

Agency Consolidation

| | |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Entry #: | 81.49.2 |
| Word Count: | 35460 words |
| Reading Time: | 177 minutes |
| Last Updated: | September 27, 2025 |

"In space, no one can hear you think."

Table of Contents

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| 1 | Agency Consolidation | 2 |
| 1.1 | Introduction to Agency Consolidation | 2 |
| 1.2 | Historical Overview of Agency Consolidation | 4 |
| 1.3 | Theoretical Foundations and Rationale | 10 |
| 1.4 | Types and Models of Agency Consolidation | 15 |
| 1.5 | Process of Agency Consolidation | 21 |
| 1.6 | Case Studies of Successful Agency Consolidation | 28 |
| 1.7 | Challenges and Criticisms of Agency Consolidation | 33 |
| 1.8 | Impact on Government Performance and Service Delivery | 40 |
| 1.9 | Political Dimensions of Agency Consolidation | 46 |
| 1.10 | Global Perspectives on Agency Consolidation | 52 |
| 1.11 | Section 10: Global Perspectives on Agency Consolidation | 53 |
| 1.12 | Future Trends in Agency Consolidation | 59 |
| 1.13 | Section 11: Future Trends in Agency Consolidation | 60 |
| 1.14 | Conclusion and Key Takeaways | 67 |
| 1.15 | Section 12: Conclusion and Key Takeaways | 67 |

1 Agency Consolidation

1.1 Introduction to Agency Consolidation

Agency consolidation stands as one of the most consequential yet frequently misunderstood processes within the complex machinery of modern governance. At its heart, it represents the deliberate restructuring of governmental organizations through the merging of multiple agencies, departments, or bureaus into fewer, larger entities. This fundamental administrative act transcends mere bureaucratic reshuffling; it embodies a profound intervention into the architecture of the state, driven by aspirations for enhanced efficiency, streamlined service delivery, and more effective responses to evolving societal challenges. The concept itself is deceptively simple: combining organizational units to achieve economies of scale, reduce duplication, and create clearer lines of authority and accountability. Yet, its implementation and consequences are anything but straightforward, touching upon deeply embedded political cultures, entrenched institutional interests, and the very nature of public service.

To truly grasp agency consolidation, one must first delineate its core concepts and distinguish it from related administrative maneuvers. While often used interchangeably in casual discourse, consolidation differs subtly but significantly from terms like “merger,” “restructuring,” or “reorganization.” A merger typically implies the combination of two entities of roughly equal size and stature into a completely new organization, often leaving both original entities dissolved. Restructuring, conversely, suggests internal changes within a single agency—altering divisions, reporting lines, or functional areas without necessarily absorbing external entities. Reorganization is the broadest term, encompassing any significant change in administrative structure, which may or may not involve consolidation. Consolidation, specifically, denotes the absorption of one or more agencies into another existing or newly formed parent entity, resulting in a net reduction in the number of distinct organizational units. This distinction matters because consolidation inherently involves questions of subordination, cultural integration, and the potential loss of institutional identity for the absorbed agencies.

Further nuance arises when considering the dimensions and types of consolidation. Horizontal consolidation occurs when agencies operating at the same level of government and possessing similar or closely related functions are merged. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in the United States in 2002 stands as a monumental example, absorbing 22 disparate federal agencies—including the Coast Guard, Secret Service, and Federal Emergency Management Agency—into a single cabinet-level department focused on national security. This aimed to break down silos and foster interagency cooperation in a critical domain. Vertical consolidation, on the other hand, involves the integration of agencies operating at different hierarchical levels within the same functional area. For instance, a national government might consolidate regional environmental monitoring offices under a single national agency, centralizing oversight and standardizing procedures. Beyond these spatial dimensions, functional integration represents a key goal: the merging of agencies not just physically, but operationally, aligning their missions, processes, and cultures to deliver cohesive services or policy outcomes. The United Kingdom’s formation of HM Revenue & Customs (HMRC) in 2005, merging the Inland Revenue and HM Customs & Excise, exemplifies this drive towards functional unification in tax collection and enforcement.

The scope and relevance of agency consolidation extend far beyond the confines of a single nation or level of government. It is a recurring phenomenon across the entire spectrum of public administration, manifesting in local municipalities, states or provinces, and national governments worldwide. At the local level, city-county consolidations, such as the landmark merger of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky in 2003, represent efforts to eliminate duplication in urban service delivery, reduce administrative overhead, and create more unified regional planning. State and provincial governments frequently undergo consolidation during periods of fiscal stress, seeking to streamline operations and cut costs by merging departments with overlapping responsibilities. The global significance is underscored by the near-ubiquity of such efforts; from Australia's periodic "machinery of government" changes under different Prime Ministers, to Canada's departmental restructurings following elections, to the European Union's ongoing efforts to integrate agencies managing cross-border issues like migration or market regulation. Consolidation is not merely an administrative tool; it is intrinsically linked to broader, perennial themes in governance: the quest for efficiency in the face of rising demands and constrained resources, the balance between centralization and decentralization, the tension between specialization and coordination, and the continuous adaptation of governmental structures to meet new challenges, whether technological, economic, or societal. It reflects the dynamic nature of the state itself, constantly reshaping its internal architecture in pursuit of more effective and legitimate governance.

This article embarks on a comprehensive exploration of agency consolidation, recognizing it as a multidimensional phenomenon that cannot be fully understood through a single disciplinary lens. We will adopt a multidisciplinary approach, drawing insights from public administration, political science, economics, organizational theory, and history to construct a holistic understanding. The journey begins with a historical overview in Section 2, tracing the lineage of consolidation practices from the sophisticated administrative systems of ancient empires like Rome and China, through the rationalizing impulses of the Enlightenment and the scientific management fervor of the Progressive Era, to the complex consolidation movements of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. This historical grounding reveals that while the scale and complexity have evolved, the fundamental drivers and dilemmas of consolidation remain remarkably persistent. Following this, Section 3 delves into the theoretical foundations, examining the economic arguments for economies of scale, the administrative theories underpinning structural change, and the political and institutional theories that explain both the impetus for and resistance to consolidation. Understanding these rationales is crucial for evaluating the promises and pitfalls of consolidation efforts.

The article then progresses to Section 4, which provides a detailed typology of consolidation models, distinguishing between structural approaches (horizontal, vertical, functional), governance levels (intra-level, inter-level, multi-jurisdictional), and implementation strategies (comprehensive vs. incremental). This classification offers a framework for analyzing the diverse ways consolidation manifests in practice. Section 5 meticulously unpacks the complex process of consolidation itself, from the initial planning and feasibility studies through the fraught design phase to the critical implementation and evaluation stages, highlighting best practices and common obstacles encountered along the way. To ground this theoretical and process-oriented discussion in reality, Section 6 presents in-depth case studies of successful consolidations across different government levels, analyzing the factors that contributed to their outcomes and extracting transferable lessons. Conversely, Section 7 provides a critical counterpoint, examining the significant challenges,

theoretical critiques, and documented failures that underscore the risks inherent in consolidation, ensuring a balanced perspective.

The impact of consolidation on the tangible performance of government forms the focus of Section 8, assessing the empirical evidence regarding effects on efficiency and costs, service quality and citizen outcomes, and the internal dynamics of the workforce and organizational culture. Recognizing that consolidation is never a purely technical exercise, Section 9 explores its deeply political dimensions, including partisan influences, the powerful role of interest groups and public employee unions, and the ways electoral cycles and executive leadership shape consolidation initiatives. Expanding the perspective globally, Section 10 offers a comparative analysis of consolidation practices across different political systems—federal, unitary, and in developing nations—highlighting how cultural, institutional, and contextual factors shape approaches and outcomes. Finally, Section 11 looks towards the horizon, examining emerging trends such as technology-enabled consolidation, network governance alternatives, and how profound challenges like pandemics and climate change are influencing future organizational models in the public sector. By navigating this comprehensive landscape, the article aims to equip policymakers, practitioners, scholars, and engaged citizens with a deep, nuanced understanding of agency consolidation—its forces, forms, processes, consequences, and its enduring place in the ongoing project of shaping effective and responsive government.

1.2 Historical Overview of Agency Consolidation

To understand the contemporary practice of agency consolidation, we must journey backward through time to trace its historical evolution. The impulse to consolidate governmental authority and streamline administrative structures is far from a modern phenomenon; rather, it represents a recurring theme throughout human civilization, manifesting in various forms across different eras and cultures. This historical perspective reveals not only the enduring nature of consolidation as a governance strategy but also illuminates how approaches, motivations, and outcomes have evolved in response to changing societal needs, technological capabilities, and political philosophies. From the sophisticated bureaucratic systems of ancient empires to the rationalizing reforms of the Enlightenment, and from the scientific management fervor of the Progressive Era to the complex consolidation movements of our contemporary era, the historical record offers invaluable insights into the perennial challenges and opportunities inherent in efforts to reshape governmental architecture.

The roots of administrative consolidation stretch deep into antiquity, where the first large-scale empires confronted the fundamental challenge of governing vast territories and diverse populations. The Roman Empire, particularly during its later phases, provides one of the earliest and most sophisticated examples of administrative consolidation. Facing the monumental task of administering an empire stretching from Britain to Mesopotamia, Emperor Diocletian (284-305 CE) implemented a radical restructuring of Roman governance that serves as a remarkable early case of agency consolidation. Recognizing that the empire had grown too unwieldy for a single ruler to manage effectively, Diocletian introduced the Tetrarchy, dividing the empire into eastern and western halves, each ruled by an Augustus (senior emperor) assisted by a Caesar (junior emperor). This vertical consolidation of authority created a more manageable hierarchy while simul-

taneously horizontalizing administrative functions across the two domains. More significantly, Diocletian dramatically expanded the imperial bureaucracy, consolidating previously disparate provincial administrations under a more centralized and systematic structure. He reduced the number of provinces but increased the layers of administration, creating smaller, more manageable units overseen by a hierarchical bureaucracy responsible to the emperor. This reorganization, while primarily aimed at improving military defense and tax collection, fundamentally consolidated administrative functions previously dispersed across hundreds of semi-autonomous provincial entities. Constantine I (306-337 CE) furthered this process by establishing a new administrative capital at Constantinople, effectively creating a parallel bureaucratic structure that gradually absorbed many functions of the older Roman administration. The Roman example demonstrates how even in antiquity, the challenges of scale, efficiency, and control drove rulers to consolidate administrative structures—albeit with the primary goals of enhancing imperial authority, resource extraction, and military effectiveness rather than public service delivery as conceived today.

Equally instructive are the administrative consolidation practices of Imperial China, where bureaucratic organization reached unprecedented levels of sophistication and centralization. The Qin Dynasty (221-206 BCE), though short-lived, established the template for Chinese administrative consolidation that would endure for millennia. Emperor Qin Shi Huang dismantled the feudal system of the preceding Zhou Dynasty, replacing it with a highly centralized bureaucratic structure based on commanderies and counties directly accountable to the imperial court. This represented a radical consolidation of authority, eliminating the intermediate aristocratic layers that had previously governed territories. The Han Dynasty (206 BCE-220 CE) refined this system, developing a merit-based civil service examination system that created a cohesive administrative class loyal to the central state rather than to local power centers. Perhaps the most striking example of administrative consolidation in Chinese history occurred during the Sui (581-618 CE) and Tang (618-907 CE) Dynasties, which implemented the Three Departments and Six Ministries system. This structure consolidated governmental functions into a coherent framework where the Three Departments (the Secretariat, the Chancellery, and the Department of State Affairs) handled policy formation, review, and implementation respectively, while the Six Ministries (Personnel, Revenue, Rites, War, Justice, and Works) managed specific functional domains. This arrangement represented a remarkably systematic approach to horizontal consolidation, bringing together previously disparate administrative functions under clear lines of authority and standardized procedures. The Song Dynasty (960-1279) further consolidated administrative power by deliberately weakening military authority in favor of civilian bureaucrats, creating a more unified and coordinated administrative apparatus. The Chinese example illustrates how administrative consolidation could be driven by the need to prevent regional fragmentation, standardize governance across vast territories, and create a unified administrative culture through mechanisms like the civil service examination system—principles that continue to resonate in modern consolidation efforts.

Moving from the ancient world to the Renaissance and Enlightenment periods, we witness a renewed focus on administrative consolidation as a tool for state-building and governance reform. The Italian city-states of the Renaissance, while not large empires, developed sophisticated administrative structures that consolidated various functions under municipal authority. The Republic of Venice, for instance, created a complex but unified administrative system that consolidated financial, judicial, and commercial functions under various

magistracies and councils, all ultimately accountable to the powerful Doge and the Great Council. This system allowed Venice to efficiently manage its far-flung commercial empire and maintain its position as a dominant Mediterranean power. Similarly, the Medici family in Florence gradually consolidated political and administrative authority, bringing various city functions under their control through strategic appointments and institutional reforms.

The Enlightenment era witnessed more systematic and philosophically grounded approaches to administrative consolidation, particularly in the absolutist states of continental Europe. Prussia under Frederick William I (1713-1740) and Frederick the Great (1740-1786) exemplified this trend. Frederick William I, often called the “Soldier King,” implemented sweeping administrative reforms that consolidated previously fragmented provincial administrations under a central General Directory established in 1723. This body consolidated financial, military, and domestic policy functions, creating a more unified and efficient administrative structure that enabled Prussia to punch above its weight in European affairs. Frederick the Great continued and expanded these reforms, further centralizing authority while also introducing more rational administrative principles based on Enlightenment ideals of order, efficiency, and service to the state. The Prussian model demonstrated how administrative consolidation could serve both absolutist political goals and emerging rational-bureaucratic ideals.

Similarly transformative were the administrative reforms in Austria under Maria Theresa (1740-1780) and Joseph II (1780-1790). Maria Theresa initiated a process of administrative centralization that her son Joseph II pursued with revolutionary zeal. Joseph’s reforms represented perhaps the most ambitious attempt at administrative consolidation in 18th century Europe. He dissolved numerous autonomous provincial estates and privileges, replacing them with a unified administrative structure based on districts directly accountable to Vienna. He consolidated judicial systems, standardized tax collection, and created a more hierarchical and centralized bureaucracy. These reforms, though many were reversed after his death, embodied the Enlightenment belief in rational, centralized administration as the key to effective governance and modernization.

France provides another compelling example of Enlightenment-era administrative consolidation, particularly in the lead-up to and aftermath of the French Revolution. The Ancien Régime was characterized by a patchwork of overlapping jurisdictions, privileges, and administrative structures that created inefficiency and confusion. The revolutionary government sought to dismantle this system and replace it with a more rational, unified administrative structure. The Constitution of 1791 divided France into departments, districts, and municipalities with standardized powers and responsibilities, effectively consolidating hundreds of disparate local administrative units into a coherent national system. This process was further refined under Napoleon, who created the prefectural system that centralized administrative authority under officials directly appointed by and accountable to Paris. The French revolutionary and Napoleonic administrative reforms were groundbreaking in their systematic approach to administrative consolidation, emphasizing uniformity, hierarchy, and direct accountability to the central state—principles that would profoundly influence administrative development throughout Europe and beyond.

The early modern period also witnessed significant administrative consolidation in England, though following a different trajectory than its continental counterparts. The Tudor monarchs, particularly Henry VIII,

initiated a process of consolidating royal authority and administrative functions that continued under the Stuarts and reached its apogee in the 18th century. The creation of the Treasury as a consolidated financial institution, the development of more centralized revenue collection, and the gradual subordination of local administration to central authority all represented forms of administrative consolidation. Perhaps most significant was the emergence of cabinet government in the 18th century, which consolidated executive authority under a body of ministers collectively responsible to Parliament. This development represented a form of horizontal consolidation, bringing together previously separate departmental functions under a more coordinated executive structure.

The transition to the 19th and early 20th centuries brought new ideological influences to bear on administrative consolidation, particularly the rise of scientific management and the Progressive movement. The Progressive Era (roughly 1890s-1920s) in the United States represented a watershed moment in the application of systematic thinking to governmental organization, profoundly shaping modern approaches to agency consolidation. This period was characterized by a growing belief that the problems of an increasingly complex, industrialized society could be solved through the application of scientific principles and professional expertise to government. The influence of Frederick Winslow Taylor's "scientific management" concepts was particularly profound, as reformers sought to apply his ideas about efficiency, standardization, and systematic organization to the public sector.

Taylor's 1911 monograph "The Principles of Scientific Management" argued that industrial efficiency could be dramatically improved through careful analysis of work processes, time and motion studies, standardization of tools and procedures, and clear separation of planning from execution. While initially developed for factory settings, these ideas quickly found their way into public administration through the efforts of Progressive reformers who saw in scientific management a solution to the perceived inefficiency, corruption, and patronage that plagued government at all levels. The New York Bureau of Municipal Research, founded in 1906, became a leading proponent of applying scientific management principles to government, conducting detailed studies of municipal operations and recommending reorganizations based on efficiency criteria. These reformers viewed agency consolidation not merely as a way to reduce costs but as a means to create more rational, professional, and effective governmental structures based on scientific principles rather than political expediency.

The impact of scientific management on federal agency organization became most evident during World War I, when the Wilson administration created numerous new agencies to manage the war effort. The War Industries Board, led by Bernard Baruch, represented a massive consolidation of industrial regulation and production planning functions previously dispersed across multiple departments. Similarly, the Committee on Public Information consolidated propaganda and public communication functions under George Creel. These wartime consolidations, while temporary, demonstrated the potential efficiency gains and coordination benefits that could be achieved through centralized administrative structures.

The most significant institutional embodiment of Progressive Era scientific management principles in federal organization was the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. This landmark legislation represented a fundamental consolidation of financial management functions within the federal government. Prior to 1921,

federal budgeting was a fragmented process, with each department submitting its funding requests directly to Congress without central coordination or executive oversight. The lack of centralized budget authority made it virtually impossible to control spending, coordinate priorities, or assess the overall efficiency of government operations. The Budget and Accounting Act addressed these problems by creating the Bureau of the Budget (later to become the Office of Management and Budget) within the Treasury Department, consolidating budget preparation and executive oversight functions under a single agency headed by a presidential appointee. The Act also established the General Accounting Office (now the Government Accountability Office) as an independent audit agency, consolidating financial accountability and oversight functions. This legislation fundamentally transformed the relationship between the executive branch and Congress regarding fiscal matters and created a powerful institutional mechanism for promoting administrative efficiency and coordination across federal agencies. The Bureau of the Budget would go on to play a crucial role in subsequent reorganization efforts, using its control of the budget process to encourage or force agencies to consolidate functions and eliminate duplication.

The influence of scientific management and Progressive ideals on agency consolidation extended well beyond the federal level. State and local governments across the country undertook significant reorganizations during this period, inspired by the efficiency movement. In 1917, Illinois Governor Frank Lowden appointed a Commission on Economy and Efficiency that recommended sweeping consolidations of state agencies, leading to the creation of a consolidated Department of Finance and a unified system of state institutions. Similarly, Ohio in 1919 created a Department of Administration that consolidated various support functions previously dispersed across multiple agencies. At the municipal level, city manager governments emerged as a popular reform, consolidating executive authority under a professionally trained administrator rather than elected officials or fragmented commissions. These municipal consolidations were explicitly justified in terms of efficiency, expertise, and coordination—core values of the scientific management movement.

The Hoover Commissions of the mid-20th century represent the culmination and evolution of Progressive Era scientific management approaches to agency consolidation. The first Hoover Commission, formally known as the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, operated from 1947 to 1949 under the leadership of former President Herbert Hoover. Comprising leading figures from business, academia, and government, the Commission conducted a comprehensive review of federal agency organization and operations, producing 273 recommendations in 19 task force reports. The Commission's work was explicitly grounded in the principles of scientific management and business efficiency, viewing government through the lens of organizational theory and managerial best practices. Its recommendations included numerous agency consolidations aimed at eliminating duplication, improving coordination, and increasing efficiency. Notably, the Commission recommended the creation of a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (later to become Health and Human Services and Education), consolidating numerous previously separate agencies dealing with social welfare, public health, and education. This recommendation was implemented in 1953, creating one of the largest federal departments and demonstrating the enduring influence of consolidation as a strategy for improving governmental organization.

The second Hoover Commission, operating from 1953 to 1955 under President Eisenhower, continued this work with an emphasis on improving the management of executive branch operations. While it produced

fewer recommendations for large-scale agency consolidations than its predecessor, it focused on improving coordination and efficiency within existing structures. The Commission's advocacy for performance budgeting and clearer lines of authority reflected the continuing influence of scientific management principles, even as new administrative theories were beginning to emerge.

The mid-20th century witnessed the gradual evolution of agency consolidation approaches as new administrative theories and political contexts emerged. The traditional model of hierarchical, centralized consolidation rooted in scientific management began to give way to more nuanced approaches that recognized the complexity of governmental operations and the importance of factors beyond mere efficiency. This evolution became particularly evident during the 1960s and 1970s, as the expansion of government programs and the rise of new public administration theories challenged traditional consolidation models.

The creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in 1965 and the Department of Transportation (DOT) in 1966 represented significant consolidations that reflected both traditional efficiency concerns and newer policy coordination imperatives. HUD consolidated numerous housing and urban development programs previously scattered across multiple agencies, recognizing the need for a more coordinated approach to urban issues. Similarly, DOT brought together transportation functions from the Department of Commerce and other agencies, creating a unified approach to national transportation policy. These consolidations were driven not merely by efficiency considerations but by a recognition that complex policy domains required comprehensive, coordinated administrative structures.

The 1970s saw further evolution in consolidation approaches with the creation of the Department of Energy (1977) and the Department of Education (1979). The Department of Energy consolidated energy-related functions from dozens of agencies, reflecting both the energy crisis of the period and the need for a comprehensive national energy policy. The Department of Education, meanwhile, elevated education to cabinet status, consolidating numerous education programs previously administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These consolidations demonstrated how policy coherence and political priorities could drive agency reorganization alongside traditional efficiency concerns.

The 1980s and 1990s witnessed the rise of the New Public Management (NPM) movement, which fundamentally reshaped approaches to agency consolidation. Emerging first in the United Kingdom under Margaret Thatcher and then spreading to the United States under Ronald Clinton and Al Gore's "Reinventing Government" initiative, NPM represented a paradigm shift in thinking about governmental organization. Rather than emphasizing hierarchical consolidation and centralized control, NPM emphasized decentralization, competition, market mechanisms, and customer service. This seemingly paradoxical development actually led to new forms of consolidation focused on creating more autonomous, mission-driven agencies while consolidating oversight and support functions.

The United Kingdom's Next Steps Initiative, launched in 1988, exempl

1.3 Theoretical Foundations and Rationale

The evolution of agency consolidation practices from the Progressive Era through New Public Management naturally leads us to examine the theoretical frameworks that underpin these governmental reorganizations. While historical examples demonstrate the persistent appeal of consolidation, the intellectual foundations supporting or critiquing such efforts draw from diverse academic disciplines, each offering distinct lenses through which to understand the rationales, mechanics, and consequences of merging governmental entities. These theoretical perspectives are not merely academic exercises; they actively shape how policymakers conceptualize consolidation, how administrators implement it, and how scholars evaluate its outcomes. The interplay between economic imperatives, administrative principles, and political realities creates a complex theoretical landscape that explains both the enduring allure of consolidation and the often-contentious nature of its implementation. Understanding these theoretical foundations is essential for moving beyond surface-level descriptions to grasp the deeper forces driving governmental restructuring efforts across time and context.

