1. (a) Good answers should earn marks even if they do not comply with the markscheme.

New INDEX / pass-by-reference / variable parameters pass changes back to the calling routine / main program [1 mark].
NUMBERS / pass-by-value parameters do not pass any changes back [1 mark].
(Accept an answer along the lines of INDEX uses less memory space than NUMBERS. This would get [ 2 marks] even though it is not fully explained.)
(b) Award marks as follows:

| POS | NUMBERS [POS] < VALUE | VALUE | INDEX[1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5000 |  |
| 1 | true | 27 | 1 |
| 2 | false | 27 | 1 |
| 3 | true | 15 | 3 |
| 4 | true | 2 | 4 |
| 5 | false | 2 | 4 |

Award [2 marks] for each correct column of VALUE, INDEX [1], and NUMBERS [POS] <VALUE (give [1 mark] if only one error, and then correct follow through). (A maximum of [6 marks]).
(c) The two main ways of doing this, are to set values to 5000 once their subscripts have been transferred to INDEX, or to record the fact that a subscript has been used in INDEX by using a separate Boolean array of order 5, and set the corresponding entry to true when a subscript has been used in INDEX:

```
procedure SORT
    declare I integer
    for I <-- 1 upto 5 do
        VALUE <-- 5000
        for POS <-- 1 upto 5 do
            if NUMBERS[PQS] < VALUUE then
                        VALUE <-- NUMBERS[POS]
                INDEX[I] <-- POS
            endif
        endfor
        NUMBERS[INDEX[I]] <-- 5000
    endfor
endprocedure SORT
```

```
procedure SORT
    declare I integer
    declare USED boolean array [1..5]
    for I <-- 1 upto 5 do
        USED [I] <-- false
    endfor
    for I <-- 1 upto 5 do
        VALUE <-- 5000
        for POS <-- 1 upto 5 do
            if notUSED[POS] then
            if NUMBERS[POS] < VALUE then
                VALUE <-- NUMBERS[POS]
                INDEX[I] <-- POS
            endif
        endif
        endfor
        USED [I] <-- true
endfor
endprocedure SORT
Award marks as follows:
```

[2 marks] for outer loop; ([1 mark] for any loop, [1 mark] for 1 upto 5)
[1 mark] for setting INDEX[I] <-- POS (i.e. change from INDEX[1])
[3 marks] for not re-testing a value once the subscript has been used in INDEX:
(e.g. setting NUMBERS[INDEX[I]] <-- 5000, or setting USED[I] <-- true and testing if notUSED[POS] then)

- [1 mark] for any attempt at this
- [2 marks] for a good, but incorrect, attempt
- [3 marks] for a totally correct solution (NOTE: if the "Boolean" method is used, do not deduct marks for not including the initialisation to true or declaring the equivalent of USED)
(d) procedure SORTED
declare POS integer

```
        for POS <-- 1 upto 5 do
            SORTED[POS] <-- NUMBERS[INDEX[POS]]
        endfor
        endprocedure SORTED
```

        Award marks as follows:
    [1 mark] for correct loop and declaration of variable as an integer [1 mark] for a correct array and subscript for SORTED in the assignment [2 marks] for value in the assignment ([1 mark] for a good, but incorrect, attempt at using INDEX and NUMBERS to get the value). The candidate may have separated the values, which is acceptable, e.g:

```
for POS <-- 1 upto 5 do
    SUB <-- INDEX[POS]
    SORTED[POS] <-- NUMBERS [SUB]
endfor
```

(e) Two solutions are:

```
procedure TALLY
    declare POS, COUNT, CURRENT integer
    POS <-- 1
    COUNT <-- 1
    CURRENT <-- ORDERED[1]
    repeat
        while POS < 600 and ORDERED[POS+1] = CURRENT do
            COUNT <-- COUNT+1
            CURRENT <-- ORDERED[POS+1]
            POS <-- POS+1
        endwhile
        output CURRENT, " is stored ", COUNT, " times "
        if POS < 600 then
            CURRENT <-- ORDERED[POS+1]
            COUNT <-- }
        else
            output ORDERED[600], " is stored once "
        endif
    until POS = 600
endprocedure TALLY
```

Or:

```
procedure TALLY
    declare POS, COUNT, LAST integer
    COUNT <-- 1
    LAST <-- ORDERED[1]
    for POS <-- 2 upto 600 do
        if ORDERED[POS] = LAST then
            COUNT <-- COUNT+1
        else
            output LAST, " is stored ", COUNT, " times "
            LAST <-- ORDERED[POS]
            COUNT <-- 1
        endif
    enddo
    output LAST, " is stored ", COUNT, " times "
endprocedure TALLY
Award marks as follows:
```

