CPU, RAM
   Language & version (e.g., Python 3.11.7)

    Any optional notes (e.g., solver libraries, performance notes)

4. Submit the GitHub URL for your repository.
Submit Your Solution
Create a GitHub repository with the structure above and submit the URL below:
```

**6** Submit Repository

Leave to the contract of the c

decisions.

← Back to Home

**ERP.AI** Engineering Assessment

Part 2: Factory Steady State & Bounded Belts