Economic theories provide some of the most powerful rationales for agency consolidation, centering on efficiency gains and resource optimization. The concept of economies of scale stands as perhaps the most fundamental economic justification for merging governmental organizations. This principle posits that as organizations grow larger, the average cost of producing goods or services decreases due to factors such as spreading fixed costs over more units, bulk purchasing advantages, and specialization opportunities. In the governmental context, economies of scale suggest that larger, consolidated agencies can deliver services at lower per-unit costs than smaller, fragmented entities. For instance, the 2005 merger of the UK's Inland Revenue and HM Customs & Excise to form HM Revenue & Customs (HMRC) was explicitly justified by projected economies of scale. The consolidation aimed to eliminate duplicate administrative functions, reduce overlapping IT systems, and create a unified tax collection apparatus capable of processing more cases with fewer resources. The Treasury estimated annual savings of £1.5 billion, primarily through reducing overhead costs and achieving operational efficiencies that smaller, separate agencies could not match. Similarly, the consolidation of numerous federal agencies into the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in 2002 was predicated partly on achieving economies of scale in security-related functions, from procurement to personnel management, by leveraging the purchasing power and administrative capacity of a larger organization. However, the empirical evidence on whether such economies of scale materialize as predicted remains mixed, with many studies finding that initial cost savings are often offset by increased coordination costs and bureaucratic complexity in the merged entity.

Closely related to economies of scale is the concept of economies of scope, which argues that organizations can achieve cost advantages by producing a variety of related products or services rather than specializing in a single output. In governmental terms, this suggests that agencies delivering complementary services can reduce costs and improve effectiveness by consolidating under a single administrative umbrella. The creation of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) in 1953 embodied this principle, bringing together health, education, and social welfare programs that served overlapping populations and required similar professional expertise. The theoretical rationale was that a consolidated department could

develop integrated service delivery models, share specialized resources like epidemiologists or educational researchers, and provide more holistic approaches to social problems than separate agencies operating in silos. While HEW was later split into the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education in 1979, the initial consolidation reflected the economic logic of scope economies in public administration.

Transaction cost economics offers another influential economic perspective on agency consolidation. Developed by Oliver Williamson, this theory focuses on the costs associated with economic exchanges between parties, including information gathering, negotiation, monitoring, and enforcement. Applied to government, transaction cost economics suggests that fragmentation creates high transaction costs when agencies must coordinate, share information, or collaborate on service delivery. Consolidation theoretically reduces these transaction costs by bringing related functions under a single management structure with unified reporting lines, shared information systems, and integrated decision-making processes. The establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1970 exemplifies this rationale. Prior to the EPA's creation, environmental regulation was fragmented across multiple agencies, including the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (air pollution), the Department of the Interior (water pollution), and the Department of Agriculture (pesticides). This fragmentation created high transaction costs for regulated entities facing multiple regulators and for the government itself struggling to coordinate policy. The EPA consolidated these functions under one roof, theoretically reducing transaction costs for both government and the regulated community by creating a single point of contact and unified regulatory framework. However, critics argue that consolidation can sometimes increase internal transaction costs by creating larger, more complex organizations where information flows become impeded and coordination challenges persist despite formal unification.

Public choice theory provides a more skeptical economic perspective on agency consolidation, viewing government organizations through the lens of individual and group self-interest rather than abstract notions of public good. Developed by scholars like James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock, public choice theory applies economic analysis to political behavior, assuming that politicians, bureaucrats, and interest groups act rationally to maximize their own utility rather than some collective welfare function. From this perspective, agency consolidation initiatives often reflect rent-seeking behavior by political actors seeking to expand their power or by bureaucrats attempting to increase their budgets and jurisdictional authority. For instance, the creation of large consolidated departments may allow cabinet secretaries to control larger budgets and command more political influence than ministers of smaller agencies. Similarly, bureaucrats may support consolidation if it promises greater career advancement opportunities or organizational prestige. Public choice theory also warns of the principal-agent problems that can emerge in large consolidated agencies, where political leaders (principals) have difficulty monitoring and controlling the behavior of unelected bureaucrats (agents) who may pursue their own agendas. The theory suggests that consolidation can exacerbate these problems by creating larger, more complex agencies with greater autonomy from political oversight. The troubled early years of the Department of Homeland Security illustrate these concerns, as the massive consolidated agency faced challenges in aligning the diverse interests of its component parts and maintaining effective political control over its sprawling operations.

Beyond economic theories, administrative theories offer crucial insights into the organizational dynamics of agency consolidation. Classical organizational theory, rooted in the work of Max Weber and Frederick Taylor, provides a foundational perspective that emphasizes hierarchy, specialization, formal rules, and impersonal relationships as essential elements of efficient organizations. From this viewpoint, agency consolidation can improve governmental performance by creating clearer lines of authority, reducing duplicated functions, and establishing more rational division of labor. Weber's concept of the ideal bureaucracy—with its hierarchical structure, clearly defined responsibilities, and merit-based advancement—suggests that consolidation can move fragmented agencies closer to this ideal model by eliminating overlapping jurisdictions and creating more unified command structures. The scientific management principles that influenced the Hoover Commissions directly reflect this classical perspective, as those commissions sought to apply rational, hierarchical analysis to governmental organization. However, classical theory also acknowledges potential downsides of consolidation, particularly the risk of creating overly large, rigid bureaucracies that become unresponsive to changing conditions and develop their own self-serving dynamics. The tension between the efficiency gains of consolidation and the dangers of bureaucratic rigidity forms a central theme in administrative theory.

Bureaucratic politics theory offers a contrasting perspective that emphasizes the role of organizational interests, power struggles, and competing missions in shaping agency behavior and consolidation outcomes. Developed by scholars like Graham Allison and Morton Halperin, this view conceptualizes government not as a unified rational actor but as a collection of competing semi-autonomous organizations, each with its own interests, perspectives, and standard operating procedures. From this standpoint, agency consolidation is not merely a technical reorganization exercise but a political battleground where different organizational cultures, professional norms, and stakeholder interests clash. The merger of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and elements of the Coast Guard and Transportation Security Administration into DHS provides a compelling example. The FAA, with its long-standing safety culture and technical expertise, struggled to integrate with the more security-oriented DHS culture, leading to tensions over priorities and operational approaches. Bureaucratic politics theory suggests that such conflicts are inevitable when agencies with distinct missions and organizational identities are forced together, and that consolidation outcomes reflect the relative power and influence of the competing organizational factions rather than some abstract rational design. This perspective helps explain why many consolidations fail to achieve their promised synergies, as the component parts continue to operate according to their pre-merger logics despite formal unification.

Systems theory and complexity approaches offer a more nuanced administrative perspective on agency consolidation, viewing organizations as complex adaptive systems embedded in larger environmental contexts. Rather than assuming that consolidation can be designed through rational planning, this approach emphasizes the emergent, non-linear properties of organizational systems and the importance of feedback loops, adaptation, and self-organization. From a systems perspective, agency consolidation can be seen as an intervention into a complex ecosystem of governmental organizations, with unpredictable consequences that depend on the specific interconnections between agencies and their environments. The creation of the Department of Energy in 1977 illustrates this complexity. The consolidation brought together agencies with diverse missions—from nuclear weapons development at the Energy Research and Development Administration to

energy regulation at the Federal Energy Administration—creating a single department with inherently conflicting goals. Systems theory would predict that such a consolidation would generate unexpected dynamics as these different components interact, potentially leading to suboptimal outcomes as the system seeks equilibrium. Indeed, the Department of Energy has faced persistent challenges in balancing its dual missions of energy security and nuclear weapons management. Complexity approaches further suggest that large-scale consolidations may be inherently problematic because they reduce the diversity and redundancy that can make governmental systems more resilient to shocks. The COVID-19 pandemic, for instance, revealed how consolidated public health systems could struggle to adapt quickly compared to more decentralized arrangements, highlighting the trade-offs between efficiency and resilience that systems theory emphasizes.

Political and institutional theories provide yet another crucial dimension to understanding agency consolidation, focusing on how power relations, institutional contexts, and broader political dynamics shape consolidation efforts. Institutional theories of organizational change, drawing on the work of scholars like Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell, emphasize how organizations are embedded in institutional environments that prescribe appropriate structures and practices through regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive mechanisms. From this perspective, agency consolidation often occurs not primarily for efficiency reasons but because it conforms to institutional expectations about what constitutes “modern” or “effective” government organization. The global spread of New Public Management reforms during the 1980s and 1990s exemplifies this dynamic, as governments worldwide adopted consolidation and other NPM-inspired reforms not necessarily because of clear evidence of their effectiveness in their specific contexts, but because these reforms had become institutionalized as the “proper” way to organize government. The rise of performance management, autonomous agencies, and consolidated service centers became taken-for-granted elements of contemporary governance, creating isomorphic pressures for governments to adopt similar structures regardless of local conditions. This institutional isomorphism helps explain why consolidation initiatives often follow similar patterns across very different political and administrative systems.

Power dynamics and political influences feature prominently in political theories of agency consolidation, which view reorganization efforts as fundamentally political contests rather than technical exercises. From this perspective, consolidation initiatives reflect the relative power of different political actors, including elected officials, bureaucratic leaders, interest groups, and legislative bodies. The creation of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) in 1989 as a cabinet-level department, for instance, reflected the growing political power of veterans’ organizations and their allies in Congress, who successfully advocated for elevating the previously independent Veterans Administration to cabinet status to increase its visibility and budgetary authority. Similarly, the periodic reorganizations of federal agencies following presidential elections often reflect the new administration’s political priorities and desire to reward allies, as much as any objective assessment of administrative efficiency. The Obama administration’s creation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) in 2011 as an independent bureau within the Federal Reserve system represented a political compromise that reflected both the administration’s commitment to consumer protection and the need to navigate opposition from financial industry interests and congressional Republicans. Political theories remind us that agency consolidation is never neutral; it always creates winners and losers in terms of power, resources, and influence, and these distributional consequences shape both the decision

to consolidate and the form that consolidation takes.

Institutional isomorphism and mimetic processes, concepts developed by DiMaggio and Powell, offer particular insight into why consolidation initiatives often follow similar patterns across different contexts and time periods. These processes suggest that organizations adopt similar structures not necessarily because those structures are objectively superior, but because they confer legitimacy and reduce uncertainty. Mimetic isomorphism occurs when organizations imitate others perceived as successful or legitimate, particularly in ambiguous situations where the appropriate course of action is unclear. In the governmental context, this explains why countries often adopt similar consolidation models—for instance, the creation of consolidated border protection agencies following the U.S. formation of DHS, seen in countries like Canada with the Canada Border Services Agency and Australia with the Australian Border Force. These agencies adopted similar structures and approaches not necessarily based on rigorous analysis of their specific needs, but because the DHS model became the institutionalized template for border security organization in the post-9/11 era. Coercive isomorphism, driven by formal and informal pressures from powerful external actors, also plays a role in consolidation processes. International organizations like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund have often promoted agency consolidation as part of structural adjustment programs, exerting coercive pressure on borrowing countries to reorganize their governmental structures according to preferred models. Normative isomorphism, stemming from professionalization and educational networks, further contributes to the spread of similar consolidation approaches, as public administration professionals trained in similar programs and exposed to the same “best practices” literature implement comparable reforms across different jurisdictions.

The theoretical foundations of agency consolidation thus reveal a complex interplay of economic, administrative, and political forces that both drive and constrain governmental reorganization efforts. Economic theories emphasize efficiency gains through scale and scope economies while warning of potential inefficiencies from bureaucratic bloat and principal-agent problems. Administrative theories highlight the tensions between rational design and organizational complexity, between hierarchical control and adaptive capacity. Political and institutional theories underscore how power dynamics, institutional contexts, and mimetic processes shape consolidation outcomes in ways that often diverge from technical efficiency considerations. These theoretical perspectives do not provide simple answers about when consolidation is appropriate or how it should be implemented; rather, they offer complementary frameworks for understanding the multifaceted nature of agency consolidation and the often-unintended consequences that flow from efforts to reshape governmental architecture. The richness and occasional contradictions among these theories reflect the inherent complexity of governmental organization itself—a complexity that no single theoretical lens can fully capture. As we move from theoretical foundations to examining specific types and models of consolidation in the next section, these theoretical frameworks will continue to illuminate the choices, challenges, and consequences that characterize efforts to consolidate governmental agencies in pursuit of more effective and efficient governance.

1.4 Types and Models of Agency Consolidation

The theoretical foundations discussed in Section 3 provide a crucial framework for understanding the diverse manifestations of agency consolidation in practice. As we move from the abstract rationales and critiques to the concrete forms consolidation takes in the real world, we encounter a rich taxonomy of approaches and models that reflect different structural designs, governance arrangements, and implementation strategies. The complexity of governmental organizations and the varied contexts in which they operate have given rise to multiple consolidation types, each with distinct characteristics, advantages, and limitations. Understanding these different models is essential for policymakers and practitioners considering consolidation, as the choice of approach can significantly influence both the process of implementation and the ultimate outcomes. This section examines the major typologies of agency consolidation, moving from structural approaches that define how organizations are architecturally combined, to governance-level distinctions that clarify the hierarchical relationships between consolidated entities, and finally to implementation strategies that determine the pace and scope of consolidation efforts. By categorizing these diverse approaches, we can better appreciate the nuanced ways in which consolidation manifests across different governmental contexts and the factors that make certain models more appropriate for specific situations than others.

Structural approaches to consolidation represent perhaps the most fundamental way to categorize agency reorganization efforts, focusing on the architectural relationship between the entities being combined. Horizontal consolidation stands as one of the most common structural models, involving the merger of agencies operating at the same governmental level and possessing similar or closely related functions. This approach aims to eliminate duplication of effort, create economies of scale, and establish clearer lines of authority within a particular functional domain. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002 exemplifies horizontal consolidation at the federal level, bringing together 22 previously separate agencies—including the Coast Guard, Secret Service, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and Transportation Security Administration—under a single cabinet-level department. The rationale was straightforward: these agencies were all operating at the federal level with missions related to national security, but their fragmented structure was seen as hindering effective coordination and creating unnecessary administrative overhead. By consolidating them horizontally, policymakers hoped to achieve greater efficiency, improve information sharing, and create a more unified approach to homeland security challenges. However, this horizontal consolidation also illustrates the potential pitfalls of the model, as the cultures, operational procedures, and professional identities of the component agencies proved difficult to integrate, leading to persistent coordination challenges despite formal unification.

Horizontal consolidation is equally prevalent at state and local levels of government. In Virginia, the 2012 merger of the Department of Environmental Quality and the Department of Conservation and Recreation created a consolidated Department of Conservation and Recreation, combining agencies with overlapping responsibilities for environmental protection and natural resource management. This horizontal consolidation aimed to reduce administrative costs by eliminating duplicate functions like human resources, information technology, and public relations, while also creating more coordinated approaches to environmental stewardship. Similarly, the city of Indianapolis and Marion County, Indiana underwent a comprehensive

horizontal consolidation known as Unigov in 1970, merging numerous city and county departments into unified governmental structures. This consolidation eliminated duplication in service delivery, created more standardized procedures across the urban area, and established clearer accountability for governmental functions. The longevity of Unigov—still in place five decades later—suggests that horizontal consolidation can create stable and effective governmental structures when implemented thoughtfully and with attention to local context.

In contrast to horizontal consolidation, vertical consolidation involves the integration of agencies operating at different hierarchical levels within the same functional area. This approach aims to create more seamless service delivery, standardize procedures across jurisdictions, and establish clearer lines of authority from top to bottom within a particular policy domain. The transformation of public health administration in England following the 2012 Health and Social Care Act provides a compelling example of vertical consolidation. The Act abolished Primary Care Trusts, which had operated at a regional level, and transferred their functions to the Clinical Commissioning Groups and a new national body called Public Health England. This vertical consolidation aimed to create clearer lines of accountability for public health outcomes, standardize public health interventions across the country, and reduce fragmentation in the public health system. While the reorganization has been controversial, with critics arguing that it disrupted established local relationships and expertise, it clearly illustrates the vertical consolidation model's emphasis on hierarchical integration within a functional area.

Vertical consolidation is also evident in environmental governance, where national environmental agencies often consolidate regional or state-level offices under unified command structures. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's regional structure represents a form of vertical consolidation, with ten regional offices that consolidate federal environmental functions across multiple states. These regional offices integrate the EPA's various programmatic functions—air quality, water quality, waste management, and more—under a single regional administrator, creating vertical integration within the agency's geographic domains. This structure aims to balance national consistency with regional responsiveness, allowing the EPA to address environmental challenges that cross state boundaries while maintaining some adaptation to local conditions. The vertical consolidation model is particularly useful for addressing policy problems that span multiple jurisdictions, as it can reduce inter-jurisdictional conflicts and create more coordinated approaches to shared challenges.

Beyond the horizontal-vertical dichotomy, functional consolidation represents another important structural approach, focusing on merging agencies based on their core missions rather than their hierarchical position or geographic scope. Functional consolidation aims to create more coherent policy domains by bringing together agencies with related purposes, even if they previously operated in different organizational contexts. The creation of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) in the United States exemplifies this approach. Established in 1980 when the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was split into HHS and the Department of Education, HHS consolidated numerous agencies related to health and social welfare—including the Food and Drug Administration, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institutes of Health, and Administration for Children and Families—under a single departmental umbrella. This functional consolidation was driven by the recognition that health and social welfare programs

are inherently interconnected, with many serving the same populations and addressing related needs. By consolidating these functionally related agencies, policymakers sought to create more integrated service delivery models, reduce administrative fragmentation, and establish clearer accountability for health and social welfare outcomes.

Cross-functional consolidation models represent a more complex structural approach, integrating agencies with complementary rather than identical functions to create synergies across policy domains. This approach recognizes that many contemporary governance challenges cut across traditional functional boundaries and require coordinated responses from multiple policy areas. The creation of the Department of Energy in 1977 illustrates cross-functional consolidation, bringing together agencies with diverse but complementary missions related to energy policy, including the Energy Research and Development Administration (focused on energy technology), the Federal Energy Administration (focused on energy regulation and pricing), and parts of the Department of the Interior (focused on energy resource management on federal lands). The rationale was that energy policy required an integrated approach spanning technology development, market regulation, and resource management—functions that had previously been dispersed across multiple agencies. While the Department of Energy has faced challenges in balancing these diverse missions, its creation exemplifies the cross-functional consolidation model's attempt to address complex, multi-faceted policy problems through organizational integration.

Another example of cross-functional consolidation can be found in the United Kingdom's creation of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) in 2001. This department consolidated functions related to environmental protection, agriculture, fisheries, and rural development—areas that had previously been handled by separate ministries. The cross-functional approach recognized that environmental policy, agricultural policy, and rural development are deeply interconnected, with decisions in one area significantly affecting outcomes in the others. For instance, agricultural practices impact environmental quality, while environmental regulations affect farming viability and rural economies. By consolidating these complementary functions, Defra aimed to create more coherent policies that would balance environmental sustainability with agricultural productivity and rural economic vitality. This cross-functional model represents an acknowledgment of the complex interdependencies that characterize many contemporary governance challenges and the limitations of more narrowly focused functional consolidation approaches.

The governance level at which consolidation occurs provides another important dimension for categorizing consolidation models. Intra-level consolidation involves merging agencies within the same level of government, such as combining multiple federal agencies into a single department or merging several city departments into a unified municipal structure. This approach focuses on improving coordination and efficiency within a particular governmental tier. The 2003 consolidation of 22 federal agencies into the Department of Homeland Security represents a clear example of intra-level consolidation at the federal level, as all the merged agencies were previously part of the federal executive branch. Similarly, the 2018 merger of the Department of Communications and the Arts and the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development in Australia to create the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development exemplifies intra-level consolidation at the national level. This consolidation aimed to create more integrated approaches to infrastructure development and regional policy by bringing together related functions within

the same governmental level.

Intra-level consolidation is also common at state and local levels of government. In Minnesota, the 2017 merger of the Departments of Health and Human Services created a single consolidated agency responsible for the state's health and social welfare programs. This intra-level consolidation aimed to reduce administrative costs, eliminate duplication between the two departments, and create more integrated service delivery models for Minnesota residents. At the local level, the 1995 consolidation of the City of Toronto with five surrounding municipalities to create an amalgamated City of Toronto represents a dramatic example of intra-level consolidation. This merger eliminated six separate municipal governments and their respective departments, creating a single unified municipal structure. Proponents argued that the consolidation would reduce administrative overhead, create economies of scale in service delivery, and establish more coordinated planning for the entire metropolitan area. While the Toronto amalgamation remains controversial, with critics arguing that it reduced local responsiveness and failed to achieve promised cost savings, it clearly illustrates the intra-level consolidation model's application at the municipal level.

Inter-level consolidation, in contrast, involves merging agencies across different levels of government, such as combining federal and state agencies or integrating county and municipal functions. This more complex approach aims to improve coordination across governmental tiers, reduce intergovernmental conflicts, and create more seamless service delivery for citizens. The creation of unified transportation agencies that combine federal, state, and sometimes local transportation functions exemplifies this model. In Germany, the Autobahn police represent a form of inter-level consolidation, integrating federal and state law enforcement functions for highway policing. These officers are employed by the individual German states (Länder) but operate under federal regulations and coordinate closely with federal transportation authorities. This inter-level consolidation creates more consistent enforcement of traffic laws across state boundaries while maintaining some connection to state-level law enforcement structures.

Another example of inter-level consolidation can be found in environmental governance, where federal environmental agencies often establish joint offices or shared programs with state-level counterparts. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Performance Partnership Grants program represents a form of inter-level consolidation, allowing states to combine multiple federal environmental grants into a single consolidated grant with more flexibility in implementation. This program reduces administrative burdens for both federal and state agencies while creating more integrated approaches to environmental management. Similarly, in Australia, the National Water Initiative represents an inter-level consolidation effort, coordinating water management policies across federal, state, and territorial governments through a unified framework and shared governance structures. These examples demonstrate how inter-level consolidation can address policy challenges that span multiple governmental tiers without eliminating the distinct identities and authorities of different levels of government.

Multi-jurisdictional consolidation models represent the most complex governance-level approach, involving the integration of agencies across multiple distinct jurisdictions that retain some degree of legal or political autonomy. This approach is particularly relevant in federal systems or metropolitan areas with numerous local governments. The Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) in New York provides a compelling

example of multi-jurisdictional consolidation. Created in 1965, the MTA consolidated transportation functions across New York City, several suburban counties in New York State, and Connecticut, creating a unified transportation authority that operates subways, buses, commuter rail lines, and bridges and tunnels across this multi-jurisdictional region. The MTA represents a form of multi-jurisdictional consolidation because it integrates transportation services that were previously provided by separate entities in different jurisdictions, creating more coordinated regional transportation planning and operations. While the MTA has faced significant challenges over the years, including financial difficulties and tensions between different jurisdictions, it has succeeded in creating a more integrated regional transportation system than would have been possible without consolidation.

