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Political Science Political Science Set The health component is not addressed adequately in the planning of WMD. Such is because the health component has to be used in the evaluation of the key impacts of WMD to the environment and society (Gronlund, & MacDonald, 2014). These entails issues related to both flora and fauna at the point of release of the WMD.   
States and local governments and the associated health care facilities will have sufficient funding, which will ensure that they have the ability to plan and prepare for all the incidents (ONeil, 2003). This should occur because the national government has to invest heavily on the security agencies and levels of the country to protect its citizens.   
Set 2   
The objective that needs revision is that of hazard identification and quantification. Such is because vulnerability of the drones is highly based on the technology that is used to develop and control the drones. As such, terrorist may have an access to such a technology, which will give them room to control and manage the drones for their benefit to attack native and other citizens (Bentley, 2011). Hence, the component of technology and its important in improving the security level of the drones has to be involved in the illustration of this objective.   
The proposed objective is the evaluation of the technology level for the system maintenance and continuous monitoring of the drones to detect instances of technical impairment or tampering of the drones.   
Some of the issues to arise include security of the drone, technical infrastructure of the drone and responsibility of drone monitoring and management (Jensen, 2006).   
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