[2 marks] for initialisations ([1 mark] for an incomplete list).
[1 mark] for outer loop until 600 locations have been tested
[2 marks] for a correct test of same values (e.g. ORDERED[POS+1] = CURRENT in the while, or ORDERED[POS] = LAST in the if etc.); ([1 mark] for a reasonable, but incorrect, attempt)
[2 marks] for a correct increment of a counter (eg COUNT) in the correct place ([1 markJ for a reasonable, but incorrect, attempt)
[2 marks] for correctly updating test value (i.e. CURRENT<--ORDERED[POS+1] in the first algorithm, or LAST<--ORDERED[POS] in the second) in the correct place ([I markJ for a reasonable, but wrong, attempt in the correct place, or correct statements in the wrong place; [0 marks] for a reasonable, but wrong, attempt in a incorrect place) [2 marks] for the output (the wording is not important, even though it is given in the question, but it must contain the equivalent of CURRENT/LAST and COUNT and be in the correct position for both marks, deduct a mark for any of these points that are missing (but do not give [-1 mark] if all are missing!))
[1 mark] for a good attempt at the final output required (i.e. as part of the else in algorithm 1 for a single value in location 600 , or in the final display in algorithm 2)
(a) Award [1 mark] for any feasible sensor.
e.g. Temperature, moisture, pressure, barometric etc.
(b) Award marks as follows, up to [2 marks] max:

- new supercomputers would have predicted bad storm [1 mark], whereas less powerful ones didn't [1 mark].
- newer computers will be able to process equations faster [1 mark], giving forecasts earlier [1 mark].
- new computers will be able to process more complex equations (i.e. more than 7 variables) [1 mark], giving more accurate predictions [1 mark].
(c) Award [1 mark] for defining archive data, and [2 marks] for a clear description of its use ([1 mark] for a reasonable attempt), up to [3 marks] max:
- Data kept after initial use / for long-term store not required for on-line access [1 mark]
- Used for research / tracking history [1 mark] to test for patterns [1 mark]
(d) Award marks à follows:
(i) - Data collection site $\Rightarrow$ National Weather Service [1 mark]
(ii) - forecasting based on it [1 mark], so important for accuracy [1 mark]
(e) Award [1 mark] for a correct identification, and [2 marks] for a clear reason, for two reasons, giving a maximum of [6 marks].
new media will take less space [1 mark]. As archive data continues to increase [1 mark], it will keep space used to a minimum if more compact media is used [1 mark] current media will become out-of-data / obsolete [1 mark]. New media is always being developed [1 mark] and if data is not changed with the new media, it may not be able to be read [1 mark].
(f) (i) Award [1 mark] for:
the bad snow storm [1 mark]
(ii) Award up to [3 marks] maximum for a discussion on trusting computers more than people, eg:
peoples' skills become devalued / not trusted [1 mark] so less people will have those skills [1 mark], and since people program computers [1 mark] forecasts will get worse [1 mark]
(g) Award [1 mark] for a suitable form and up to [2 marks] for a clear outline ([1 mark] for a partial outline), for two forms of output, up to [6 marks] maximum, e.g:

Text [1 mark], a forecast in printed form [1 mark], so that a weather forecaster can read it out [1 mark].

Graphic [1 mark], a forecast in pictorial form [1 mark] so that a copy can be shown on the television as a map so that viewers can see it [1 mark].

Note: the question does not require the candidate to explicitly state the form (e.g. text or graphic), so if the format is clear from the description, allocate this mark as well.
3. (a) Allow other answers that involve data storage that is input and storage of data that may change.

To store the data from the sensors [1 mark]
(b) Award [1 mark] for any feasible input device, and [1 mark] for a good attempt at a description / reason. Award [1 mark] for any feasible output device, and [1 mark] for a good attempt at a description / reason. To a maximum of $[4$ marks]. If it is feasible, possible and sensible, and if the description works award the marks even if its not likely e.g.
keyboard / keypad [1 mark] to allow entry (code) of destination [1 mark]
presence sensor / any feasible sensor [1 mark] so that it doesn't hit any objects / people [1 mark]

Speaker / sound device [1 mark] to warn people of approaching buggy [1 mark] (Remember, no marks for motor as this is given in the question)
(c) Award [1 mark] for identifying a suitable implication, and [2 marks] for a good discussion for [3 marks] maximum. e.g:

Loss of work time [1 mark]. Without buggy heavy objects cannot be transported / have to be done by hand [1 mark] which will slow / halt production [1 mark].

Possible danger [1 mark]. If any sensor malfunctions / doesn't work [1 mark] then if there is not an auto-shut off [1 mark] the buggy may crash into objects / people [1 mark] (causing injury).

Note: the candidate does not have to identify the implication explicitly. If it is clear from the description, this mark is to be awarded.
(d) Award up to [3 marks] maximum by giving [1 mark] per valid point. e.g:
the new layout must be recorded into the buggy's processor [1 mark] the ROM must be reprogrammed [1 mark] by creating a new one [1 mark]
if movement is by sensing (e.g. following white line on floor, reading barcodes around the factory etc.) [1 mark]
these will have to be relocated [1 mark]
time will be required to do this [1 mark]
therefore must be planned / tested beforehand / or time lost [1 mark]
must be tested thoroughly, otherwise collisions may occur [1 mark]
Do not give any marks for a statement along the lines of 'the buggy will crash', unless justified (similar to the final point above).