Another example of multi-jurisdictional consolidation can be found in Europe, where the European Union has created various agencies that integrate functions across multiple sovereign states. The European Medicines Agency (EMA), headquartered in Amsterdam, represents a form of multi-jurisdictional consolidation, bringing together pharmaceutical regulatory functions from EU member states into a single agency that coordinates drug approval and monitoring across the Union. While individual countries retain some regulatory authority, the EMA creates more standardized approaches to pharmaceutical regulation and reduces duplication of effort among national agencies. Similarly, the European Border and Coast Guard Agency (Frontex) consolidates border management functions across EU member states, coordinating border patrols, sharing intelligence, and providing technical support to national border authorities. These EU agencies demonstrate how multi-jurisdictional consolidation can address policy challenges that cross national boundaries while respecting the continuing sovereignty of individual states.

Beyond structural approaches and governance-level distinctions, the implementation strategy chosen for agency consolidation represents another crucial dimension that shapes both the process and outcomes of reorganization efforts. Comprehensive or “big-bang” approaches to consolidation involve implementing the entire reorganization in a single, decisive action, typically following a relatively short planning period. This approach aims to achieve rapid transformation, minimize prolonged uncertainty, and create clear break points with previous organizational arrangements. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002 exemplifies the comprehensive approach, as the legislation establishing the department mandated the transfer of all 22 component agencies within a one-year timeframe. This rapid implementation was driven by the sense of urgency following the September 11 terrorist attacks, with policymakers believing that swift action was necessary to address perceived national security vulnerabilities. The comprehensive approach allowed DHS to begin operations quickly as a unified entity, but it also created significant challenges in integrating disparate organizational cultures, information systems, and operational procedures within such a compressed timeframe.

Comprehensive consolidation approaches are also evident in other contexts. The 2005 merger of the UK’s Inland Revenue and HM Customs & Excise to form HM Revenue & Customs (HMRC) followed a relatively rapid implementation timeline, with the new agency becoming operational less than a year after the merger was announced. This compressed timeline was designed to minimize uncertainty for employees and stakeholders and to quickly achieve the anticipated efficiency gains from eliminating duplicate functions. Similarly, the 2018 merger of the Department of Communications and the Arts and the Department of

Infrastructure and Regional Development in Australia was implemented comprehensively, with the new Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development commencing operations shortly after the merger decision was announced. These examples illustrate how the comprehensive approach prioritizes speed and decisiveness in implementation, often in response to perceived crises or compelling efficiency imperatives.

In contrast to comprehensive approaches, incremental consolidation strategies involve implementing reorganization changes gradually over an extended period, typically in phases or stages. This approach aims to manage risk, allow for learning and adjustment during implementation, and minimize disruption to ongoing operations. The transformation of the UK's National Health Service (NHS) following the 2012 Health and Social Care Act provides a notable example of incremental consolidation. Rather than abolishing all existing structures immediately, the Act established a multi-year timeline for the transition from Primary Care Trusts to Clinical Commissioning Groups and Public Health England. This phased approach allowed time for new organizations to be established, for staff to be transitioned, and for systems and processes to be adapted gradually. The incremental strategy acknowledged the complexity of the NHS and the risks associated with rapid, comprehensive change, particularly for such a vital public service.

Incremental consolidation is also evident in private-sector-inspired reorganizations of government agencies. The U.S. Internal Revenue Service's modernization efforts, beginning in the late 1990s, followed an incremental approach to consolidating its organizational structure and systems. Rather than attempting a complete overhaul at once, the IRS implemented changes in phases, starting with pilot programs in specific regions or functions, evaluating results, and then gradually expanding successful initiatives across the agency. This incremental approach allowed the IRS to manage risks associated with such a massive transformation, particularly regarding potential disruptions to tax collection functions. Similarly, Canada's consolidation of its federal science departments into a single department began with preliminary steps like shared services arrangements and joint planning before moving to more formal organizational integration. This incremental strategy acknowledged the complexity of scientific research and the importance of maintaining continuity in important government functions during the transition period.

Hybrid models of consolidation implementation combine elements of both comprehensive and incremental approaches, typically implementing some aspects of the reorganization quickly while phasing in others over time. This approach attempts to balance the benefits of decisive action with the risk management advantages of gradual implementation. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security incorporated some hybrid elements, as while the formal establishment of the department and the transfer of agencies occurred relatively quickly, the integration of specific functions like information systems and procurement processes occurred more gradually over several years. This hybrid approach allowed DHS to begin operations quickly as a unified entity while acknowledging that full integration of its diverse components would require a longer timeframe.

Another example of a hybrid approach can be found in the 2003 merger of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky. While the city-county consolidation itself was implemented comprehensively through a single referendum and legislative action, the integration of specific departmental functions occurred incrementally

over several years. Some functions, like police and fire services, were merged relatively quickly, while others, such as parks and recreation and public works, were integrated more gradually. This hybrid approach allowed the consolidated government to begin operations promptly while managing the complexity of integrating dozens of separate departments and thousands of employees. The relative success of the Louisville-Jefferson County consolidation, now two decades old, suggests that hybrid models can sometimes capture the benefits of both comprehensive and incremental approaches when implemented thoughtfully.

The choice between comprehensive, incremental, and hybrid implementation strategies depends on numerous factors, including the urgency driving the consolidation, the complexity of the agencies being merged, the political environment, and the potential risks associated with disruption to essential services. Comprehensive approaches tend to be favored when there is a sense of crisis or urgency, when political windows of opportunity are narrow, or when the benefits of consolidation are expected to be significant and immediate. Incremental approaches are typically preferred when the organizations involved are complex, when continuity of operations is critical, when resistance to change is anticipated to be strong, or when the optimal organizational design is uncertain. Hybrid approaches attempt to balance these considerations, implementing some changes quickly to demonstrate momentum and achieve early wins while phasing in more complex or controversial elements over time.

As we have seen, the types and models of agency consolidation are diverse and multifaceted, reflecting the complex nature of governmental organizations and the varied contexts in which they operate. Structural approaches range from horizontal and vertical consolidation to functional and cross-functional models, each addressing different aspects of organizational fragmentation. Governance-level distinctions include intra-level, inter-level, and multi-jurisdictional consolidation, reflecting different approaches to integrating governmental functions across hierarchical tiers and political boundaries. Implementation strategies vary from comprehensive “big-bang” approaches to incremental phased implementations and hybrid models that combine elements of both. Each of these models has distinct advantages and limitations, and their appropriateness depends heavily on the specific context, goals, and constraints of the consolidation effort. Understanding these different types and models is essential for policymakers and practitioners considering agency consolidation, as the choice of approach can significantly influence both the process of implementation and the ultimate outcomes. As we move from the categorization of consolidation types to the practical process of implementing consolidation in the next section,

1.5 Process of Agency Consolidation

The diverse typologies and models of agency consolidation discussed in the previous section provide essential frameworks for understanding how governmental reorganizations can be structured, yet these architectural blueprints alone cannot guarantee successful outcomes. Moving beyond the question of what type of consolidation to implement, we must examine the intricate process through which these reorganizations are conceived, designed, executed, and evaluated. The process of agency consolidation represents a complex journey fraught with political, technical, and organizational challenges that can determine success or failure regardless of the theoretical elegance of the chosen model. A well-designed consolidation can founder

on poor implementation, while even a theoretically suboptimal model might succeed through exemplary process management. Understanding this process in all its dimensions—from initial planning through final evaluation—provides crucial insights for practitioners and policymakers contemplating governmental reorganization. The journey of consolidation typically unfolds through three major phases: planning and assessment, design and decision-making, and implementation and evaluation. Each phase presents distinct challenges and requires specific strategies and tools to navigate successfully. By examining these phases in detail, with attention to both best practices and common pitfalls, we can develop a more nuanced appreciation of the practical realities of governmental reorganization and the factors that separate successful consolidations from failed ones.

The planning and assessment phase forms the critical foundation of any agency consolidation effort, setting the trajectory for all subsequent activities and determining whether the initiative will address genuine needs or merely create new problems. This initial phase begins with a comprehensive needs assessment and gap analysis, which seeks to identify the specific problems that consolidation is intended to solve and the gaps in current organizational arrangements that create these problems. A rigorous needs assessment goes beyond superficial observations of duplication or inefficiency to probe deeply into the root causes of organizational dysfunction. For instance, when the United Kingdom began planning the 2005 merger of the Inland Revenue and HM Customs & Excise to form HM Revenue & Customs (HMRC), the initial needs assessment revealed not merely administrative duplication but more fundamental problems in tax collection. The assessment found that billions in tax revenue were being lost annually due to gaps in information sharing between the two agencies, with businesses and individuals able to exploit inconsistencies in their respective systems. This deeper understanding of the problem shaped the entire consolidation approach, emphasizing not just administrative efficiency but the creation of truly integrated tax administration systems that could close these revenue gaps.

Conducting an effective gap analysis requires examining multiple dimensions of organizational performance, including service delivery outcomes, administrative efficiency, coordination mechanisms, and strategic alignment with government priorities. The State of Virginia's 2012 consolidation of environmental agencies illustrates this comprehensive approach. The state's gap analysis examined not only obvious areas of potential duplication between the Department of Environmental Quality and the Department of Conservation and Recreation but also more subtle misalignments in regulatory approaches, data systems, and public engagement strategies. The analysis revealed that while both agencies were technically achieving their mandated missions, their fragmented approach was creating confusion for regulated entities, inconsistent data on environmental conditions, and missed opportunities for more holistic environmental protection strategies. This nuanced understanding of the gaps between desired outcomes and current performance supported a more thoughtful consolidation design that went beyond simple organizational merging to address these deeper misalignments.

Stakeholder identification and engagement represents another crucial element of the planning phase, as consolidation initiatives inevitably affect numerous groups both within and outside government. Effective stakeholder engagement begins with comprehensive mapping of all individuals and groups who will be impacted by or have influence over the consolidation effort. This includes internal stakeholders such as

employees and managers of the agencies involved, political leaders, oversight bodies, and unions, as well as external stakeholders such as service recipients, regulated entities, community organizations, and advocacy groups. The 2003 consolidation of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky, provides a compelling example of thorough stakeholder engagement. The consolidation planners conducted extensive outreach to diverse stakeholders, including neighborhood associations, business groups, labor unions, and social service organizations, through town hall meetings, focus groups, and advisory committees. This engagement process revealed significant concerns about potential reductions in neighborhood-level services, changes in tax burdens, and representation in the new consolidated government. By identifying these concerns early, planners were able to address them directly in the consolidation design, creating specific protections for neighborhood services and establishing transitional arrangements to address tax equity issues.

The importance of stakeholder engagement is further illustrated by the contrasting experience of the Toronto amalgamation in 1998. The Ontario provincial government mandated the consolidation of the City of Toronto with five surrounding municipalities with relatively limited consultation beyond formal public hearings. This minimal engagement process failed to adequately surface and address concerns from suburban residents about potential loss of local identity and services, as well as concerns from Toronto residents about potential tax increases and dilution of urban priorities. These unaddressed concerns fueled significant public opposition to the amalgamation, which continued to affect the political environment and implementation challenges for years after the consolidation was completed. The Toronto experience demonstrates how insufficient stakeholder engagement during the planning phase can create lingering resistance and implementation difficulties that undermine consolidation outcomes.

Feasibility studies and cost-benefit analysis methodologies form the analytical backbone of the planning phase, providing systematic frameworks for evaluating whether consolidation is likely to achieve its intended benefits and whether those benefits justify the costs and risks of implementation. A comprehensive feasibility study examines multiple dimensions of the proposed consolidation, including legal and regulatory requirements, financial implications, technical compatibility of systems and processes, human resource considerations, and political viability. The 2018 merger of the Department of Communications and the Arts and the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development in Australia underwent an extensive feasibility study that examined not only the obvious potential efficiencies from eliminating duplicate corporate functions but also more complex considerations such as the alignment of policy expertise, cultural compatibility between the agencies, and the impact on external stakeholders like media companies and infrastructure contractors. This multifaceted feasibility assessment supported a more realistic understanding of both the opportunities and challenges of the consolidation.

Cost-benefit analysis for agency consolidation presents unique methodological challenges compared to similar analyses for other public investments. While many infrastructure projects have relatively clear and measurable costs and benefits, consolidation initiatives often involve complex intangible benefits like improved coordination, better policy coherence, and enhanced strategic capacity that are difficult to quantify monetarily. Additionally, consolidation costs and benefits often accrue to different groups and different time periods, creating distributional complexities that must be carefully considered. The United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) has developed specialized methodologies for assessing agency consolidations

that attempt to address these challenges by identifying both quantitative and qualitative benefits, accounting for implementation costs over realistic timeframes, and considering distributional effects across different stakeholder groups. These methodologies were applied in the assessment of proposals to consolidate federal science agencies, revealing that while significant administrative savings might be achieved in the long term, substantial upfront costs would be required for systems integration and facility consolidation, with potential disruption to research continuity during the transition period.

The planning and assessment phase culminates in a comprehensive consolidation proposal that clearly articulates the rationale for consolidation, the specific problems it is intended to address, the expected benefits and costs, the proposed scope and timeline, and the identified risks and mitigation strategies. This proposal serves as the foundation for the next phase of design and decision-making, translating the analytical work of planning into concrete organizational design options. A well-developed consolidation proposal not only makes the case for proceeding with consolidation but also establishes the parameters within which the detailed design work will occur. The proposal for the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, for instance, while developed rapidly in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, still contained essential elements that guided the subsequent design process, including the core agencies to be included, the central missions of the new department, key governance principles, and critical milestones for implementation. Even though the compressed timeline limited the depth of analysis possible, the structured proposal provided a crucial starting point for the massive design and implementation effort that followed.

With the foundation laid through thorough planning and assessment, the process advances to the design and decision-making phase, where abstract consolidation concepts are translated into concrete organizational structures, governance arrangements, and implementation plans. This phase involves making critical choices about how the consolidated agency will be structured, how it will be led and governed, and how its diverse elements will be integrated into a coherent whole. These design decisions have profound implications for the ultimate success or failure of the consolidation effort, as they determine whether the new organization will be capable of achieving its intended purposes while managing the inherent challenges of combining disparate entities.

Organizational design options for consolidated agencies represent one of the most critical sets of decisions in this phase, encompassing choices about reporting structures, division of responsibilities, and coordination mechanisms. The design process typically begins with consideration of several alternative models, each with different implications for efficiency, accountability, and organizational effectiveness. A functional design organizes the consolidated agency around core functions or services, with divisions responsible for specific activities like policy development, service delivery, or compliance. This approach emphasizes specialized expertise and clear functional responsibilities but can create silos that hinder coordination across functions. A geographic design organizes the agency by regions or territories, with each regional office containing multiple functional capabilities. This approach emphasizes responsiveness to local conditions and integrated service delivery at the regional level but can create inconsistencies in approaches and standards across regions. A hybrid design attempts to capture the benefits of both approaches, typically organizing the agency centrally around core functions while maintaining regional structures for service delivery and local engagement. The Environmental Protection Agency's structure exemplifies this hybrid approach, with

central program offices for air, water, waste, and other environmental media, combined with ten regional offices that integrate these functions for implementation across specific geographic areas.

The 2005 HMRC merger in the United Kingdom illustrates the complexity of organizational design decisions in large-scale consolidations. planners considered multiple design options ranging from maintaining essentially separate tax administration systems under a common leadership umbrella to fully integrating all functions and systems. They ultimately chose a phased integration approach that initially maintained some separate processes for direct taxes (income tax, capital gains tax) and indirect taxes (value-added tax, excise duties) while creating unified structures for customer service, compliance, and corporate services. This hybrid design acknowledged the significant differences in the underlying systems and processes for different tax types while still achieving meaningful integration in areas where coordination was most critical. The design also created specialized business units for different taxpayer segments (large businesses, small businesses, individuals) rather than organizing purely by tax type, reflecting a customer-centric approach that cut across traditional functional boundaries.

Leadership structure and governance models constitute another crucial set of design decisions that can significantly influence consolidation outcomes. These decisions determine how power and authority will be distributed within the consolidated agency, how decisions will be made, and how the agency will be held accountable for its performance. One fundamental choice is between a unitary leadership structure, with a single clear line of authority from the agency head to front-line operations, and a more distributed leadership model that shares authority among multiple leaders representing different functions or components of the consolidated agency. The unitary model emphasizes clear accountability and decisive leadership but can create challenges in representing the diverse perspectives and expertise within a large consolidated agency. The distributed model can better incorporate diverse viewpoints but risks creating fragmentation and unclear accountability.

The Department of Homeland Security's leadership structure illustrates the challenges of designing governance for large consolidated agencies. The department was created with a unitary leadership structure, with a Secretary having clear authority over all component agencies. However, the reality of implementation has been more complex, with component agency heads often maintaining significant autonomy due to their statutory authorities, congressional relationships, and specialized missions. This has created tensions between the desire for unified departmental leadership and the practical realities of managing diverse components with distinct histories and mandates. In contrast, the creation of the Department of Health and Human Services followed a different governance approach, with more integrated leadership structures that subsumed previously independent agencies more completely into the departmental hierarchy. This more unitary approach has generally resulted in stronger departmental coordination but has sometimes been criticized for diminishing the visibility and influence of specific public health functions that previously had more direct reporting lines to political leadership.

Governance models for consolidated agencies also involve decisions about the role of advisory bodies, oversight mechanisms, and stakeholder engagement processes. Many successful consolidations have established formal governance structures that include representation from key stakeholder groups, advisory commit-

tees with external experts, and clear mechanisms for legislative oversight and public accountability. The Metropolitan Transportation Authority in New York provides an interesting example of complex governance design for a multi-jurisdictional consolidated agency. The MTA is governed by a board with members appointed by different jurisdictions (New York City, suburban counties, and the Governor), reflecting its multi-jurisdictional nature. This governance structure attempts to balance regional coordination with representation of local interests, though it has also been criticized for creating political fragmentation in decision-making. The design of governance structures for consolidated agencies thus requires careful consideration of how to balance effective management with appropriate accountability to diverse stakeholders.

Approaches to merging systems, processes, and organizational cultures represent perhaps the most challenging aspect of the design phase, as these elements often contain the deepest embedded assumptions and practices of the pre-consolidation agencies. Systems integration encompasses both technological systems, such as information technology infrastructure and data management platforms, and administrative systems, such as budgeting, procurement, and human resource management. Process integration involves aligning workflows, standardizing procedures, and creating coherent service delivery models across previously separate organizations. Cultural integration addresses the often-overlooked but critically important task of creating shared values, norms, and working practices among employees who may have very different professional backgrounds and organizational experiences.

The experience of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) following the 9/11 Commission Report illustrates the challenges of systems and process integration in the context of agency reform. While not a consolidation of multiple agencies, the FBI's transformation efforts involved significant internal reorganization and process changes to improve intelligence sharing and counterterrorism capabilities. The bureau faced substantial challenges in integrating its traditional criminal investigation functions with new intelligence missions, including incompatible information systems, different security clearance processes, and deeply ingrained cultural differences between agents and analysts. The design of the transformation effort had to address these multiple dimensions simultaneously, creating new organizational structures, developing integrated information systems, establishing new processes for intelligence analysis, and working to bridge cultural divides between different parts of the organization. The FBI's experience demonstrates how systems, processes, and culture are deeply interconnected and how changes in one area inevitably affect the others.

The creation of the Department of Homeland Security provides another compelling example of the challenges of integrating diverse systems and processes. The 22 agencies merged into DHS brought with them a wide array of information systems, procurement processes, personnel systems, and security protocols. The design phase had to make difficult decisions about which systems to standardize across the department, which to maintain separately, and how to create interfaces between incompatible systems. The initial approach attempted to standardize many systems quickly across all components, but this proved overly ambitious given the technical complexities and operational requirements of different agencies. A more phased approach was later adopted, focusing initially on creating interoperability between systems while deferring full standardization where it would disrupt critical operations. This more nuanced approach acknowledged that systems integration often requires balancing the desire for standardization with the need to maintain operational con-

tinuity in essential functions.

Cultural integration presents perhaps the subtlest but most persistent challenge in agency consolidation. Every organization develops its own culture—shared values, assumptions, norms, and practices—that shape how employees approach their work and interact with each other. When agencies with different cultures are consolidated, these cultural differences can create significant obstacles to effective integration, even when formal structures and systems have been aligned. The merger of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) in 1958 provides an interesting historical example of cultural integration in a successful consolidation. NACA had a research-oriented culture with relatively flat hierarchies and emphasis on technical expertise, while the newly formed NASA needed to develop a more programmatic culture capable of managing large-scale space missions with clear lines of authority and responsibility. The leadership of the new NASA consciously worked to create a hybrid culture that preserved NACA's technical excellence while developing the program management capabilities needed for space exploration. This cultural integration was facilitated by strong leadership, clear mission focus, and the excitement of the space race, which helped create a shared sense of purpose that transcended previous organizational identities.

The design and decision-making phase culminates in a detailed consolidation plan that specifies the new organizational structure, governance arrangements, implementation timeline, resource requirements, risk management strategies, and performance metrics. This plan serves as the blueprint for the implementation phase, translating design decisions into actionable steps. A well-developed consolidation plan provides clarity on what will happen, when it will happen, who will be responsible, and how success will be measured. It also acknowledges the inherent uncertainties in large-scale organizational change and establishes mechanisms for adaptive management as implementation unfolds. The detailed consolidation plan for the HMRC merger, for instance, included specific milestones for IT system integration, staff transition plans, customer service continuity measures, and financial management arrangements, providing a comprehensive roadmap for the complex implementation process that followed.

With the design completed and decisions made, the consolidation process enters the implementation and evaluation phase, where abstract plans are translated into concrete actions and the rubber meets the road of organizational change. This phase is often the most visible and challenging part of consolidation, involving the practical work of restructuring organizations, integrating systems and processes, managing human transitions, and maintaining operational continuity throughout the transformation. Implementation requires careful management of multiple work streams, each with its own complexities and interdependencies, while evaluation provides the feedback mechanisms necessary to assess progress and make course corrections as needed.

Implementation strategies and timeline development represent crucial first steps in this phase, as they determine the pace, sequence, and approach to the practical work of consolidation. As discussed in the previous section, implementation approaches can range from comprehensive “big-bang” strategies that attempt to implement all changes simultaneously to incremental approaches that phase in changes over time, with hybrid models combining elements of both. The choice of implementation strategy depends on multiple factors,

including the urgency driving the consolidation, the complexity of

1.6 Case Studies of Successful Agency Consolidation

...the complexity of the agencies being merged, the political environment, and the potential risks associated with disruption to essential services. Comprehensive approaches tend to be favored when there is a sense of crisis or urgency, when political windows of opportunity are narrow, or when the benefits of consolidation are expected to be significant and immediate. Incremental approaches are typically preferred when the organizations involved are complex, when continuity of operations is critical, when resistance to change is anticipated to be strong, or when the optimal organizational design is uncertain. Hybrid approaches attempt to balance these considerations, implementing some changes quickly to demonstrate momentum and achieve early wins while phasing in more complex or controversial elements over time.

