Notes from Session 7

Medical

There were the following comments in the plenary discussion of the session on Medical:

- Dr. Hall – it would be interesting to explore the parallels between computer viral transmission and biological viral transmission because discovery efforts in both attempt to track and investigate the infection after the infection has begun.
- ?? – It depends on how the virus is spread. If it is spread via email then the parallels are strong, but if it is a specifically targeted attack (by proxy or otherwise) then the parallels may not be so strong.
- Mr. Zeltzer – there is still a lack of use of technology for reporting outbreak information
- Dr. Taylor – there is a specific difference between computer and biological viruses in that some computer viruses are programmed to strike on specific days, etc.
- Mr. Taylor – other parallels include susceptibility or lack of susceptibility based on inoculation and/or temperament of the user.
- Dr. Lem – there are strong parallels between IA practices and sexually transmitted diseases and infections.
- Col. (Ret'd) Alward – two aspects of computer viruses are that a global infection can be very quick and that a computer virus is human-induced.
- Dr. Lem – there are parallels in those cases to bio-terrorism. Visualizations can help to identify nodes with different characteristics.
- Col. (Ret'd) Alward – there could be value in a real time social network display during an outbreak so that you can take actions to contain it.
- Dr. Lem – when you have smarter agents you can more effective simulations.
- ?? – There is a simulation online of the spread of the whinnie worm.
- Mr. Taylor – the analogy is reasonable because the computer model can take in parameters for susceptibility. However, physical proximity is not a factor for computer virus propagation. Dr. Lem notes that in that sense, an analogy to a neural network would fit more appropriately.