

- Comments**
- Q1. This question was done by few students, possibly because it was the least similar to questions on past papers. Performance was very so-so. Many candidates remembered the basic topology of the Towers-of-Hanoi search space, at least roughly; only a few correctly wrote a Prolog program to generate a solution.
- Q2. This question was attempted by nearly every candidate. Formalization and conversion to clause form were not a problem for most; however, construction of a simple resolution proof foxed almost everyone. This was, frankly, pathetic. Several such problems were done on the board in lectures, and the method is clearly described in the required reading. Many candidates (deservedly) lost marks here.
- Q3. This question was very popular, and marks were high. On reflection, it seems to have been too easy. Quite a few candidates scored full marks.
- Q4. This question was popular, and marks were high. On reflection, it seems to have been too easy. Most candidates displayed a good knowledge of computing meanings using the simply-typed lambda calculus. I was actually amazed by how many candidates correctly answered the last part, as this involved material (the untyped lambda calculus) which went beyond what was technically covered in lectures.
- General comment. The moderator's comment before the exam was taken was that the paper appeared to be on the difficult side. In the event, most candidates coped with most of the material very well, and marks were, if anything, on the high side.
-