The theoretical frameworks, typological models, and implementation processes we have explored thus far provide essential conceptual tools for understanding agency consolidation, yet they remain incomplete without concrete examination of how these principles have played out in real-world settings. Theory and process guidelines can only take us so far; the true test of consolidation approaches comes in their practical application across different governmental contexts and challenges. By examining detailed case studies of successful agency consolidation efforts, we can identify patterns, extract transferable lessons, and understand how abstract principles adapt to the messy realities of governmental reorganization. These cases reveal not just what successful consolidation looks like in practice, but also the contingent factors, leadership approaches, and contextual adaptations that separate successful implementations from failed ones. The following analysis spans national, state/provincial, and local government levels, offering a comprehensive view of consolidation success across different scales and contexts.

At the national level, few agency consolidations have been as consequential or scrutinized as the creation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in the United States. Established in November 2002 through the Homeland Security Act, DHS represented the most significant reorganization of the federal government since the creation of the Department of Defense in 1947. The consolidation brought together 22 previously separate federal agencies with approximately 180,000 employees, including the Coast Guard, Secret Service, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Transportation Security Administration, and Immigration and Naturalization Service, among others. The driving force behind this massive consolidation was the widespread recognition that the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks had exposed critical failures in information sharing and coordination among agencies responsible for national security. The 9/11 Commission's subsequent investigation would highlight how these agencies operated in "stovepipes" that prevented effective intelligence sharing and collaborative threat assessment.

The implementation of DHS faced enormous challenges, not least of which was integrating agencies with deeply entrenched cultures, distinct missions, and incompatible information systems. Yet despite these obstacles, DHS has evolved into a functional department that has significantly improved homeland security coordination. Several factors contributed to this relative success. First, the consolidation was driven by a

clear and compelling national purpose—protecting the country from terrorist attacks—that provided a unifying mission transcending agency parochialism. Second, the implementation, while rapid, included thoughtful provisions for preserving core capabilities of critical agencies like the Coast Guard during the transition period. Third, Congress provided significant resources for the consolidation, including funding for information technology integration and physical infrastructure consolidation. Fourth, the department benefited from strong leadership in its formative years, particularly under Secretaries Tom Ridge and Michael Chertoff, who worked to establish a unified departmental culture while respecting the specialized expertise of component agencies. The creation of DHS also demonstrated the importance of building in flexibility for adaptation; the department has undergone several internal reorganizations since its creation as leaders learned from experience and adapted to evolving threats. Perhaps most importantly, the consolidation established clear mechanisms for interagency coordination that did not previously exist, creating structures like the National Operations Center that facilitate real-time information sharing among agencies that previously operated in isolation.

Another compelling national-level consolidation example comes from Canada following the 2015 federal election. The newly elected Liberal government under Prime Minister Justin Trudeau implemented a significant reorganization of federal agencies, consolidating several departments to better align with government priorities and improve policy coherence. One of the most notable consolidations was the creation of Global Affairs Canada, which merged the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development with the Canadian International Development Agency. This consolidation aimed to create a more integrated approach to Canada's international engagement, recognizing the increasingly interconnected nature of diplomacy, trade, and development assistance. The implementation was carefully planned over a six-month period, with extensive consultation with stakeholders both within and outside government. The success of this consolidation can be attributed to several factors: the clear articulation of a compelling vision for more coherent international policy; the appointment of strong leadership with experience across all three streams of international engagement; the preservation of distinct policy expertise while creating unified administrative structures; and the development of clear performance metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of the integrated approach. The consolidation has generally been viewed as successful in creating more aligned international policies and reducing duplication of effort in Canada's overseas operations.

The United Kingdom's agency consolidation efforts under Conservative governments since 2010 provide additional national-level insights. Facing significant fiscal pressures following the 2008 financial crisis, the UK government embarked on an ambitious program of agency consolidation and restructuring aimed at reducing administrative costs while maintaining service quality. One particularly successful example was the consolidation of the UK Border Agency into the Home Office in 2013, creating a single integrated border and immigration system. This consolidation addressed long-standing problems with uncoordinated border control functions that had been split between different agencies. The implementation was phased over 18 months, allowing for careful integration of systems and processes while maintaining border security operations. Key success factors included the development of a unified IT system for border management, the creation of integrated training programs for staff, and the establishment of clear performance metrics focused on reducing border wait times while maintaining security effectiveness. The consolidation has resulted in

estimated annual savings of over £500 million while improving coordination between immigration and customs functions. Another successful UK consolidation was the merger of the Food Standards Agency with the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs in 2015, creating a more integrated food safety and regulatory system. This consolidation addressed gaps in food safety oversight that had been exposed by several high-profile food contamination incidents. The success of this merger was facilitated by the development of unified risk assessment protocols, integrated inspection processes, and clear lines of accountability for food safety outcomes.

Moving to the state and provincial level, Virginia's 2012 consolidation of environmental agencies offers a compelling case study of successful governmental restructuring. Facing budget pressures and recognizing the inefficiencies of having separate agencies for environmental quality and conservation, Governor Bob McDonnell proposed merging the Department of Environmental Quality and the Department of Conservation and Recreation into a new Department of Conservation and Recreation. The consolidation aimed to eliminate duplication in permitting, monitoring, and enforcement functions while creating more coordinated approaches to environmental protection. The implementation process involved extensive stakeholder engagement with regulated industries, environmental groups, and local governments over a nine-month planning period, followed by a phased implementation over 18 months. Key to the success of this consolidation was the development of unified information systems that integrated permitting, compliance monitoring, and enforcement data across previously separate functions. The consolidation also created integrated regional offices that provided single points of contact for regulated entities and local governments, significantly reducing administrative burdens. The new department has been credited with improving environmental outcomes through more coordinated watershed management approaches while reducing administrative costs by approximately 15%. The Virginia case demonstrates the importance of extensive stakeholder engagement in building support for consolidation, the value of integrated information systems in breaking down bureaucratic silos, and the benefits of creating unified regional structures for service delivery.

Minnesota's 2017 consolidation of health and human services agencies provides another successful state-level example. Faced with growing complexity in health and human service delivery and recognizing the fragmentation of services across multiple agencies, the state merged the Departments of Health and Human Services into a single consolidated agency. This consolidation aimed to create more coordinated approaches to population health, reduce administrative overhead, and improve service integration for clients with multiple needs. The implementation was carefully phased over two years, beginning with the consolidation of administrative functions and gradually moving to program integration. Critical success factors included the development of integrated case management systems that allowed workers to access all of a client's relevant information across previously separate programs, the creation of unified eligibility determination processes that reduced bureaucratic burdens for clients, and the establishment of clear performance metrics focused on health outcomes and client experience. The consolidation has enabled more integrated service delivery models, such as the "Healthcare Homes" initiative that coordinates physical health, mental health, and social services for high-need populations. The Minnesota case illustrates how consolidation can enable more holistic approaches to complex service delivery challenges when supported by integrated information systems and unified administrative processes.

At the provincial level in Canada, Alberta's 2019 restructuring of government departments offers valuable insights into successful consolidation. The newly elected United Conservative government under Premier Jason Kenney reduced the number of government ministries from 12 to 8 through strategic consolidations aimed at reducing administrative costs while improving policy coherence. One particularly successful consolidation was the creation of the Ministry of Energy, which merged the previous departments of Energy and Environment and Parks, recognizing the interconnected nature of energy development and environmental stewardship. This consolidation was implemented over a six-month period with careful attention to preserving environmental regulatory functions while creating more integrated approaches to energy development. Key success factors included the development of unified regulatory frameworks that balanced economic development with environmental protection, the creation of integrated data systems that linked energy production with environmental monitoring, and the establishment of clear performance metrics measuring both economic and environmental outcomes. The consolidation has enabled more balanced decision-making on energy projects while reducing administrative burdens on industry through single-window regulatory processes. The Alberta case demonstrates how consolidation can create more balanced policy approaches when designed to integrate rather than eliminate important functions.

Ontario's 2018 consolidation of government services provides another successful provincial example. Facing significant fiscal pressures and recognizing inefficiencies in service delivery, the provincial government merged several service delivery agencies into a new single entity called ServiceOntario. This consolidation aimed to create a one-stop shop for government services while reducing administrative costs. The implementation was phased over 18 months, beginning with the consolidation of back-office functions and gradually moving to integrated service delivery. Critical to the success of this consolidation was the development of a unified digital platform that allowed citizens to access multiple government services through a single online portal, the creation of integrated service centers that provided in-person assistance for multiple government programs, and the establishment of clear performance metrics focused on service accessibility and user satisfaction. The consolidation has reduced wait times for government services by an average of 30% while achieving annual administrative savings of approximately \$200 million. The Ontario case illustrates the potential for digital transformation to enable more effective consolidation by creating unified service delivery platforms that transcend traditional organizational boundaries.

At the local government level, the 2003 consolidation of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky stands as one of the most successful city-county consolidations in the United States. This merger created a unified governmental structure for the entire county, eliminating the previous fragmentation between the city of Louisville and surrounding Jefferson County. The consolidation was driven by recognition that the fragmented governmental structure was hindering economic development, creating inefficiencies in service delivery, and limiting coordinated planning for the metropolitan area. The implementation process involved extensive public engagement over a two-year period, including a citizen commission that developed detailed consolidation plans, multiple public hearings, and a successful referendum. Key to the success of this consolidation was the development of transition plans that protected neighborhood-level services while creating unified county-wide structures, the establishment of clear fiscal arrangements that addressed tax equity concerns, and the creation of unified planning and zoning processes that enabled more coordinated metropolitan

development. The consolidation has resulted in significant economic development benefits, with Louisville consistently ranking among the top metro areas for business location decisions, while also improving service delivery efficiency and creating more coordinated approaches to urban challenges. The Louisville case demonstrates the importance of extensive public engagement in building support for local government consolidation and the value of transition arrangements that address legitimate concerns about service levels and local representation.

The metropolitan governance restructuring of Melbourne, Australia in 1994 provides another compelling local-level success story. Facing fragmentation across dozens of local municipalities in the metropolitan area, the Victorian state government implemented a comprehensive consolidation that reduced the number of local councils from 54 to 31. This restructuring aimed to create more financially viable local governments capable of providing consistent services across the metropolitan area while enabling more coordinated regional planning. The implementation process involved detailed boundary reviews, extensive public consultation, and careful attention to maintaining local representation in the new structure. Critical success factors included the development of unified regional planning frameworks that addressed metropolitan-wide challenges like transportation and economic development, the creation of shared service arrangements that allowed smaller councils to access specialized expertise, and the establishment of performance measurement systems that evaluated both efficiency and service quality outcomes. The consolidation has resulted in more consistent service delivery across the metropolitan area, improved financial sustainability of local governments, and more effective regional planning that has supported Melbourne's development as one of the world's most livable cities. The Melbourne case illustrates how local government consolidation can enable more effective regional governance when designed to balance metropolitan coordination with local responsiveness.

Special district consolidations provide yet another category of successful local-level reorganization. California's 2011 consolidation of special districts through the District Reorganization Act offers a notable example. Facing proliferation of special districts providing overlapping services like water, fire protection, and recreation, the state created a framework for consolidating these districts to improve efficiency and service coordination. One successful implementation was the consolidation of 13 separate water districts in the Sacramento region into a single Regional Water Authority. This consolidation aimed to create more integrated water resource management while reducing administrative overhead. The implementation involved extensive stakeholder engagement with water users, environmental groups, and local governments over an 18-month planning period, followed by a phased implementation over two years. Key success factors included the development of integrated water management plans that addressed supply, quality, and conservation in a coordinated manner, the creation of unified rate structures that reflected the true cost of water services, and the establishment of clear governance structures that ensured representation for all communities in the consolidated district. The consolidation has improved water resource management through more coordinated planning and investment while reducing administrative costs by approximately 25%. The California special district consolidation demonstrates how targeted restructuring of specialized service providers can address specific inefficiencies while maintaining focus on technical expertise and service quality.

These case studies of successful agency consolidation at national, state/provincial, and local levels reveal several common patterns and success factors. Across all levels, successful consolidations were driven by

clear and compelling purposes that transcended mere administrative efficiency to address substantive policy challenges. They benefited from strong leadership that could articulate a vision for the consolidated organization while managing the practical challenges of implementation. They involved extensive stakeholder engagement that built support for change while identifying and addressing legitimate concerns. They included thoughtful implementation approaches that balanced the need for timely change with the preservation of critical capabilities during transition. They invested in integrated information systems that enabled consolidated organizations to function effectively across previously separate functions. They established clear performance metrics that measured both efficiency outcomes and effectiveness in achieving policy goals. And perhaps most importantly, they recognized that consolidation is not merely a technical exercise but a profound organizational change that requires attention to culture, people, and processes as much as to structures and systems.

These successful cases also demonstrate that effective consolidation is not about simply creating larger organizations but about designing structures that enable better coordination, more coherent policy approaches, and more efficient service delivery. The most successful consolidations maintained or even enhanced specialized expertise while creating mechanisms for coordination across functions. They preserved responsiveness to local needs while achieving economies of scale in administrative functions. They balanced the drive for efficiency with attention to service quality and policy outcomes. And they recognized that consolidation is a means to an end—better government performance and outcomes—rather than an end in itself.

As we consider these successful examples, it is important to recognize that they represent the positive end of a spectrum that includes many less successful or outright failed consolidation efforts. The factors that contributed to these successes provide valuable guidance for future consolidation initiatives, but they must be understood in context. What worked in one set of circumstances may not work in another, and the specific design choices that led to success in these cases may not be appropriate for different contexts. Nevertheless, these case studies offer important insights into the principles and practices that can increase the likelihood of successful agency consolidation across different governmental levels and contexts.

Having examined successful consolidation efforts in detail, we must now turn our attention to the other side of the coin: the challenges, criticisms, and failures that have characterized many agency consolidation initiatives. While the case studies presented here demonstrate that consolidation can indeed achieve its promised benefits under the right conditions, a balanced understanding requires frank examination of the significant obstacles, theoretical critiques, and documented failures that have led many observers to question the wisdom of consolidation as a general strategy for governmental improvement. The next section explores these challenges and criticisms in depth, providing a necessary counterpoint to the success stories and a more complete picture of the consolidation landscape.

1.7 Challenges and Criticisms of Agency Consolidation

The successful case studies of agency consolidation examined in the previous section demonstrate that under the right conditions, governmental reorganizations can achieve significant benefits in efficiency, coordination, and service delivery. Yet these success stories represent only one side of a complex and often con-

tentious policy landscape. For every consolidation that achieves its intended outcomes, numerous others struggle with implementation challenges, fail to deliver promised benefits, or create new problems more severe than those they were meant to solve. A balanced understanding of agency consolidation requires frank examination of the significant obstacles, theoretical critiques, and documented failures that have led many scholars and practitioners to question consolidation as a universal solution to governmental challenges. This critical perspective does not negate the potential value of consolidation but rather highlights the importance of realistic expectations, careful planning, and contextual adaptation in reorganization efforts. By examining the challenges and failures that have characterized many consolidation initiatives, we can develop a more nuanced understanding of when consolidation is appropriate, how it can be implemented effectively, and what alternatives might be preferable in certain circumstances.

Implementation challenges represent perhaps the most immediate and practical obstacles to successful agency consolidation. These challenges begin with resistance to change from bureaucrats and political actors, whose support is essential for consolidation yet whose interests may be threatened by reorganization. Bureaucratic resistance often stems from legitimate concerns about loss of professional autonomy, diminished status, disruption of established working relationships, and uncertainty about future roles and responsibilities. When the United Kingdom created the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) in 2001, merging the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food with parts of the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, the merger faced significant resistance from agricultural scientists and policy specialists who feared their expertise would be marginalized in a department with broader environmental priorities. This resistance manifested in various forms, from passive non-cooperation in planning processes to active lobbying of political leaders to preserve the autonomy of agricultural functions. Similar resistance emerged during the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, where agencies like the Coast Guard and Secret Service fought to preserve their distinct identities and operational independence within the new departmental structure. These bureaucratic battles were not merely turf wars but reflected genuine concerns about maintaining specialized capabilities and organizational cultures that had developed over decades to address specific mission requirements.

Political resistance to consolidation can be equally formidable, stemming from partisan calculations, interest group pressures, and institutional rivalries. Elected officials often approach agency consolidation through the lens of political advantage rather than administrative efficiency, supporting reorganizations that expand their influence while opposing those that diminish their control over important functions. When the Obama administration proposed consolidating six agencies dealing with business and trade into a single department in 2012, the initiative faced immediate opposition from congressional committees whose jurisdictions would be affected by the reorganization. Chairpersons and ranking members of committees with oversight over trade, manufacturing, and small business programs resisted the consolidation not necessarily on administrative grounds but because it threatened their committee's influence and resources. This political dynamic helps explain why comprehensive agency consolidation is often more feasible during periods of unified government or in the aftermath of crises that create unusual political alignment. Even when consolidation initiatives enjoy initial political support, that support can erode as implementation challenges emerge, as witnessed during the Trump administration's unsuccessful attempts to reorganize federal agencies despite

Republican control of Congress.

Technical and logistical difficulties in merging operations and systems present another category of implementation challenges that can derail consolidation efforts. Modern government agencies depend on complex information systems, financial management processes, and operational procedures that have often developed incrementally over decades with little consideration for future integration. When agencies with incompatible systems are consolidated, the technical challenges of creating unified platforms can be enormous in both scale and complexity. The Department of Homeland Security's early struggles with information technology integration exemplify these challenges. The 22 agencies merged into DHS brought with them more than 100 major information systems, many of which were incompatible with each other and built on outdated technology platforms. Creating unified systems for border security, emergency management, and intelligence sharing required not merely technical solutions but also complex decisions about data standards, security protocols, and business processes that had profound implications for operational effectiveness. Years after DHS's creation, information sharing between components remained inadequate, as documented by the Government Accountability Office in multiple reports highlighting persistent interoperability problems.

Information technology integration challenges are not unique to DHS. When Canada merged its fisheries and oceans departments in the 1990s, the consolidation faced enormous technical difficulties in integrating vessel tracking systems, licensing databases, and scientific research data that had been maintained separately for decades. The resulting system failures temporarily disrupted fisheries management and licensing operations, creating political backlash that threatened the entire consolidation effort. Similarly, when Minnesota consolidated its health and human services agencies in 2017, the merger of eligibility determination systems for different programs created significant technical challenges that temporarily delayed benefits for some vulnerable populations. These technical difficulties often extend beyond information systems to include physical infrastructure, equipment, and specialized facilities that may be duplicated across agencies but difficult to consolidate due to location constraints or specialized requirements.

Budgetary and resource constraints during consolidation transitions represent yet another category of implementation challenges that can undermine reorganization efforts. Consolidation initiatives typically require significant upfront investments in systems integration, facilities consolidation, staff transition costs, and temporary operational overlaps during the transition period. These costs often materialize at precisely the moment when governments are seeking consolidation to achieve budget savings, creating a fundamental tension between short-term fiscal pressures and long-term efficiency goals. When the United Kingdom's HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC) was formed through the merger of the Inland Revenue and HM Customs and Excise in 2005, the consolidation required substantial upfront investments estimated at over £400 million for information technology integration, staff retraining, and facilities consolidation. These investments strained the UK's fiscal resources during a period of budget restraint and created political pressure to demonstrate rapid returns that were not realistically achievable given the scale of the transformation.

The budgetary challenges of consolidation are often compounded by unrealistic expectations about cost savings that can be achieved through reorganization. Political leaders frequently promote consolidation initiatives with promises of significant efficiency gains and budget reductions, yet empirical evidence suggests

that the actual savings from consolidation are often more modest and take longer to achieve than anticipated. A comprehensive study by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) examining consolidation initiatives across multiple countries found that while administrative consolidations typically achieve cost savings of 5-15% in the long term, these savings often require 3-5 years to fully materialize and may be partially offset by transition costs in the short term. The study also found that savings are heavily concentrated in administrative and support functions rather than in direct service delivery, where consolidation may actually increase costs in the short term due to the need to maintain service continuity during transition.

Beyond these practical implementation challenges, agency consolidation faces significant theoretical critiques from scholars in public administration, political science, and organizational theory. These critiques go beyond specific implementation difficulties to question fundamental assumptions about the desirability and effectiveness of consolidation as a strategy for governmental improvement. One line of critique, developed by public administration scholars like Donald Kettl and Paul Light, argues that consolidation often misunderstands the nature of governmental problems, which are frequently not caused by organizational fragmentation but by more fundamental issues of capacity, leadership, and accountability. From this perspective, consolidating agencies without addressing these deeper issues merely creates larger organizations with the same underlying problems. Kettl has argued that the focus on consolidation as a solution to governmental challenges reflects a “structuralist fallacy” that assumes organizational form determines performance, when in reality performance is influenced by multiple factors including leadership quality, employee skills, resource adequacy, and external environment.

This critique suggests that consolidation initiatives often target symptoms rather than root causes of governmental dysfunction. For instance, the fragmented response to Hurricane Katrina in 2005 was frequently attributed to organizational fragmentation between federal, state, and local agencies, leading to calls for greater consolidation of emergency management functions. Yet subsequent analyses by scholars like Donald Moynihan have demonstrated that the primary failures were not structural but related to leadership, planning, and execution failures that would have persisted even under more consolidated organizational arrangements. Similarly, the intelligence failures preceding the 9/11 attacks were often attributed to fragmentation between the CIA and FBI, leading to the creation of the Directorate of National Intelligence to coordinate intelligence activities. Yet the 9/11 Commission’s own report emphasized that the failures were primarily due to cultural barriers, information sharing practices, and analytical approaches that were not fundamentally addressed by the structural reorganization.

Democratic accountability concerns represent another important theoretical critique of agency consolidation, particularly as it relates to the creation of larger, more powerful government agencies. Political theorists like Matthew Holden and Woodrow Wilson (in his later work) have warned that consolidation can create agencies that are too large and complex for effective political oversight, potentially diminishing democratic accountability. As agencies grow larger through consolidation, they often develop greater autonomy from political control, with more resources to resist oversight and more complexity to obscure accountability. The Department of Homeland Security exemplifies this concern, as its enormous size and complex mission have made it difficult for Congress to exercise effective oversight despite multiple committees with jurisdiction

over its activities. Similarly, when the United Kingdom created the Home Office as a consolidated “super-ministry” encompassing police, immigration, and security functions, critics warned that the department had become too powerful and insufficiently accountable to Parliament, with its size and complexity making it difficult for legislators to monitor its activities effectively.

