Solution and evaluation:

The first task was rated as 30%, the second task was rated as 70%.

In the first task, the first two questions were graded as 1/4 each, and the last as 1/2. The full score for the first task was rounded.

a. It is only possible to get to א from ד, with the probability of 0.5. The probability to get to ד when opening the net is 0.25. Then, the probability of (a) is 0.25 * 0.5 = 0.125

b. This is only possible thru ב -> ד -> א -> ב . Then, p(b) = 0.25 * 1 * 0.5 * 1 = 0.125

c. We need to calculate the probability of not getting to ∞. The probability of not getting to ∞ when opening the internet is 3/4. Whether the user starts at א or ב, she will get to ד, in two or one steps, respectively. At ד, the user avoids getting to ∞ with the probability of 1/2. However, even if he avoids getting to ∞, she will be brought to the same choice in the next two moves. Then, the probability of avoiding getting to ∞ two times is $3/4*(1/2)^2$; three times, $3/4*(1/2)^3$. The probability to always avoid ∞ converges to zero as n tends to infinity (∞). In the probabilistic view, this means it is impossible never to get to ∞. (Alias все там будем.)

In the second task, the grading was as follows (according to the elements of the full solution). The full score for the second task was rounded.

1. On nouns, nasalization on the last vowel marks an A on nouns (⅛), nouns are ergative (⅛)
Accusative does not appear on lexical nouns, which amounts to them following the ergative pattern. -rã is considered in 5 below.

2. On personal (1 and 2 person) pronouns, DO (alias P) is marked by -a (⅛), nazalization marks S/A (⅛); personal pronouns follow accusative strategy (⅛); max is ¼
For the personal pronouns (1st and 2nd person), together with nazalization for S/A, this amounts to accusative alignment on personal pronouns. The uses of -a also prove that nazalization is not inherent on pronouns. Importantly, then, both S/A and and P functions have morphological exponence - an unusual pattern.

3. Third person pronouns overlap pronominal (the pronominal accusative -a is used) and nominal (nazalization marks A but not S) strategy. (⅛ of the full score)
This amounts to a much less frequent contrastive system. S remains unmarked.

Together, 1, 2 and 3 amount to core-argument marking split along the animacy hierarchy, with personal pronouns being accusative, lexical NPs ergative. Third person pronouns, that are caught in between, are contrastive.

4. -ɾã marks P (DO) in case it is displaced to the left (alternatively, under OSV order), but not under SOV order (¼ of the full score)
This applies both to nouns and pronouns.
Comment: One could want to distinguish between two 'layers' of marking, one morphological, the other NP clitic (or edge inflection) level. While this cannot be directly supported by the evidence (in the examples, pronominal arguments are not expanded rightwards; and it is unclear whether they can, in the first place), we do have examples where the DO marker follows the accusative marker on pronouns (ex 5). This supports suggestion that the marking involves two different layers, and the DO marker is not part of the 'inner inflection' but is rather connected to information structure management. Indeed:

5. Both DO marker -ɾã and nazalization but not accusative marking apply to the last element of the NP (⅛ of the full score).