This accountability critique is closely related to concerns about the potential for bureaucratic imperialism in consolidated agencies. As agencies grow larger through consolidation, they often develop greater capacity to define their own missions and expand their jurisdictions with limited political constraint. The environmental policy scholar Marc Landy has documented how the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, originally created to consolidate fragmented environmental regulatory functions, gradually expanded its regulatory reach well beyond its initial mandate, using its consolidated authority and scientific expertise to advance environmental objectives that had not been explicitly authorized by Congress. While environmental advocates may view this expansion positively, it raises legitimate democratic concerns about unelected bureaucrats making policy decisions that should properly be made by elected representatives.

Organizational theory perspectives on diseconomies of scale and bureaucracy provide yet another theoretical critique of agency consolidation. While consolidation is often justified by the promise of economies of scale, organizational theorists like Charles Perrow and James Q. Wilson have warned that large organizations often face diseconomies of scale that can offset or even outweigh the benefits of consolidation. As organizations grow larger, they typically develop more complex hierarchical structures, more elaborate formal procedures, and more extensive internal communication requirements that can reduce efficiency and responsiveness. Wilson, in his seminal work “Bureaucracy,” documented how large government agencies often develop multiple conflicting goals, diffuse accountability, and operational rigidities that make them less effective than smaller, more focused organizations.

The concept of bureau-shaping, developed by the public choice scholar Patrick Dunleavy, offers a related critique that suggests senior bureaucrats may support consolidation not because it improves efficiency but because it enhances their status, resources, and career opportunities. From this perspective, consolidation initiatives often reflect bureaucratic self-interest rather than objective assessments of administrative efficiency. Dunleavy’s research found that senior bureaucrats typically prefer consolidations that create larger agencies with higher status positions, more discretionary resources, and greater career advancement opportunities, regardless of whether these consolidations improve organizational performance. This helps explain why consolidation initiatives often enjoy strong support from senior bureaucrats despite limited evidence of their effectiveness in improving service delivery or policy outcomes.

These theoretical critiques are not merely academic but have profound implications for how we approach agency consolidation in practice. They suggest that consolidation should not be viewed as a default solution to governmental challenges but rather as one option among many, with specific benefits and limitations that must be carefully weighed in each context. They also highlight the importance of considering alternatives to consolidation that may address governmental problems without creating the accountability and scale problems associated with larger organizations.

Documented failures and lessons learned from unsuccessful consolidation efforts provide perhaps the most

compelling evidence of the limitations and risks of agency consolidation. While the previous section examined successful case studies, an equally important body of evidence comes from consolidations that failed to achieve their intended outcomes or created significant unintended consequences. One of the most frequently cited examples of consolidation failure is the pre-9/11 relationship between the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). While these agencies were not formally consolidated, their experience highlights the dangers of assuming that structural solutions can overcome deep-seated cultural and procedural barriers to coordination. The 9/11 Commission's investigation revealed that despite numerous attempts to improve coordination between the FBI and CIA through structural reforms, information sharing remained inadequate due to cultural differences, legal restrictions, and institutional incentives that prioritized agency autonomy over collaboration. This case demonstrates that even when structural barriers to coordination are addressed through consolidation or other mechanisms, deeper issues of organizational culture and incentive structures may persist.

The creation of the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) in 2001 as part of the Department of Homeland Security provides another example of consolidation challenges with mixed results. While TSA successfully federalized airport security screening, replacing private contractors with federal employees, the consolidation of security screening functions under a single agency has faced persistent criticisms regarding effectiveness, efficiency, and customer service. The Government Accountability Office has documented numerous instances where TSA's standardized approach to screening has failed to adapt to evolving security threats, while the agency has struggled with high turnover rates among screeners and inconsistent application of security protocols across airports. Critics argue that TSA's consolidated structure has created a bureaucracy that is less flexible and innovative than the previous system of private contractors operating under federal oversight, suggesting that consolidation may sometimes reduce rather than enhance adaptability in security-related functions.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) experience within the Department of Homeland Security offers another cautionary tale about consolidation risks. Before being merged into DHS in 2003, FEMA was an independent agency with a clear mission focused on emergency management. After consolidation, FEMA became one of many components within DHS, competing for attention and resources with higher-profile security functions. The agency's widely criticized response to Hurricane Katrina in 2005 was attributed in part to its diminished status within DHS, which had reduced its direct access to the President and diluted its focus on emergency management. This experience led to significant reforms, including giving FEMA greater autonomy within DHS and directly elevating its administrator to the Cabinet level. The FEMA case illustrates how consolidation can sometimes diminish the visibility and effectiveness of critical functions, particularly when those functions are subsumed within larger organizations with different priorities.

International examples further illuminate the risks of agency consolidation. Australia's 2013 consolidation of customs and border protection functions into the Australian Border Force provides a cautionary case study. The consolidation aimed to create a more integrated approach to border management but faced significant implementation challenges, including industrial action by border protection officers, confusion about roles and responsibilities between customs and immigration functions, and disruptions to border operations. The

government was eventually forced to reverse parts of the consolidation, restoring separate chains of command for customs and immigration functions while maintaining some integrated border management capabilities. This case demonstrates how consolidation initiatives can sometimes create more problems than they solve, particularly when implemented rapidly without adequate planning or stakeholder engagement.

The experience of Russia's administrative reforms under President Vladimir Putin offers another example of consolidation with mixed results. Beginning in 2004, Putin implemented a series of consolidations that reduced the number of federal ministries from 30 to 17 and created several large "super-agencies" with broad regulatory powers. While these consolidations centralized control under the presidency, they also created enormous bureaucratic structures that have been criticized for inefficiency, corruption, and lack of responsiveness to regional needs. The Federal Service for Surveillance in Healthcare and Social Development, created through the consolidation of multiple regulatory agencies, became notorious for bureaucratic inefficiency and corruption, with businesses reporting that regulatory requirements had become more complex and unpredictable rather than streamlined after consolidation. This case illustrates how consolidation initiatives driven primarily by political centralization rather than administrative efficiency can create significant governance problems.

From these documented failures and challenges, several important lessons have emerged that can inform future consolidation efforts. First, consolidation should be driven by clear and compelling purposes rather than abstract efficiency goals. The most successful consolidations have addressed specific, well-defined problems like information sharing failures or service coordination gaps, while unsuccessful consolidations have often pursued vague objectives like "increasing efficiency" without clear definitions of what this means in practice. Second, the human and cultural dimensions of consolidation are at least as important as structural and technical considerations. Failed consolidations typically underestimate the challenges of merging organizational cultures, establishing shared values, and addressing employee concerns during transition. Third, consolidation initiatives require realistic timelines and adequate resources for implementation. The most problematic consolidations have often been those implemented rapidly with insufficient planning or resources, leading to operational disruptions and unanticipated problems.

Fourth, accountability mechanisms must be strengthened rather than weakened through consolidation. Successful consolidations have established clear lines of accountability and robust oversight mechanisms, while unsuccessful ones have often created larger, more complex organizations that are more difficult to monitor and control. Fifth, consolidation should be viewed as a means to an end rather than an end in itself. The most effective consolidations have maintained focus on improved outcomes for citizens rather than merely creating larger organizations, while failed consolidations have often treated structural change as the ultimate goal rather than a tool for achieving better performance.

These lessons suggest a more nuanced approach to agency consolidation that recognizes both its potential benefits and significant limitations. Rather than viewing consolidation as a universal solution to governmental challenges, this approach sees it as one strategy among many, appropriate in some circumstances but potentially counterproductive in others. This perspective acknowledges that while consolidation can address certain problems like fragmentation and duplication, it may exacerbate others like bureaucratic rigidity and

accountability challenges. The most successful governmental systems are likely those that strike an appropriate balance between consolidation and fragmentation, creating sufficient coordination to address cross-cutting challenges while preserving enough specialization and autonomy to maintain expertise, innovation, and responsiveness to diverse needs.

As we move from examining the challenges and failures of agency consolidation to assessing its impact on government performance and service delivery, this balanced perspective becomes increasingly important. The evidence from both successful and unsuccessful consolidations suggests that the effects of reorganization are contingent on multiple factors including design choices, implementation quality, and contextual circumstances. Understanding these contingent relationships is essential for developing more sophisticated approaches to governmental organization that can achieve the benefits of coordination without sacrificing the advantages of specialization and decentralization. The next section examines the empirical evidence on how agency

1.8 Impact on Government Performance and Service Delivery

The next section examines the empirical evidence on how agency consolidation affects government performance, efficiency, service quality, and outcomes for citizens. While theoretical arguments about consolidation abound and case studies offer valuable insights, the ultimate test of any governmental reorganization lies in its measurable impact on performance and results. Understanding these effects requires careful examination of empirical research across multiple dimensions of governmental performance, from straightforward efficiency metrics to more complex assessments of service quality, citizen outcomes, and organizational dynamics. This evidence-based approach reveals a nuanced picture of consolidation impacts, demonstrating that outcomes vary significantly depending on context, implementation quality, and the specific dimensions of performance being measured. Rather than offering simple answers about whether consolidation “works,” the empirical literature provides a more sophisticated understanding of the conditions under which consolidation is likely to improve or diminish governmental performance, the types of benefits and costs that typically result, and the trade-offs that must be weighed in consolidation decisions.

Efficiency and cost effects represent perhaps the most commonly cited rationale for agency consolidation, with policymakers frequently justifying reorganizations by promising significant cost savings and administrative efficiencies. The empirical evidence on these effects, however, presents a mixed picture that challenges simplistic assumptions about consolidation’s financial benefits. Multiple comprehensive studies examining consolidation initiatives across different countries and governmental levels have found that while cost savings are achievable, they are typically more modest than promised and take longer to materialize than anticipated. A landmark study by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) analyzing consolidation efforts across 30 countries found that administrative consolidations typically achieve cost savings of 5-15% in the long term, with the higher end of this range representing exceptional cases rather than typical outcomes. More importantly, the study found that these savings generally require 3-5 years to fully materialize, as they depend on gradual processes like staff attrition, facility consolidation, and system integration rather than immediate cuts. These findings help explain why consolidation initiatives often face

political difficulties when early savings fail to meet inflated expectations.

The distribution of cost savings across different functional areas reveals another important pattern in the empirical evidence. Research consistently shows that consolidation achieves the greatest efficiency gains in administrative and support functions like human resources, information technology, financial management, and procurement, where duplication is most apparent and standardization is most feasible. A detailed analysis of the 2005 merger of the UK's Inland Revenue and HM Customs & Excise to form HM Revenue & Customs (HMRC) found that approximately 80% of the £1.5 billion in eventual annual savings came from consolidating corporate services rather than front-line tax administration functions. The consolidation eliminated duplicate call centers, merged processing centers, integrated IT systems, and standardized back-office processes, achieving significant economies of scale in these support functions while preserving specialized expertise in tax collection. This pattern has been observed consistently across other consolidation initiatives, from Virginia's environmental agency merger to Minnesota's health and human services consolidation, suggesting that the efficiency benefits of consolidation are concentrated in areas where standardization is feasible and duplication is clear.

Methodological challenges in measuring efficiency impacts complicate the empirical assessment of consolidation effects. Most fundamentally, determining a counterfactual—what would have happened without consolidation—is inherently difficult, as governmental agencies operate in dynamic environments with multiple influences on performance. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has highlighted this challenge in multiple evaluations of federal agency consolidations, noting that it is nearly impossible to isolate the effects of consolidation from other simultaneous changes like budget fluctuations, leadership transitions, policy shifts, and external events. Additionally, different measurement approaches can yield significantly different results. Cash-based accounting may show immediate savings from staff reductions, while accrual-based accounting might reveal long-term costs from pension obligations or capital investments that offset apparent savings. Similarly, narrow measures of administrative costs may show improvements while broader measures of total system costs, including costs borne by service recipients and regulated entities, may show little change or even increases. The 2003 consolidation of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky illustrates these measurement challenges. While the consolidated government achieved clear reductions in administrative overhead, these savings were partially offset by increased costs from equalizing service levels across the previously separate jurisdictions and investing in integrated information systems. A comprehensive assessment conducted five years after consolidation found net savings of approximately 8% in governmental operations, but only when all factors were considered and measured over an appropriate timeframe.

Evidence on administrative efficiency improvements beyond simple cost reductions presents a more consistently positive picture. Multiple studies have found that consolidation often improves administrative efficiency through reduced duplication, simplified processes, and better utilization of specialized expertise. A comprehensive evaluation of Canada's consolidation of its revenue collection agencies found that while cost savings were modest, administrative efficiency improved significantly as measured by processing times, error rates, and staff productivity. The consolidation allowed for specialization of functions, with staff developing deeper expertise in specific aspects of tax administration rather than requiring generalists to handle

multiple tax types. This specialization improved both the quality and speed of processing, with average processing times for complex tax returns decreasing by 23% within three years of consolidation. Similar improvements in administrative efficiency have been documented in other consolidated agencies, from the United Kingdom's Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency to Australia's Department of Human Services, suggesting that consolidation can enhance administrative performance even when cost savings are limited.

Moving beyond efficiency and cost effects, the empirical evidence on service quality and citizen outcomes following agency consolidation presents a complex picture with significant variation across different service types and consolidation approaches. Unlike administrative efficiency, which can be measured through relatively straightforward metrics like processing times and error rates, service quality encompasses multiple dimensions including accessibility, responsiveness, reliability, and appropriateness of services to citizen needs. Research on these dimensions yields more mixed results than efficiency studies, with outcomes depending heavily on how consolidation is implemented and which services are involved.

Accessibility of services represents one dimension where consolidation has shown both positive and negative effects in empirical studies. On the positive side, consolidating service delivery functions can create one-stop shops that reduce the burden on citizens to navigate multiple agencies for related services. The creation of ServiceOntario, which consolidated numerous government service functions under a single umbrella, provides compelling evidence of these accessibility benefits. An independent evaluation conducted five years after implementation found that 78% of citizens reported easier access to government services, with particular improvements for complex needs that previously required interactions with multiple agencies. The consolidation reduced the average number of contacts citizens needed to make to resolve issues from 3.2 to 1.7, while simultaneously increasing the range of services available through each access point. Similarly, the consolidation of veterans' services under the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs has improved accessibility for veterans with complex needs that span healthcare, benefits, and rehabilitation services, creating integrated case management that transcends traditional program boundaries.

However, consolidation can also negatively impact accessibility when it reduces local service points or creates more centralized systems that are less responsive to local needs. The 1998 amalgamation of Toronto with five surrounding municipalities illustrates this potential downside. A comprehensive study by the Institute on Municipal Finance and Governance found that while some services became more accessible through centralized call centers and online platforms, others became less accessible, particularly for residents in outlying areas who previously had local service points. The study documented a 15% decrease in satisfaction with accessibility of in-person services among suburban residents, compared to a 5% increase among downtown residents, highlighting how consolidation effects can vary across different populations within the same jurisdiction. This pattern has been observed in other municipal consolidations, suggesting that the accessibility impacts of consolidation depend significantly on how service delivery networks are redesigned during implementation.

Responsiveness of services represents another dimension where empirical evidence shows mixed effects from consolidation. Consolidated agencies often develop more standardized procedures and decision-making frameworks that can improve consistency but may reduce flexibility in addressing unique circumstances. A

detailed study of Australia's consolidated social services system found that response times for standard applications decreased by an average of 18% following consolidation, as streamlined processes eliminated bottlenecks in the previous fragmented system. However, the same study found that response times for complex or exceptional cases increased by 12%, as frontline staff had less discretion to adapt procedures to unusual circumstances and more referrals were required to specialized units. This trade-off between standardization and flexibility emerges consistently in studies of consolidation impacts, suggesting that while consolidation may improve efficiency in handling routine cases, it may reduce responsiveness to exceptional needs unless specific mechanisms for flexibility are built into the consolidated structure.

Citizen satisfaction with government services provides yet another lens through which to assess consolidation impacts, with empirical studies showing varied results depending on service type and implementation approach. A meta-analysis of 47 studies on citizen satisfaction following governmental consolidations found that satisfaction increased in 57% of cases, decreased in 23%, and remained unchanged in 20%. The analysis identified several factors that predicted positive satisfaction outcomes: maintenance of local service access points, preservation of specialized expertise, effective communication about changes, and minimal disruption during transition. The consolidation of Denmark's tax administration illustrates these positive factors. Denmark merged its national tax agency with regional tax offices into a single unified administration while maintaining local service centers throughout the country. A comprehensive evaluation found citizen satisfaction increased from 68% to 82% following consolidation, with improvements particularly noted in consistency of information and reduced bureaucratic runaround. The evaluation attributed these positive outcomes to the deliberate preservation of local access points combined with back-office consolidation that improved efficiency without reducing service accessibility.

Equity considerations in consolidated service delivery models represent a crucial dimension of consolidation impacts that has received increasing attention in empirical research. Consolidation can affect equity through multiple mechanisms, including changes in service availability across different geographic areas, standardization of eligibility criteria and application processes, and reallocation of resources previously distributed across multiple agencies. The evidence on these effects suggests that consolidation has the potential to either improve or diminish equity depending on implementation choices. A landmark study of the Netherlands' consolidation of social service agencies found that equity improved significantly when the consolidation was accompanied by explicit equity frameworks and resource allocation formulas that maintained service levels in disadvantaged areas. The study documented a 23% reduction in geographic disparities in service access following consolidation, along with a 17% reduction in disparities in approval rates for social assistance applications across different demographic groups. These improvements were attributed to standardized decision-making frameworks that reduced subjective bias and resource allocation mechanisms that directed additional support to high-need areas.

Conversely, research on the United States' welfare reform consolidations in the 1990s found that equity diminished in many cases when consolidation was implemented without explicit attention to distributional impacts. A multi-state study by the Urban Institute found that consolidation of welfare programs under Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) led to significant variations in approval rates and benefit levels across counties within states, as consolidated state agencies often failed to account for local differences

in cost of living, availability of support services, and demographic characteristics. The study documented approval rate variations of up to 30 percentage points between counties in the same state following consolidation, compared to variations of 10-15 percentage points before consolidation. These findings suggest that while consolidation has the potential to improve equity through standardization and resource pooling, realizing this potential requires deliberate attention to distributional impacts during the design and implementation phases.

Employee and organizational outcomes constitute the third major dimension of consolidation impacts, with empirical evidence revealing significant effects on workforce dynamics, organizational culture, and innovation capacity. These outcomes are particularly important because they mediate many of the effects on efficiency and service quality discussed previously, as consolidated agencies ultimately depend on their employees to realize envisioned improvements.

Workforce impacts of consolidation extend well beyond simple headcount reductions to include changes in skill mix, career opportunities, job satisfaction, and retention. Empirical studies consistently find that consolidation creates significant workforce transitions that affect both the quantity and quality of human capital in governmental agencies. A comprehensive longitudinal study of the UK's civil service consolidations found that while overall staffing levels decreased by 12% across consolidated agencies, the impact varied dramatically by skill category. Professional and specialized staff decreased by only 5%, while administrative and support staff decreased by 22%, reflecting a strategic shift toward higher skill composition in consolidated agencies. The same study found that turnover rates increased by 35% in the first two years following consolidation, particularly among mid-career employees with specialized expertise who had opportunities in other sectors. This pattern of selective attrition has been observed in multiple consolidation contexts, suggesting that the workforce effects of consolidation extend beyond simple numbers to changes in organizational capacity and expertise.

The impact of consolidation on employee morale and job satisfaction represents another important dimension with significant implications for organizational performance. Multiple studies have documented negative effects on morale in the immediate aftermath of consolidation, followed by gradual recovery as organizations stabilize. A meta-analysis of 23 studies on employee responses to governmental consolidation found that job satisfaction decreased by an average of 18% in the first year following consolidation, with particular declines in perceptions of job security, organizational support, and communication effectiveness. However, the analysis also found that satisfaction levels typically recovered to baseline or slightly above baseline within three years in successful consolidations, while continuing to decline in unsuccessful ones. The study identified several factors that predicted better outcomes for employee satisfaction: transparent communication about changes, opportunities for employee involvement in implementation, clear career pathways in the consolidated organization, and preservation of professional identities and expertise.

The experience of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security illustrates both the challenges and potential recovery in employee morale following consolidation. Employee surveys conducted by the Office of Personnel Management in the years following DHS's creation showed significant declines in job satisfaction, with the agency ranking near the bottom of federal agencies in multiple employee satisfaction dimensions.

However, subsequent surveys conducted five to ten years after consolidation showed gradual improvement as the department stabilized, developed clearer career paths, and established stronger organizational identity. By 2015, DHS's employee satisfaction scores had recovered to near the federal average, suggesting that while consolidation creates significant workforce challenges, these can be addressed over time through effective leadership and organizational development.

Organizational culture effects represent perhaps the most profound and persistent impacts of agency consolidation, as merging organizations with distinct histories, values, and norms creates cultural dynamics that can significantly influence performance. Empirical research on cultural integration following consolidation reveals that this is typically the most challenging and time-consuming aspect of consolidation, often taking five to seven years or longer to fully achieve. A landmark study of 15 major governmental consolidations across five countries found that cultural integration typically follows three phases: an initial period of cultural collision characterized by tension and competition between pre-existing cultures, a middle period of cultural accommodation where elements of different cultures begin to merge, and a final period of cultural integration where a new unified culture emerges. The study found that this process rarely proceeded smoothly, with approximately 60% of consolidations experiencing significant cultural conflicts that impeded performance for extended periods.

The cultural challenges of consolidation are particularly acute when agencies with different professional orientations and operational philosophies are merged. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security provides a compelling example of these cultural challenges. DHS merged agencies with dramatically different cultures, from the military-style hierarchy of the Coast Guard to the law enforcement culture of the Secret Service to the scientific culture of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center. A detailed ethnographic study conducted five years after DHS's creation documented persistent cultural differences that impeded coordination and created operational inefficiencies. The study found that agencies maintained distinct cultural identities despite formal unification, with different approaches to decision-making, risk assessment, and operational procedures. These cultural differences contributed to coordination problems during major events like Hurricane Katrina, where different components of DHS operated according to different cultural assumptions rather than integrated protocols.

Despite these challenges, the empirical evidence also shows that successful cultural integration can create significant organizational benefits. A study of the consolidation of Finland's food safety agencies found that the development of a unified organizational culture combining scientific expertise with regulatory rigor improved both the quality and consistency of food safety oversight. The consolidation brought together agencies with different professional cultures—scientific research, regulatory inspection, and risk assessment—into a single agency with a unified culture that integrated these perspectives. The study documented improved coordination between scientific research and regulatory functions, more consistent inspection standards across different regions, and enhanced public trust in food safety systems following consolidation.

Innovation and adaptability in consolidated agencies represent another important dimension with significant implications for long-term performance. The empirical evidence on these effects presents a mixed picture, with consolidation potentially either enhancing or diminishing innovation depending on how it is

implemented. On one hand, consolidated agencies may have greater resources, broader expertise, and more capacity for experimentation than smaller fragmented agencies. A study of innovation in consolidated environmental agencies found that larger consolidated agencies were more likely to develop new monitoring technologies and analytical approaches than smaller specialized agencies, attributing this to greater research capacity and ability to amortize innovation costs across larger operations.

Conversely, consolidation may reduce innovation by creating larger, more bureaucratic organizations with more standardized procedures and less flexibility to experiment. The Government Accountability Office's evaluation of the Department of Homeland Security found that innovation in security technologies and approaches decreased in the years following consolidation, as the larger department developed more centralized and standardized procurement and research processes. Component agencies that previously had autonomy to experiment with new approaches were required to conform to department-wide standards that prioritized consistency over innovation. This pattern suggests that while consolidation may enhance innovation in some areas through greater resources and expertise, it may diminish innovation in others through increased bureaucracy and standardization.

The empirical evidence on agency consolidation impacts thus reveals a complex and contingent picture rather than simple conclusions about effectiveness. Consolidation typically produces modest administrative efficiencies and cost savings concentrated in support functions, with effects on service quality, citizen outcomes, and organizational dynamics varying significantly depending on implementation choices and contextual factors. The evidence suggests that consolidation is not a universal solution to governmental challenges but rather a specific tool with particular benefits and limitations that must be carefully weighed in each context. Successful consolidations tend to be those that maintain local accessibility while achieving back-office efficiencies, preserve specialized expertise while eliminating duplication, address equity concerns explicitly, and invest in cultural integration and workforce development. Less successful consolidations typically focus excessively on structural changes at the expense of these human and operational dimensions.

As we move from examining the empirical impacts of consolidation to exploring its political dimensions, this evidence-based perspective becomes increasingly important. The mixed and contingent nature of consolidation effects helps explain why these initiatives often generate such intense political debate, as different stakeholders experience different outcomes and prioritize different dimensions of performance. Understanding these varied impacts is essential for navigating the political dynamics that shape consolidation decisions, which we will examine in the next section.

Political considerations permeate

1.9 Political Dimensions of Agency Consolidation

Political considerations permeate every aspect of agency consolidation, shaping the decision to pursue reorganization, influencing the design of consolidated structures, and determining implementation outcomes. While the previous sections examined the empirical impacts of consolidation on efficiency, service quality, and organizational dynamics, these technical dimensions exist within a broader political context that often

determines whether consolidation initiatives succeed or fail before they even begin. The political landscape of agency consolidation encompasses partisan ideologies, interest group maneuvering, electoral calculations, and leadership dynamics that collectively create an environment where technical efficiency considerations often intersect with, and sometimes yield to, political imperatives. Understanding these political dimensions is essential for a complete picture of agency consolidation, as they frequently determine not only whether consolidation occurs but also what form it takes and how it is implemented. The interplay between political forces and administrative goals creates a complex dynamic where consolidation initiatives must simultaneously satisfy multiple, often competing, objectives – from partisan advantage to interest group appeasement to genuine public administration improvement.

Partisan and ideological influences stand among the most powerful political forces shaping agency consolidation efforts. Different political parties approach governmental reorganization through distinct ideological lenses that reflect their fundamental beliefs about the role and scope of government. Conservative parties typically view agency consolidation through the prism of limited government and market efficiency, emphasizing the potential for consolidation to reduce bureaucracy, eliminate duplication, and constrain the growth of governmental power. This perspective was evident in the United Kingdom under Conservative Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, whose government pursued numerous agency consolidations during the 1980s with the explicit goal of reducing the size and scope of government. The creation of executive agencies through the Next Steps Initiative, while not strictly consolidation in the merger sense, reflected Conservative ideological preferences for creating more autonomous, business-like government units that could operate with greater efficiency and less direct political control. Similarly, the Conservative government of David Cameron pursued significant agency consolidations after 2010, merging the UK Border Agency into the Home Office and consolidating numerous regulatory bodies, driven by ideological commitments to reducing governmental footprint and enhancing efficiency.

In contrast, liberal and progressive parties often approach agency consolidation with different ideological priorities, emphasizing coordination, equity, and improved service delivery rather than mere size reduction. For progressive parties, consolidation typically serves as a means to create more coherent policy approaches across related functions, reduce inequities in service delivery, and enhance governmental capacity to address complex social problems. This perspective was evident in the United States during the New Deal era, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration created numerous consolidated agencies like the Social Security Board and the Works Progress Administration to address the Great Depression. These consolidations were driven not by a desire to reduce government but by the belief that larger, more coordinated agencies could more effectively implement ambitious social programs. Similarly, the creation of the Department of Education by President Jimmy Carter in 1979 reflected progressive ideological priorities, consolidating education functions that had been scattered across multiple agencies into a single cabinet-level department with greater visibility and capacity to advance educational equity.

The ideological foundations of these different approaches to consolidation can be traced to deeper philosophical traditions in public administration. Conservative approaches often draw on public choice theory and new public management, which view bureaucratic fragmentation as a source of inefficiency and rent-seeking behavior that can be addressed through consolidation and market-like incentives. Progressive ap-

proaches, conversely, often reflect more traditional public administration and institutionalist perspectives that view governmental coordination as essential for addressing complex societal problems and achieving equity goals. These differing ideological foundations create predictable patterns in how parties approach consolidation when they gain power. A comprehensive study of agency consolidations across twelve democratic countries found that conservative governments were approximately 40% more likely to pursue consolidations focused on administrative efficiency and cost reduction, while progressive governments were 35% more likely to pursue consolidations aimed at improving policy coordination and service integration.

Partisan conflicts over consolidation proposals frequently emerge when these differing ideological approaches collide, particularly in systems with divided government or when power transitions between parties. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002 provides a compelling example of how partisan dynamics can shape consolidation efforts. While the September 11 terrorist attacks created a compelling case for better coordination among national security agencies, the specific form that consolidation took reflected Republican control of Congress and the White House. The resulting department structure emphasized centralized control and security-focused approaches that aligned with conservative administrative philosophies, while Democratic proposals for consolidation had typically emphasized greater civil liberties protections and more balanced approaches to security and other governmental functions. These partisan differences continued to influence DHS's development in subsequent years, with Democratic administrations attempting to rebalance the department's priorities and Republican administrations reemphasizing security-focused approaches.

Another example of partisan influence on consolidation can be seen in Canada's approach to environmental agencies. When Conservative Prime Minister Stephen Harper took office in 2006, his government pursued a significant consolidation of environmental science and monitoring functions, merging several specialized agencies into a unified department with a more streamlined regulatory approach. This consolidation reflected Conservative ideological priorities for reducing regulatory burden and emphasizing economic development over environmental protection. When Liberal Prime Minister Justin Trudeau took office in 2015, his administration partially reversed this approach, reestablishing separate agencies for environmental assessment and climate change and emphasizing scientific independence and environmental protection. These oscillations in organizational structure demonstrate how partisan control can significantly influence not only whether consolidation occurs but also what form consolidated agencies take, with implications for policy outcomes and administrative approaches.

The ideological dimensions of agency consolidation extend beyond simple partisan divides to encompass deeper philosophical debates about the proper structure and role of government. Libertarian perspectives, for instance, often oppose consolidation that creates larger government agencies regardless of efficiency claims, viewing any expansion of governmental power as inherently problematic. This perspective was evident in opposition to the creation of the Department of Homeland Security from some libertarian-leaning conservatives who feared the consolidation would create an unaccountable security bureaucracy. Conversely, communitarian perspectives may support consolidation not for efficiency reasons but because they believe larger, more comprehensive agencies can better promote the common good through coordinated action. These philosophical differences underlie many debates about agency consolidation and help explain why similar proposals

can generate dramatically different responses depending on the ideological framework through which they are viewed.

Interest group dynamics represent another crucial political dimension of agency consolidation, as organized groups with stakes in governmental organization often play decisive roles in shaping consolidation proposals and outcomes. Interest groups approach consolidation efforts through the lens of how reorganization will affect their specific interests, leading to complex patterns of support and opposition that cut across typical ideological lines. Business groups, for instance, frequently support consolidation of regulatory agencies when they believe it will create more consistent and predictable regulatory environments, even if they generally oppose governmental expansion. The consolidation of financial regulatory functions in the United States following the 2008 financial crisis received significant support from financial industry groups that preferred dealing with a single consolidated regulator rather than multiple agencies with potentially overlapping or conflicting requirements. Similarly, manufacturing groups have often supported consolidations of environmental and safety regulatory agencies, arguing that streamlined regulatory processes reduce compliance costs and administrative burdens.

Conversely, business groups may oppose consolidation when they believe it will create more powerful or aggressive regulatory agencies. The proposed consolidation of antitrust enforcement functions in the United States has faced opposition from business groups concerned that a single consolidated agency would be more likely to pursue aggressive enforcement actions than multiple agencies with different approaches and priorities. This pattern of conditional support reflects a sophisticated understanding among business interest groups that consolidation can either enhance or diminish their influence depending on how it is structured and implemented. A study of business group positions on 42 major consolidation proposals across five countries found that business groups supported consolidation in 58% of cases, with support most likely when consolidation promised regulatory simplification and opposition most likely when consolidation threatened to create more powerful or ideologically aligned regulatory bodies.

Public employee unions represent another set of powerful interest groups that significantly influence consolidation dynamics, typically opposing consolidations that threaten jobs, seniority, or collective bargaining agreements. The resistance of public employee unions to consolidation efforts can be formidable, as these groups often possess substantial political resources, organizational capacity, and relationships with elected officials. The 2012 consolidation of Virginia's environmental agencies faced significant opposition from public employee unions representing workers in both agencies, who were concerned about potential job losses, changes in working conditions, and diminishment of collective bargaining power. These unions engaged in extensive lobbying efforts, public relations campaigns, and negotiations with the governor's office, ultimately securing significant concessions including no-layoff guarantees, preservation of seniority rights, and union representation on transition planning committees. The experience in Virginia reflects a broader pattern documented in multiple studies of governmental consolidation, where public employee unions have successfully modified or blocked approximately 35% of proposed consolidations that would have significantly affected their members.

Advocacy groups and non-governmental organizations also play important roles in consolidation debates,

typically evaluating proposals based on how they might affect specific policy outcomes or stakeholder interests. Environmental organizations, for instance, have mixed relationships with consolidation of environmental agencies. Some environmental groups support consolidation when they believe it will create more coherent and effective environmental protection, as was the case with environmental organizations' support for creating the Environmental Protection Agency in 1970. Other environmental groups oppose consolidation when they fear it will dilute focus on environmental issues by subsuming them within larger agencies with broader missions, as evidenced by environmental groups' opposition to proposals to merge the EPA with the Department of Energy. This conditional support based on perceived policy impacts extends across numerous issue areas, from disability rights groups evaluating consolidations of social service agencies to consumer advocacy groups assessing mergers of regulatory bodies.

The strategies employed by interest groups to influence consolidation decisions range from direct lobbying and public campaigns to more subtle approaches like cultivating relationships with key decision-makers and providing technical analysis that supports particular positions. During the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, for example, interest groups employed diverse strategies including direct lobbying of Congress, public relations campaigns emphasizing national security needs, technical analyses of different organizational options, and efforts to cultivate relationships with the White House transition team. These efforts significantly influenced the final structure of DHS, with provisions included in the authorizing legislation that addressed specific concerns of various interest groups from border security businesses to civil liberties organizations.

The role of interest groups in consolidation dynamics extends beyond influencing whether consolidation occurs to shaping the specific design of consolidated agencies. Interest groups frequently advocate for specific structural features, governance arrangements, and procedural requirements that protect their interests within consolidated organizations. During the creation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) in 2011, for instance, consumer advocacy groups successfully advocated for specific provisions in the authorizing legislation that insulated the bureau from political influence and provided dedicated funding, while financial industry groups secured provisions that established specific reporting requirements and oversight mechanisms. These structural features, determined through interest group negotiations during the legislative process, have significantly influenced the bureau's operations and effectiveness since its creation.

Electoral and leadership factors constitute the third major political dimension influencing agency consolidation, with timing, leadership capacity, and electoral calculations playing decisive roles in consolidation initiatives. The electoral cycle significantly affects when consolidation proposals are advanced, with leaders strategically timing these initiatives to maximize political advantage and minimize risk. A comprehensive analysis of 78 major agency consolidations across democratic countries found that approximately 65% were announced in the first year following an election, when governments typically have the greatest political capital and the longest timeframe before facing voters again. This pattern reflects leaders' understanding that consolidation initiatives often generate short-term political costs through disruption and uncertainty, while benefits may take years to materialize. By pursuing consolidation early in their terms, leaders create the possibility that benefits will become apparent to voters before the next election.

The Australian government's consolidation of its immigration and border protection agencies in 2015 illustrates this strategic timing. The consolidation was announced just six months after Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull took office, allowing maximum time for implementation before the next election. The government framed the consolidation as part of a broader agenda for governmental efficiency and national security enhancement, themes that resonated with voters and aligned with the government's electoral platform. By contrast, consolidation proposals announced in the final year before elections typically face greater skepticism and resistance, as voters and political opponents view them as potentially rushed or politically motivated rather than substantively justified. The failure of several consolidation proposals in the United States during presidential election years reflects this dynamic, with both legislative opponents and interest groups successfully framing them as politically motivated rather than administratively necessary.

Executive leadership represents another critical factor in consolidation dynamics, with the vision, skill, and political capital of leaders often determining whether consolidation initiatives succeed or fail. Strong executive leadership can overcome bureaucratic resistance, build political support, and navigate the complex implementation challenges of consolidation. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security under President George W. Bush exemplifies the importance of executive leadership in driving major consolidation efforts. Bush made DHS a top priority following the September 11 attacks, dedicating significant presidential attention to overcoming bureaucratic resistance, negotiating with Congress, and managing implementation challenges. His administration appointed strong leaders to key positions, including Tom Ridge as the first Secretary of Homeland Security, and maintained consistent pressure on agencies to integrate despite cultural and operational differences. While DHS faced significant implementation challenges, the fact that the consolidation occurred at all reflects the importance of committed executive leadership in driving major reorganizations.

Conversely, the absence of strong executive leadership typically dooms consolidation initiatives, regardless of their technical merits. The numerous failed attempts to consolidate federal science agencies in the United States demonstrate this pattern. Multiple administrations have proposed consolidating various science-related agencies to improve coordination and reduce duplication, but these proposals have consistently faltered due to insufficient presidential commitment and inadequate leadership to overcome resistance from agencies, Congress, and scientific communities. Without strong executive leadership to articulate a compelling vision, build political support, and drive implementation, even well-designed consolidation proposals typically stall in the face of bureaucratic inertia and political opposition.

Term-limited and lame-duck consolidation efforts represent a fascinating phenomenon in electoral politics, with leaders sometimes pursuing major reorganizations in the final periods of their terms when they no longer face electoral consequences. These end-of-term consolidations can be particularly consequential, as leaders may feel freer to make difficult decisions that could generate short-term political costs but promise long-term benefits. The creation of the Department of Veterans Affairs as a cabinet-level department in 1988 during President Ronald Reagan's final year in office exemplifies this phenomenon. Reagan, who could not run for another term, supported the elevation of the Veterans Administration to cabinet status despite concerns from some advisors about the costs and bureaucratic implications. Without electoral constraints, Reagan was able to make this decision based on policy merits and symbolic importance rather than political calculations.

Lame-duck consolidations can also occur between administrations, when outgoing leaders use their final months in office to implement organizational changes that incoming administrations may find difficult to reverse. The transition from President Barack Obama to President Donald Trump in 2016-2017 saw several such efforts, with the Obama administration issuing executive orders and guidance documents that consolidated certain functions and established new coordination mechanisms that the incoming Trump administration then had to actively work to undo. These end-of-term organizational changes reflect leaders' attempts to shape governmental structure in ways that reflect their priorities and values, even after they have left office.

The relationship between leadership transitions and consolidation implementation represents another important dimension of electoral and leadership factors. Consolidation initiatives often span multiple electoral cycles and leadership transitions, creating challenges for continuity and sustained commitment. The creation of HM Revenue and Customs in the United Kingdom, begun under the Blair government and continued under the Brown government, benefited from consistent leadership commitment across a transition within the same party. Conversely, consolidations that span transitions between parties often face significant disruptions as new leaders reassess priorities and approaches. The Department of Homeland Security experienced significant shifts in emphasis and approach as it transitioned from the Bush to Obama to Trump administrations, with each new leadership team bringing different priorities and organizational preferences that affected the department's evolution.

The political dimensions of agency consolidation thus encompass a complex interplay of partisan ideologies, interest group dynamics, and electoral and leadership factors that collectively shape the landscape within which consolidation initiatives occur. These political forces often determine not only whether consolidation happens but also what form it takes and how it is implemented. Understanding these dimensions is essential for a complete picture of agency consolidation, as they frequently create the context and constraints within which technical and administrative considerations operate. The most successful consolidation initiatives are typically those that navigate these political dimensions effectively, building support across partisan divides, addressing legitimate interest group concerns, and leveraging electoral timing and leadership capacity to maximize chances of success. As we move to examining global perspectives on agency consolidation in the next section, these political dimensions will provide an important lens for understanding how different political systems and contexts shape consolidation approaches and outcomes around the world.

1.10 Global Perspectives on Agency Consolidation

I need to write section 10 of the Encyclopedia Galactica article on "Agency Consolidation," focusing on "Global Perspectives on Agency Consolidation." This section should provide a comparative analysis of agency consolidation practices across different countries and regions, highlighting cultural, institutional, and contextual factors that shape approaches.

The section should cover three main subsections: 10.1 Consolidation in Federal Systems 10.2 Consolidation in Unitary States 10.3 Consolidation in Developing Countries

I should write approximately the target word count for this section (though the actual target isn't specified

in the prompt, I'll aim for a comprehensive treatment similar to the previous sections).

I need to build naturally upon the previous content, which ended with a discussion of political dimensions of agency consolidation. I'll create a smooth transition from where the previous section ended.

I should follow the outline structure but expand with rich detail and examples, maintaining the same tone and quality as the previous sections. I'll include specific examples, anecdotes, and fascinating details, ensuring all content is factual and based on real-world information.

I'll continue the narrative prose style from previous sections, avoiding bullet points and weaving information into flowing paragraphs. I'll use transitions to connect ideas naturally.

Let me start drafting this section:

1.11 Section 10: Global Perspectives on Agency Consolidation

The political dimensions of agency consolidation examined in the previous section reveal how partisan ideologies, interest group dynamics, and electoral considerations shape reorganization efforts within individual countries. Yet these political factors operate within broader national and institutional contexts that vary dramatically across different governmental systems and cultural traditions. Understanding agency consolidation requires a global perspective that examines how different political systems, administrative traditions, and developmental contexts influence both the approach to and outcomes of governmental reorganization. The international landscape of agency consolidation reveals fascinating patterns of convergence and divergence, as countries face similar administrative challenges yet respond through approaches deeply rooted in their distinctive institutional structures, cultural values, and historical experiences. This comparative analysis illuminates how contextual factors shape consolidation practices, offering valuable insights for policymakers and scholars seeking to understand the conditions under which different consolidation models are likely to succeed or fail.

10.1 Consolidation in Federal Systems

Federal systems present distinctive challenges and opportunities for agency consolidation, characterized by constitutional divisions of power between national and subnational governments, multiple layers of jurisdiction, and complex intergovernmental relationships. In these systems, consolidation efforts must navigate not only the standard bureaucratic and political obstacles encountered in unitary states but also the constitutional constraints and jurisdictional complexities inherent in federal structures. The United States, Germany, Australia, Canada, and other federal countries have pursued diverse approaches to agency consolidation that reflect their unique constitutional arrangements, political cultures, and administrative traditions, offering valuable comparative insights into how federalism shapes governmental reorganization.

The United States provides a compelling case study of agency consolidation within a federal system characterized by a strict separation of powers and strong constitutional protections for state autonomy. American federalism creates a complex environment for consolidation, as the national government must respect constitutional limits on its authority while states retain significant autonomy over their internal administrative

structures. This context has produced distinctive patterns of consolidation at both federal and state levels, with relatively limited cross-jurisdictional consolidation but significant intrajurisdictional reorganizations. At the federal level, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002 stands as the most ambitious consolidation effort in American history, merging 22 agencies with approximately 180,000 employees into a single department. This consolidation was made possible by the extraordinary circumstances following the September 11 terrorist attacks, which created political momentum sufficient to overcome the formidable obstacles to federal reorganization in the U.S. system. The constitutional authority for this consolidation derived from Congress's power to provide for the common defense and regulate interstate commerce, though the process required extensive negotiations to address concerns about federalism implications, particularly regarding the relationship between federal agencies and state-level emergency management and law enforcement entities.

The American experience with federal consolidation reveals how the separation of powers creates both constraints and opportunities for reorganization. The U.S. system requires congressional authorization for major agency consolidations, giving significant influence to congressional committees whose jurisdictions would be affected by reorganization. This fragmented congressional authority often creates obstacles to comprehensive consolidation, as committees resist changes that would diminish their oversight responsibilities. The Government Accountability Office has documented how this congressional fragmentation has stymied numerous consolidation proposals over the decades, from efforts to unify federal science agencies to attempts to consolidate economic regulatory functions. At the same time, the American system provides considerable discretion to the executive branch to implement reorganizations within authorized agency structures, allowing presidents to pursue significant consolidations through administrative actions that do not require congressional approval. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's creation of the Executive Office of the President in 1939 through Reorganization Plan No. 1 exemplifies this approach, consolidating various management and budgetary functions under presidential control without needing congressional legislation, though subsequent reorganization plans have faced greater congressional resistance.

At the state level, American federalism produces remarkable variation in consolidation approaches, reflecting the diverse political cultures, administrative traditions, and constitutional arrangements across the fifty states. Virginia's 2012 consolidation of environmental agencies, discussed in previous sections, represents one successful approach within this federal context, leveraging the state's relatively strong governorship and tradition of administrative professionalism to overcome bureaucratic resistance. By contrast, California's experience with agency consolidation illustrates the challenges in states with more fragmented governmental systems. California's numerous attempts to consolidate various regulatory and administrative functions have frequently been stymied by the state's complex constitutional requirements, powerful interest groups, and fragmented executive authority. The state's 2011 attempt to consolidate enterprise zone functions under a single agency, for instance, faced significant opposition from local governments and business interests concerned about losing control over economic development programs, ultimately resulting in a much more limited reorganization than originally proposed.

The German federal system offers a contrasting approach to agency consolidation, shaped by its distinctive cooperative federalism model, strong constitutional protections for state (Länder) autonomy, and tradition

of administrative federalism. Unlike the American system, where federal and state administrative structures are generally separate, Germany's administrative federalism involves significant implementation of federal laws by state administrations, creating a more integrated intergovernmental system. This context produces different patterns of consolidation, with greater emphasis on cooperative arrangements and functional reorganization rather than merely structural mergers. The 2006 reform of Germany's federal labor administration provides a compelling example of this distinctive approach. Facing significant inefficiencies in the fragmented system of federal and state labor offices, the reform created the Federal Employment Agency (Bundesagentur für Arbeit) as a self-governing public corporation with unified federal-state governance structures. This consolidation preserved the constitutional principle of state participation in federal administration while creating a more integrated service delivery system. The agency's governing board includes representatives from both federal and state governments, as well as employee and employer representatives, reflecting Germany's tradition of corporatist governance and cooperative federalism.

The German approach to consolidation also demonstrates the importance of constitutional courts in federal systems, as the Federal Constitutional Court has frequently ruled on the permissibility of various reorganization efforts. In a landmark 2006 decision, the court upheld the labor administration consolidation but imposed significant conditions regarding state participation and autonomy, illustrating how judicial review shapes consolidation possibilities in federal systems. This judicial oversight creates both constraints and legitimizing functions for consolidation efforts, forcing policymakers to carefully consider federal constitutional principles while providing authoritative resolution of disputes over reorganization authority.

Australia's federal system presents yet another distinctive model, characterized by a Westminster parliamentary tradition overlaying a federal structure, creating unique dynamics for agency consolidation. Unlike the United States, Australia has a more flexible approach to governmental reorganization, as the parliamentary system gives the executive greater authority to implement organizational changes without requiring separate legislative authorization for each restructuring. This flexibility has allowed Australian governments to pursue more frequent and comprehensive consolidations than their American counterparts. The 2013 consolidation of customs and border protection functions into the Australian Border Force exemplifies this approach, representing a significant reorganization implemented through administrative action rather than specific legislation. This flexibility stems from Australia's Westminster tradition, which concentrates executive authority in the hands of the prime minister and cabinet, allowing for more decisive administrative action.

At the same time, Australian federalism creates distinctive challenges for consolidation through the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) process, which coordinates policy across federal, state, and territorial governments. Many significant consolidation efforts in Australia require COAG agreement to be effective, creating a complex intergovernmental negotiation process. The National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS), while not strictly a consolidation of agencies, illustrates this dynamic. The NDIS required substantial reorganization of disability service delivery across all Australian jurisdictions, necessitating extensive COAG negotiations to address funding arrangements, service standards, and implementation timelines. This intergovernmental coordination process both enabled the reform through national consensus and constrained it through the need to accommodate diverse state and territorial priorities and capacities.

Canada's federal system offers additional insights into consolidation within federal contexts, characterized by its distinctive division of powers between federal and provincial governments, strong regional identities, and ongoing tensions between national unity and provincial autonomy. Canadian approaches to consolidation reflect these characteristics, with significant variation in reorganization practices across different provinces and between federal and provincial levels. The federal government's creation of Global Affairs Canada in 2015, merging the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development with the Canadian International Development Agency, represents a successful federal consolidation that navigated these challenges by focusing on functions clearly within federal jurisdiction while respecting provincial interests in areas like education and healthcare where provincial authority is constitutionally protected.

At the provincial level, Canadian federalism produces diverse consolidation approaches reflecting regional political cultures and administrative traditions. Alberta's 2019 restructuring of government departments, discussed in previous sections, exemplifies a more centralized approach within a province with a tradition of strong executive leadership. By contrast, Ontario's more incremental approach to consolidation reflects its larger size, greater regional diversity, and tradition of more consultative governance processes. These provincial variations demonstrate how federal systems can produce multiple models of consolidation within a single country, shaped by regional political cultures and administrative traditions.

The comparative analysis of consolidation in federal systems reveals several important patterns. First, constitutional structures significantly shape the possibilities for consolidation, with systems like the United States imposing greater constraints on executive reorganization authority while parliamentary systems like Australia and Canada provide more flexibility. Second, intergovernmental relationships profoundly influence consolidation approaches, with systems characterized by administrative federalism like Germany requiring more cooperative models than those with clearer separation of federal and state administrations like the United States. Third, judicial institutions play important roles in federal consolidation processes, either as facilitators through authoritative resolution of disputes or as constraints through enforcement of constitutional limitations. Fourth, subnational variation within federal systems produces diverse consolidation models that reflect regional political cultures and administrative traditions. These patterns suggest that effective consolidation in federal systems requires careful attention to constitutional constraints, intergovernmental relationships, and regional variations, with approaches tailored to the specific characteristics of each federal context rather than generic models imported from unitary systems.

10.2 Consolidation in Unitary States

Unitary states present a contrasting environment for agency consolidation, characterized by constitutional concentration of authority at the national level, fewer jurisdictional complexities, and greater executive discretion in reorganization efforts. In these systems, consolidation typically faces fewer constitutional obstacles to reorganization but must navigate other challenges including administrative traditions, cultural resistance to change, and the complexities of managing centralized bureaucracies. Countries like France, Japan, Sweden, and New Zealand offer diverse examples of consolidation approaches within unitary frameworks, revealing how different administrative traditions and cultural contexts shape reorganization efforts.

France provides a fascinating case study of agency consolidation within a unitary state characterized by a

strong tradition of centralized administration, clear hierarchical authority, and a distinctive administrative elite. The French approach to consolidation reflects these characteristics, typically involving top-down reorganizations driven by the executive branch and implemented through formal administrative decrees. The 2017 reform of the French administration under President Emmanuel Macron exemplifies this approach, consolidating various regional directorates into unified regional services while maintaining the overall structure of the centralized state. This reform aimed to reduce administrative fragmentation at the regional level while preserving France's tradition of centralized control over key functions. The consolidation was implemented through formal decrees issued by the prime minister, reflecting the French constitutional framework that grants significant reorganization authority to the executive branch.

The French experience also illustrates the importance of administrative traditions in shaping consolidation approaches. France's distinctive system of *grands corps*—elite administrative bodies with specialized expertise and significant autonomy—creates both opportunities and challenges for consolidation. On one hand, these specialized bodies provide high-capacity administrative units that can effectively implement complex reorganizations. On the other hand, their autonomy and specialized cultures can create resistance to consolidation efforts that threaten their distinct identities and prerogatives. The 2008 reform creating the General Directorate for Civil Aviation (Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile) through the merger of several civil aviation authorities illustrates this dynamic. While the consolidation achieved greater coordination in aviation regulation and oversight, it required careful negotiations with the affected *grands corps* to preserve their specialized expertise and career paths, resulting in a hybrid structure that maintained significant autonomy for specialized functions within the unified directorate.

The French approach to decentralization adds another layer of complexity to consolidation efforts. Since the 1980s, France has pursued a gradual decentralization of authority to regions and departments, creating a more complex multilevel governance system while maintaining constitutional unitary status. This evolving context has produced distinctive consolidation challenges, as national-level reorganizations must consider their implications for decentralized structures and vice versa. The 2015 reform creating regional health agencies (Agences Régionales de Santé) exemplifies this dynamic, consolidating various regional health authorities into unified agencies while navigating the complex relationships between national policy direction, regional implementation, and local service delivery. This reform reflected France's broader efforts to modernize its administration through territorial reorganization, creating more integrated regional structures while maintaining national oversight and standards.

Japan offers another compelling example of consolidation within a unitary system, characterized by its distinctive bureaucratic traditions, consensus-oriented decision-making processes, and periodic waves of administrative reform. Japan's approach to consolidation typically involves extensive deliberation within the bureaucracy followed by decisive implementation, reflecting the country's emphasis on careful preparation and formal consensus. The 2001 Central Government Reform represents the most significant consolidation effort in Japan's postwar history, reducing the number of government ministries and agencies from 22 to 12 through a comprehensive reorganization. This reform aimed to address long-standing problems of bureaucratic fragmentation, duplication, and lack of coordination in Japan's administrative system, which had developed incrementally over decades without comprehensive restructuring.

The Japanese approach to implementing this reform reveals distinctive cultural and institutional factors. The reform process involved years of deliberation within administrative councils, extensive consultations with relevant stakeholders, and careful preparation of implementation plans before the actual reorganization occurred. This meticulous approach reflected Japan's bureaucratic tradition of *nemawashi* (root-binding)—the process of building consensus informally before formal decisions are made. While this approach created delays and sometimes watered down reform proposals, it also ensured broader buy-in and smoother implementation once the reform was launched. The actual consolidation occurred on a single day—January 6, 2001—with ministries and agencies simultaneously transitioning to their new structures, reflecting Japan's capacity for coordinated action once consensus has been achieved.

Japan's experience also illustrates the challenges of sustaining consolidation efforts over time. While the 2001 reform achieved significant structural changes, subsequent evaluations have found that many of the underlying problems of coordination and fragmentation persisted despite the new organizational structures. The Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI), created through the merger of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry and parts of other economic agencies, provides a telling example. While formally consolidated, METI continued to operate with significant internal divisions reflecting its pre-merger components, with different bureaus maintaining distinct cultures and approaches to policy. This persistence of pre-existing organizational cultures despite formal consolidation has been documented in multiple Japanese agencies, suggesting that structural reorganization alone cannot overcome deeply ingrained bureaucratic traditions without complementary changes in personnel systems, operational procedures, and organizational cultures.

The Nordic countries, particularly Sweden and Denmark, offer yet another model of consolidation within unitary systems, characterized by their traditions of consultative governance, strong welfare states, and emphasis on administrative efficiency and service quality. The Swedish approach to consolidation reflects these characteristics, typically involving thorough analysis, broad stakeholder consultation, and careful attention to maintaining service quality during reorganization. The 2008 consolidation of Swedish labor market agencies exemplifies this approach, merging the Public Employment Service with several other labor market bodies into a single authority. This consolidation was preceded by extensive analysis of potential efficiency gains and service quality impacts, involving government agencies, academic researchers, and social partners in the evaluation process. The implementation itself was phased over two years to minimize disruption to services, with particular attention to maintaining local service access points while achieving back-office efficiencies.

The Danish experience with consolidation similarly reflects the Nordic tradition of consultative governance and evidence-based policy making. The 2007 municipal reform in Denmark, while primarily focused on local government structure, had significant implications for agency consolidation through its reduction of municipalities from 271 to 98 and creation of five new regions. This structural reform necessitated extensive consolidation of local government agencies and services, implemented through careful planning and extensive consultation with municipal leaders, employees, and citizen representatives. The reform aimed to create more financially viable municipalities capable of providing consistent services while maintaining local democratic accountability—a balance achieved through specific provisions ensuring local representation in the new larger municipalities and establishing clear standards for service provision.

New Zealand provides a contrasting example of consolidation within a unitary system, characterized by its tradition of public management reform, emphasis on efficiency and performance, and relatively small scale of government. New Zealand's approach to consolidation reflects its distinctive public management philosophy, which has emphasized clear organizational missions, performance accountability, and managerial autonomy since the radical reforms of the 1980s and 1990s. The 2011 merger of New Zealand's Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry with the Ministry of Fisheries to form the Ministry for Primary Industries exemplifies this approach, driven by efficiency objectives and implemented with a focus on maintaining clear performance accountability throughout the transition. The consolidation was guided by principles of maintaining specialized expertise while eliminating duplication in corporate services and policy functions, reflecting New Zealand's pragmatic approach to public management that balances efficiency concerns with recognition of the need for specialized knowledge in complex policy areas.

The comparative analysis of consolidation in unitary states reveals several distinctive patterns compared to federal systems. First, unitary systems typically provide greater executive authority for reorganization, allowing for more decisive and comprehensive consolidation efforts when political will exists. Second, administrative traditions and bureaucratic cultures play particularly important roles in shaping consolidation outcomes, as these systems lack the jurisdictional complexities of federalism that might otherwise dominate reform considerations. Third, the absence of constitutional constraints on reorganization in unitary systems places greater emphasis on administrative capacity and political leadership as determinants of consolidation success. Fourth, unitary systems often demonstrate greater capacity for coordinated, system-wide reorganization efforts, as seen in Japan's 2001 Central Government Reform and Denmark's 2007 municipal reform. These patterns suggest that while unitary systems may face fewer constitutional obstacles to consolidation, they confront distinctive challenges related to bureaucratic traditions, organizational cultures, and the management of large centralized bureaucracies.

10.3 Consolidation in Developing Countries

Developing countries present a distinctive context for agency consolidation, characterized by capacity constraints, institutional fragility, competing development priorities, and often the significant influence of international organizations and donors. In these contexts, consolidation efforts must navigate complex challenges including limited administrative capacity, political instability, corruption, and the tension between imported administrative models and local institutional

1.12 Future Trends in Agency Consolidation

I need to write section 11 of the Encyclopedia Galactica article on "Agency Consolidation," focusing on "Future Trends in Agency Consolidation." This section should explore emerging trends, innovations, and future directions in agency consolidation, including the influence of technology, changing governance models, and evolving societal expectations.

The section should cover three main subsections: 11.1 Technology-Enabled Consolidation 11.2 Network Governance and Alternative Models 11.3 Emerging Challenges and Opportunities

I should write approximately the target word count for this section (though the actual target isn't specified in the prompt, I'll aim for a comprehensive treatment similar to the previous sections).

I need to build naturally upon the previous content, which ended with a discussion of global perspectives on agency consolidation, including consolidation in federal systems, unitary states, and developing countries. I'll create a smooth transition from where the previous section ended.

I should follow the outline structure but expand with rich detail and examples, maintaining the same tone and quality as the previous sections. I'll include specific examples, anecdotes, and fascinating details, ensuring all content is factual and based on real-world information.

I'll continue the narrative prose style from previous sections, avoiding bullet points and weaving information into flowing paragraphs. I'll use transitions to connect ideas naturally.

Let me start drafting this section:

1.13 Section 11: Future Trends in Agency Consolidation

The global landscape of agency consolidation examined in the previous section reveals how different political systems, administrative traditions, and developmental contexts shape reorganization efforts across countries. Yet this comparative snapshot captures only a moment in time, as technological advancements, evolving governance paradigms, and shifting societal expectations continue to transform the context and possibilities for agency consolidation. The future of governmental reorganization will be shaped by powerful forces that are already beginning to reshape how agencies structure themselves, coordinate their activities, and deliver services to citizens. These emerging trends suggest that the traditional model of agency consolidation—focused primarily on structural mergers and hierarchical integration—may give way to more dynamic, technology-enabled, and networked approaches to governmental organization. Understanding these future directions is essential for policymakers and practitioners seeking to navigate the evolving landscape of public administration and design governmental structures capable of meeting the challenges of tomorrow.

11.1 Technology-Enabled Consolidation

Digital transformation represents perhaps the most significant force reshaping the future of agency consolidation, creating new possibilities for organizational integration that transcend traditional structural boundaries. Advanced information technologies enable forms of consolidation that were previously inconceivable, allowing agencies to coordinate operations, share information, and deliver services without formal structural merger. This technology-enabled consolidation is fundamentally different from traditional approaches, as it emphasizes functional integration over structural change, creating virtual consolidation through digital platforms rather than physical reorganization through hierarchical restructuring. The implications of this shift are profound, suggesting that the future of governmental organization may lie less in creating larger bureaucratic structures and more in developing integrated digital ecosystems that connect previously separate agencies and functions.

Cloud computing has emerged as a foundational technology enabling new approaches to agency consolidation, providing shared infrastructure and platforms that eliminate the need for each agency to maintain

separate IT systems. The U.S. federal government's Cloud Smart strategy, launched in 2018, exemplifies this trend, encouraging agencies to migrate to shared cloud services rather than maintaining separate data centers and IT infrastructure. This approach achieves many of the benefits of traditional consolidation—reduced duplication, economies of scale, standardized systems—without requiring formal organizational mergers. The General Services Administration's (GSA) cloud procurement vehicles have enabled hundreds of federal agencies to access shared computing resources, achieving estimated cost savings of over \$1 billion annually while improving system reliability and security. Similarly, the United Kingdom's Government Cloud (G-Cloud) program has created a marketplace of cloud services that agencies can access without needing to develop separate IT capabilities, effectively consolidating digital infrastructure across government while preserving organizational autonomy.

Artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies are creating even more sophisticated possibilities for technology-enabled consolidation, allowing agencies to integrate decision-making processes and service delivery in ways that transcend organizational boundaries. Estonia's once-only principle system provides a compelling example of this approach, using AI and data exchange platforms to create integrated service delivery across all government agencies without requiring structural consolidation. When Estonian citizens interact with any government agency, the system automatically retrieves relevant information from other agencies through secure data exchanges, eliminating the need for citizens to provide the same information multiple times. This virtual consolidation achieves many of the coordination benefits of traditional mergers while preserving agency specialization and autonomy. The system processes over 1 billion data exchanges annually between agencies, demonstrating how digital integration can create functional consolidation without structural change.

Blockchain technology offers another emerging avenue for technology-enabled consolidation, providing secure, decentralized mechanisms for agencies to share information and coordinate activities without hierarchical control. The Dubai Blockchain Strategy, launched in 2016, aims to conduct all applicable government transactions on blockchain platforms by 2021, creating an integrated digital government that transcends traditional agency boundaries. This approach enables agencies to maintain their distinct functions and missions while operating on a shared technological infrastructure that ensures data consistency, security, and interoperability. The Dubai Land Department's blockchain-based property registration system exemplifies this approach, integrating data from multiple agencies including the Dubai Municipality, Dubai Electricity and Water Authority, and the Roads and Transport Authority into a single unified platform without requiring structural consolidation of these agencies.

Robotic Process Automation (RPA) is transforming back-office consolidation by enabling agencies to automate routine administrative processes across organizational boundaries. The Australian Taxation Office's use of RPA provides a compelling example of this trend. By implementing robotic automation for processes spanning multiple tax and welfare agencies, the ATO has achieved significant efficiency gains and improved coordination without requiring formal organizational merger. The automation bots handle over 2 million transactions annually across agency boundaries, reducing processing times by 70% and errors by 90% compared to manual processes. This approach achieves many of the efficiency benefits of traditional consolidation while preserving agency specialization and avoiding the disruption and costs associated with

structural reorganization.

Digital identity systems represent another critical technology enabling new forms of agency consolidation, creating unified citizen profiles that can securely interact with multiple government agencies. India's Aadhaar system, the world's largest biometric identity program with over 1.2 billion enrollees, provides a striking example of this trend. By creating a single digital identity that can be used across hundreds of government services, Aadhaar has effectively consolidated identity verification functions without requiring structural merger of the numerous agencies providing these services. The system processes over 1 billion authentication transactions monthly, enabling citizens to access everything from banking services to welfare benefits through a single digital identity. This virtual consolidation of identity functions has reduced administrative costs by an estimated \$10 billion annually while dramatically improving service accessibility for citizens, particularly those previously excluded from formal identity systems.

The implications of these technology-enabled approaches for the future of agency consolidation are profound. Traditional consolidation focused primarily on creating larger hierarchical organizations through formal mergers, but technology-enabled consolidation emphasizes functional integration through digital platforms that preserve organizational autonomy while achieving coordination and efficiency. This shift suggests that the future of governmental organization may be characterized by more flexible, adaptive structures that can be reconfigured through digital means rather than physical restructuring. The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated this trend, as governments worldwide rapidly deployed digital platforms to coordinate responses across multiple agencies without time for formal consolidation processes. The European Union's digital COVID certificate system, which integrated health data from 27 member states' health agencies within months, exemplifies this capacity for rapid digital integration without structural consolidation.

11.2 Network Governance and Alternative Models

Beyond technological transformations, the future of agency consolidation is being reshaped by evolving governance paradigms that challenge traditional hierarchical models of organization. Network governance approaches are emerging as compelling alternatives to traditional consolidation, emphasizing collaborative arrangements, flexible structures, and adaptive capacity over rigid hierarchies and permanent mergers. These approaches recognize that many complex public problems cannot be effectively addressed through centralized bureaucratic structures, regardless of how large or consolidated they become. Instead, network governance models focus on creating mechanisms for coordination and collaboration across organizational boundaries while preserving the specialized expertise, innovation capacity, and democratic accountability that can be diminished in overly consolidated structures.

Collaborative governance networks represent one significant alternative to traditional consolidation, creating formal structures for interagency coordination without requiring permanent merger. The United States' National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP) provides a compelling example of this approach. Rather than consolidating the numerous federal, state, local, and private sector entities responsible for critical infrastructure protection into a single agency, the NIPP creates a networked governance structure with coordinating councils, information sharing mechanisms, and collaborative planning processes that enable integrated action while preserving organizational autonomy and specialized expertise. This network approach has proven

particularly effective for addressing complex, cross-cutting challenges like infrastructure protection, where no single agency possesses all necessary expertise or authority. The network includes over 200 participating organizations across government and industry, coordinating activities through structured collaborative processes rather than hierarchical control.

Public-private partnerships (PPPs) represent another alternative model that achieves functional consolidation through contractual arrangements rather than organizational mergers. The United Kingdom's Private Finance Initiative (PFI), while controversial in some respects, demonstrates how contractual mechanisms can integrate public and private capabilities without requiring consolidation of organizations into single entities. Under this approach, specialized government agencies maintain their distinct identities and missions while contracting with private sector partners for specific functions like infrastructure development and service delivery. This contractual consolidation achieves many of the efficiency benefits of traditional mergers while preserving public accountability and private sector innovation. The PFI has been used for over 700 projects with a total capital value of approximately £60 billion, creating integrated service delivery systems across organizational boundaries without structural consolidation.

Cross-boundary teams and task forces offer yet another alternative to traditional consolidation, creating temporary or semi-permanent structures that integrate personnel and expertise from multiple agencies to address specific challenges. The U.S. government's interagency task forces provide numerous examples of this approach. The Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATF-S), which coordinates counter-narcotics efforts across 14 federal agencies and numerous international partners, exemplifies how integrated teams can achieve functional consolidation without permanent organizational merger. JIATF-S operates as a unified command with integrated intelligence, operations, and support functions, drawing personnel from participating agencies while maintaining their organizational affiliations and career paths. This approach combines the coordination benefits of consolidation with the specialized expertise and innovation capacity of diverse organizations, achieving remarkable results in disrupting drug trafficking networks that no single agency could address alone.

Virtual agencies and digital platforms represent the most technologically sophisticated alternative to traditional consolidation, creating integrated service delivery and policy coordination through digital means rather than physical reorganization. Singapore's LifeSG mobile application provides a striking example of this approach, presenting citizens with a unified interface to access over 400 government services from 70 different agencies. From the citizen's perspective, this creates the experience of interacting with a single consolidated government, despite the fact that the underlying agencies remain structurally separate. The application processes over 1 million transactions monthly, demonstrating how digital integration can achieve many of the service coordination benefits of traditional consolidation while preserving agency specialization and autonomy. This virtual approach has been particularly effective for Singapore's government, allowing it to provide integrated services while maintaining the specialized expertise and innovation capacity of focused agencies.

Hybrid organizational forms are emerging as particularly promising alternatives to traditional consolidation, combining elements of hierarchical control with network flexibility to address complex governance chal-

lenges. The Netherlands' Environmental Assessment Agency provides an innovative example of this hybrid approach. While formally part of the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management, the agency operates with significant autonomy and maintains networked relationships with numerous other government bodies, research institutions, and international organizations. This hybrid structure enables the agency to coordinate environmental assessments across organizational boundaries while maintaining scientific independence and specialized expertise. The agency's annual National Environmental Outlook integrates data and analysis from over 100 different organizations, creating a comprehensive assessment that no single consolidated agency could produce alone.

The comparative advantages of these networked and alternative models over traditional consolidation are becoming increasingly apparent in addressing complex, cross-cutting challenges. Traditional consolidation typically creates larger, more hierarchical organizations that may achieve economies of scale in routine operations but often struggle with adaptability, innovation, and responsiveness to diverse needs. Network governance approaches, by contrast, create more flexible structures that can be rapidly reconfigured to address emerging challenges while preserving specialized expertise and innovation capacity. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted these advantages, as governments worldwide relied on networked coordination mechanisms rather than consolidated structures to rapidly mobilize responses across public health, economic support, and social service domains.

The implications of these emerging governance models for the future of agency consolidation are significant. While traditional structural consolidation will likely continue to play a role in governmental reorganization, it will increasingly be complemented—and in some cases replaced—by more flexible, networked approaches that achieve functional integration without permanent merger. This evolution suggests that the future of governmental organization may be characterized by a more diverse ecosystem of organizational forms, including traditional consolidated agencies, collaborative networks, virtual platforms, and hybrid structures, each suited to different types of governmental functions and challenges. The most effective governments will likely be those that can strategically deploy this diverse toolkit of organizational approaches, matching governance structures to specific problems rather than pursuing consolidation as a universal solution.

11.3 Emerging Challenges and Opportunities

The future landscape of agency consolidation will be shaped not only by technological innovations and evolving governance models but also by emerging challenges and opportunities that will create new imperatives for governmental reorganization. Global crises, demographic shifts, climate change, evolving citizen expectations, and changing conceptions of governance are all creating pressures that will influence how agencies organize themselves and coordinate their activities in the coming decades. Understanding these emerging dynamics is essential for anticipating future consolidation trends and preparing governmental structures to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

Crisis events have historically been catalysts for agency consolidation, creating political momentum and public support for reorganization that might otherwise face resistance. The September 11 terrorist attacks led to the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, the 2008 financial crisis spurred consolidations of financial regulatory agencies, and the COVID-19 pandemic has prompted numerous reorganizations of public

health and emergency management functions worldwide. Looking forward, climate change-related disasters are likely to become increasingly significant drivers of consolidation, as the escalating frequency and severity of climate-related events expose gaps and fragmentation in current governmental response structures. Australia's 2020 creation of the National Recovery and Resilience Agency, consolidating disaster recovery functions from multiple agencies, exemplifies this trend, as governments recognize that effective climate adaptation and disaster response require more integrated approaches than current fragmented structures can provide.

The cascading nature of modern crises presents particular challenges that will shape future consolidation approaches. Unlike traditional crises that affect specific sectors or regions, contemporary challenges like pandemics, climate disasters, and cyber attacks cascade across multiple domains, requiring coordinated responses from health, economic, security, and social service agencies. This interconnectivity creates pressure for consolidation not just within sectors but across them, leading to more comprehensive reorganizations that address the systemic nature of modern risks. The European Union's proposed European Health Union, which would consolidate health crisis preparedness and response functions across member states, reflects this emerging understanding of crisis interconnectivity. Similarly, the United States' discussion of consolidating cyber security functions across multiple civilian and defense agencies acknowledges the cross-domain nature of modern security challenges.

Demographic changes will significantly influence future agency consolidation trends, as aging populations, migration patterns, and urbanization reshape service delivery needs and governmental priorities. Aging populations in developed countries will create pressure to consolidate health and social service agencies to address the complex, interconnected needs of elderly citizens. Japan's continuing efforts to integrate health, long-term care, and social services for its rapidly aging population exemplify this trend, as the country recognizes that fragmented service structures cannot effectively address the multifaceted needs of an elderly society. Conversely, developing countries with young, rapidly growing populations will face different consolidation pressures, particularly in education, employment, and social services. Kenya's ongoing consolidation of youth service agencies reflects these demographic imperatives, as the country seeks to create more integrated approaches to serving its large youth population.

Urbanization represents another demographic force shaping future consolidation trends, as the growing concentration of populations in cities creates new governance challenges that transcend traditional jurisdictional boundaries. The rise of megacities and metropolitan regions with populations exceeding 10 million creates pressure for consolidation across municipal boundaries, as functional urban areas rarely align with political jurisdictions. The continued evolution of metropolitan governance models like those in Toronto, Melbourne, and Stuttgart, discussed in previous sections, will likely accelerate as urbanization continues. These models typically involve some form of consolidation or coordination across multiple municipalities to address region-wide challenges like transportation, environmental protection, and economic development. The emergence of city-regions as the dominant form of human settlement in the 21st century suggests that metropolitan consolidation and coordination will become increasingly important features of the governmental landscape.

Evolving citizen expectations represent another significant force shaping the future of agency consolidation, as digital natives accustomed to seamless, integrated private sector services increasingly expect similar experiences from government. This expectation is driving pressure for consolidation not necessarily to create larger organizations but to create more integrated service experiences, regardless of underlying organizational structures. The Estonian government's once-only principle and Singapore's LifeSG application, discussed earlier, represent early manifestations of this trend, as governments recognize that citizens expect unified service experiences even if service delivery remains structurally fragmented. This dynamic suggests that future consolidation efforts may focus more on front-end service integration than back-end organizational merger, creating the appearance and experience of consolidated government while maintaining the specialized expertise and innovation capacity of focused agencies.

Changing conceptions of democratic governance and accountability will also influence future consolidation trends. Traditional consolidation often creates larger, more powerful agencies that can be difficult for citizens to understand and hold accountable, potentially diminishing democratic engagement. Emerging governance models emphasize not just efficiency and coordination but also transparency, participation, and accountability, creating pressure for consolidation approaches that balance these values. The Open Government Partnership, launched in 2011 with 78 participating countries, reflects this evolving understanding, promoting governmental reforms that combine efficiency improvements with enhanced transparency and citizen participation. Future consolidation efforts will likely need to incorporate these democratic values more explicitly, creating structures that achieve coordination without sacrificing accountability or citizen engagement.

The future of work presents another significant factor that will shape agency consolidation trends, as remote work, artificial intelligence, and changing employment relationships transform how government agencies operate. The widespread adoption of remote work during the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that physical co-location is no longer necessary for many governmental functions, potentially reducing one traditional rationale for consolidation—achieving economies of scale in facilities and physical infrastructure. At the same time, the integration of artificial intelligence into government operations may create new imperatives for consolidation, as specialized AI capabilities require scale and data integration that may be difficult for smaller, fragmented agencies to achieve independently. The U.S. government's creation of the AI Initiative and the UK's establishment of the Office for AI reflect early recognition of these emerging dynamics, as governments begin to grapple with how to organize effectively for an AI-enabled future.

Resource constraints will continue to be a significant driver of consolidation in the coming decades, particularly as governments face competing demands from aging populations, climate adaptation, infrastructure investment, and debt service. These fiscal pressures will create ongoing incentives for consolidation to achieve efficiency gains and cost savings, but the nature of these consolidations may evolve as governments learn from past experiences. Rather than pursuing large-scale, high-risk consolidations that promise dramatic savings but often fail to deliver, future efforts may focus on more targeted consolidations of specific functions where duplication is clear and efficiency gains are more certain. The trend toward shared services models, which consolidate back-office functions like human resources, finance, and IT while preserving front-line service delivery in specialized agencies,

1.14 Conclusion and Key Takeaways

I need to write the final section of the Encyclopedia Galactica article on “Agency Consolidation,” which is Section 12: Conclusion and Key Takeaways. This section should synthesize the major themes and findings from the article, offering a balanced assessment of agency consolidation and providing guidance for policymakers and practitioners.

The section should cover three main subsections: 12.1 Synthesis of Evidence and Perspectives 12.2 Best Practices and Principles 12.3 Future Research and Practice Directions

I need to build naturally upon the previous content, which ended with a discussion of future trends in agency consolidation, including technology-enabled consolidation, network governance and alternative models, and emerging challenges and opportunities.

I should write approximately the target word count (though the exact target isn’t specified in the prompt, I’ll aim for a comprehensive treatment similar to the previous sections).

I’ll continue with the narrative prose style from previous sections, avoiding bullet points and weaving information into flowing paragraphs. I’ll use transitions to connect ideas naturally.

Let me start drafting this section:

1.15 Section 12: Conclusion and Key Takeaways

The landscape of agency consolidation explored throughout this article reveals a complex, multifaceted phenomenon that defies simple characterization or universal prescriptions. From historical evolution to theoretical foundations, from implementation processes to global perspectives, from empirical impacts to future trends, our examination has uncovered both the significant potential and substantial limitations of governmental reorganization as a strategy for improving public administration. The journey through this comprehensive analysis brings us to a critical juncture where we must synthesize the diverse evidence and perspectives, distill practical guidance for those considering consolidation initiatives, and identify paths forward for both research and practice. This concluding section aims to weave together the threads of our exploration, offering a balanced assessment that acknowledges both the value and challenges of agency consolidation while providing actionable insights for policymakers, practitioners, and scholars navigating this complex terrain.

12.1 Synthesis of Evidence and Perspectives

The evidence presented throughout this article reveals a nuanced picture of agency consolidation that challenges simplistic narratives about its effectiveness or desirability. Rather than a universal solution to governmental challenges, consolidation emerges as a specific tool with particular benefits and limitations that must be carefully weighed in each context. The empirical research demonstrates that consolidation typically produces modest administrative efficiencies and cost savings concentrated in support functions, with effects on service quality, citizen outcomes, and organizational dynamics varying significantly depending on implementation choices and contextual factors. This mixed performance record helps explain why consolidation

initiatives generate such intense debate and produce such varied outcomes across different settings and time periods.

One of the most striking patterns emerging from our analysis is the contingent nature of consolidation outcomes. Success or failure appears to depend less on the consolidation itself and more on how it is designed, implemented, and aligned with specific contextual factors. The successful case studies examined in Section 6—from the creation of HM Revenue and Customs in the United Kingdom to Virginia’s environmental agency consolidation—share common elements beyond mere structural change: clear and compelling purposes, careful implementation planning, attention to human and cultural factors, and alignment with broader reform objectives. Conversely, the less successful examples documented in Section 7—from FEMA’s diminished effectiveness within the Department of Homeland Security to Australia’s problematic border force consolidation—reveal common pitfalls including rushed implementation, inadequate attention to cultural integration, and misalignment with core mission requirements.

The theoretical perspectives examined in Section 3 help explain these varied outcomes by highlighting the multiple, often competing values at stake in consolidation decisions. Economic theories emphasizing efficiency gains must be balanced against political theories highlighting accountability concerns, while administrative theories focusing on organizational design must be integrated with institutional theories emphasizing path dependency and cultural persistence. This theoretical diversity explains why consolidation debates often appear intractable—different stakeholders are operating from different theoretical frameworks that emphasize different values and outcomes. The most thoughtful approaches to consolidation recognize this theoretical pluralism, seeking designs that balance efficiency with accountability, coordination with specialization, and standardization with flexibility.

Our examination of global perspectives in Section 10 revealed how different political systems and administrative traditions shape consolidation approaches and outcomes. Federal systems like the United States and Germany face distinctive challenges related to constitutional divisions of power and intergovernmental coordination, leading to more incremental or cooperative approaches to consolidation. Unitary systems like France and Japan typically exhibit greater executive capacity for decisive reorganization but confront distinctive challenges related to bureaucratic traditions and organizational cultures. Developing countries face additional constraints related to capacity limitations, institutional fragility, and competing development priorities that make ambitious consolidation initiatives particularly risky. These contextual differences suggest that effective consolidation approaches must be tailored to specific institutional environments rather than imported from other settings without adaptation.

The political dimensions explored in Section 9 further illuminate why consolidation initiatives often diverge from technically optimal designs. Partisan ideologies, interest group dynamics, electoral calculations, and leadership factors collectively shape the landscape within which consolidation decisions occur, often resulting in outcomes that reflect political compromise rather than administrative efficiency. The most successful consolidation initiatives are typically those that navigate these political dimensions effectively, building support across partisan divides, addressing legitimate interest group concerns, and leveraging electoral timing and leadership capacity to maximize chances of success. This political reality suggests that technically per-

fect consolidation designs that fail to account for political dynamics are unlikely to succeed, while politically feasible designs that incorporate sound administrative principles represent the most promising path forward.

The future trends examined in Section 11 suggest that the nature of agency consolidation itself may be evolving, as technological innovations and changing governance models create new possibilities for functional integration without formal structural merger. Technology-enabled consolidation through shared digital platforms, network governance approaches that emphasize collaboration over hierarchy, and hybrid organizational forms that combine elements of centralized control with network flexibility all represent emerging alternatives to traditional consolidation. These evolving approaches suggest that the future of governmental organization may be characterized by a more diverse ecosystem of organizational forms, each suited to different types of governmental functions and challenges. This diversity represents a maturation of thinking about governmental organization, moving beyond the assumption that bigger is necessarily better or that consolidation is the only path to improved coordination.

Perhaps the most important insight from our comprehensive analysis is the recognition that agency consolidation is not an end in itself but rather a means to achieving broader governmental objectives. The most successful consolidations have been those that maintained focus on improved outcomes for citizens rather than merely creating larger organizations. The least successful have typically treated structural change as the ultimate goal rather than a tool for achieving better performance. This distinction is crucial, as it shifts the focus from organizational structure to outcomes, from processes to results, from inputs to impacts. When consolidation is viewed through this outcome-oriented lens, the question becomes not whether to consolidate but how to organize most effectively to achieve specific public purposes, with consolidation being one option among many.

12.2 Best Practices and Principles

Drawing upon the evidence and perspectives synthesized above, we can identify several evidence-based principles and best practices that can guide policymakers and practitioners considering agency consolidation initiatives. These principles do not provide a formulaic approach to consolidation—context, as we have seen, matters immensely—but they do offer guidance on how to maximize the chances of success while minimizing the risks of failure. The most effective consolidation initiatives typically incorporate multiple elements from this set of best practices, tailored to their specific contexts and objectives.

Clear and compelling purposes represent the foundation of successful consolidation initiatives. The evidence consistently shows that consolidations driven by vague objectives like “increasing efficiency” or “reducing duplication” typically underperform compared to those addressing specific, well-defined problems. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security, for all its implementation challenges, was driven by a clear and compelling purpose: addressing the coordination failures exposed by the September 11 terrorist attacks. Similarly, the consolidation of veterans’ services under the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs addressed the specific problem of fragmented services for veterans with complex needs spanning healthcare, benefits, and rehabilitation. These purpose-driven consolidations provided clear benchmarks for success and maintained focus on outcomes rather than merely structural change. By contrast, consolidations pursued for ambiguous political reasons or abstract efficiency goals typically lack the directional clarity needed to guide

implementation and evaluate results.

Comprehensive assessment and planning constitute another critical element of successful consolidation, as the evidence repeatedly shows that rushed or poorly planned initiatives are more likely to fail. The most effective consolidations typically involve thorough needs assessment, gap analysis, stakeholder consultation, and feasibility studies before implementation begins. Virginia's environmental agency consolidation exemplifies this approach, with over a year of planning including detailed analysis of program overlaps, stakeholder engagement with environmental groups and regulated industries, and careful design of implementation timelines. This comprehensive planning process identified potential challenges early, built support among key stakeholders, and created realistic expectations about outcomes and timelines. Conversely, consolidations implemented rapidly without adequate planning, such as Australia's problematic border force consolidation, typically face operational disruptions, unanticipated problems, and political backlash that undermine their effectiveness.

Attention to human and cultural factors emerges as perhaps the most critical but frequently neglected element of successful consolidation. The evidence consistently shows that technical and structural changes are relatively straightforward compared to the challenges of merging organizational cultures, addressing employee concerns, and developing shared values and identities. The most successful consolidations invest significantly in these human dimensions through communication strategies, employee involvement in implementation, career transition support, and cultural integration initiatives. The merger of Inland Revenue and HM Customs & Excise to form HM Revenue and Customs in the United Kingdom exemplifies this attention to human factors, with extensive communication campaigns, employee consultation processes, and investments in cultural development activities that helped merge previously separate organizational identities. By contrast, consolidations that focus exclusively on structural and technical changes while neglecting human and cultural factors, such as the Department of Homeland Security's early struggles, typically face persistent challenges with coordination, morale, and effectiveness.

Preservation of specialized expertise and capacity represents another important principle for successful consolidation, particularly in agencies dealing with complex technical or professional domains. The evidence shows that consolidations that maintain and enhance specialized expertise typically perform better than those that dilute expertise through overly broad mandates or standardized approaches. Canada's consolidation of its revenue collection agencies illustrates this principle, as the merger maintained specialized expertise in different types of taxation while consolidating support functions and creating more integrated service delivery channels. This approach preserved the technical capacity needed for effective tax administration while achieving coordination benefits. Conversely, consolidations that diminish specialized expertise, such as some environmental agency mergers that have diluted scientific capacity, typically experience declines in technical quality and policy effectiveness.

Realistic expectations and timelines constitute another crucial element of successful consolidation, as the evidence consistently shows that the benefits of consolidation typically take longer to achieve than anticipated while the costs and disruptions are often underestimated. The OECD study cited in Section 8 found that administrative consolidations typically require 3-5 years to fully realize their efficiency benefits, yet

political pressures often demand much faster results. The most successful consolidations establish realistic expectations about timelines and outcomes, communicating clearly that benefits will be incremental rather than immediate. The creation of HM Revenue and Customs exemplifies this realistic approach, with implementation phased over five years and clear communication that full benefits would take time to materialize. This realistic timeline allowed for gradual integration, learning from experience, and adjustment of implementation strategies as challenges emerged. By contrast, consolidations that promise immediate dramatic results typically face disappointment and backlash when these unrealistic expectations are not met.

Strong leadership and governance arrangements represent another critical element of successful consolidation, as these initiatives require sustained direction, coordination, and problem-solving that transcend normal bureaucratic processes. The evidence shows that consolidations with clear leadership structures, dedicated transition teams, and robust governance mechanisms typically perform better than those with ambiguous accountability and fragmented oversight. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security, despite its challenges, benefited from strong leadership initially under Secretary Tom Ridge, who provided clear direction and maintained focus on integration priorities. Similarly, Virginia's environmental agency consolidation was guided by a dedicated transition team with clear authority and accountability for implementation outcomes. By contrast, consolidations with weak or fragmented leadership, such as some state-level reorganizations that assign responsibility to existing officials without additional capacity or authority, typically experience coordination problems, implementation delays, and loss of momentum.

Flexible implementation approaches emerge as another important principle for successful consolidation, as the evidence shows that even the best plans require adaptation as unanticipated challenges emerge. The most successful consolidations adopt iterative implementation approaches that allow for learning and adjustment based on experience. The United Kingdom's incremental approach to consolidating its tax administration, implementing changes in phases and learning from each stage before proceeding to the next, exemplifies this flexible approach. Similarly, Denmark's municipal reform in 2007 allowed for local variation in implementation timelines and approaches based on local circumstances and capacity. This flexibility enabled adaptation to local conditions while maintaining overall reform momentum. By contrast, consolidations implemented rigidly according to predetermined plans without capacity for adjustment typically face greater disruptions and unanticipated problems that could have been addressed with more flexible approaches.

These principles do not provide a guaranteed formula for success, as contextual factors inevitably shape consolidation outcomes. However, they do offer evidence-based guidance that can increase the likelihood of successful outcomes when thoughtfully applied to specific consolidation initiatives. The most effective approaches typically incorporate multiple elements from this set of principles, adapted to particular contexts and objectives. Perhaps the overarching principle is that consolidation should be approached not as a technical exercise in organizational design but as a complex change management process that addresses structural, technical, human, cultural, and political dimensions in an integrated manner.

12.3 Future Research and Practice Directions

As we conclude this comprehensive examination of agency consolidation, several important directions emerge for future research and practice that can advance our understanding and improve the effectiveness of gov-

ernmental reorganization efforts. These directions reflect both the limitations of current knowledge and the evolving landscape of public administration in which consolidation initiatives occur. By identifying these paths forward, we can help ensure that future approaches to agency consolidation build upon the lessons of past experience while adapting to emerging challenges and opportunities.

Contextual sensitivity represents one of the most important directions for future research and practice on agency consolidation. The evidence presented throughout this article demonstrates that consolidation outcomes vary significantly depending on contextual factors including political systems, administrative traditions, institutional capacities, and cultural environments. Yet our understanding of precisely how these contextual factors shape consolidation possibilities and outcomes remains limited. Future research should develop more sophisticated frameworks for analyzing how different contexts influence consolidation approaches and outcomes, moving beyond simple comparisons of federal versus unitary systems or developed versus developing countries to more nuanced analysis of specific institutional arrangements, cultural characteristics, and historical experiences. This research should inform practice by developing context-specific approaches to consolidation that are tailored to particular institutional environments rather than applying generic models indiscriminately.

Longitudinal analysis represents another critical direction for future research, as most existing studies of consolidation focus on immediate implementation outcomes rather than long-term effects. The evidence suggests that consolidation impacts evolve over time, with short-term disruptions potentially giving way to long-term benefits or initial improvements potentially eroding as organizations develop new rigidities. Future research should track consolidation outcomes over extended periods—decades rather than years—to understand how consolidated agencies evolve, adapt, and perform over time. This longitudinal perspective would provide valuable insights into the sustainability of consolidation benefits and the long-term organizational dynamics of consolidated agencies. The creation of the Environmental Protection Agency in 1970, for example, has now been in place for over five decades, offering an opportunity to study how a consolidated agency evolves over time in response to changing political, social, and environmental conditions.

Alternative models to traditional consolidation represent another important direction for both research and practice, as the future trends examined in Section 11 suggest that structural merger may become less dominant as a strategy for achieving governmental coordination. Future research should more thoroughly examine the effectiveness of network governance approaches, virtual consolidation through digital platforms, hybrid organizational forms, and contractual coordination mechanisms as alternatives or complements to traditional consolidation. These alternative approaches may offer ways to achieve many of the coordination benefits of consolidation without its costs and risks, particularly in contexts where formal merger is politically infeasible or administratively inadvisable. Practice should develop greater sophistication in deploying this diverse toolkit of organizational approaches, matching governance structures to specific problems rather than defaulting to consolidation as the primary solution to coordination challenges.

Democratic dimensions of consolidation represent another crucial area for future research and practice. While our analysis has touched on accountability concerns, particularly in Section 7, the relationship between consolidation and democratic governance warrants deeper investigation. Future research should ex-

amine how different consolidation approaches affect democratic values including transparency, participation, accountability, and equity. This research should explore not only how consolidation impacts formal accountability mechanisms but also how it affects citizens' perceptions of government responsiveness and legitimacy. Practice should develop approaches to consolidation that explicitly incorporate democratic values into design and implementation, creating structures that achieve coordination without sacrificing accountability or citizen engagement. The Open Government Partnership's emphasis on combining efficiency improvements with enhanced transparency and participation offers one model for how these values might be integrated into consolidation initiatives.

Cross-sectoral consolidation represents another emerging direction for both research and practice, as traditional boundaries between governmental, non-profit, and private sectors become increasingly blurred in addressing complex public problems. Future research should examine consolidation and coordination approaches that span sectoral boundaries, exploring how governments can effectively integrate with non-governmental organizations, private sector entities, and community groups to address challenges that no single sector can address alone. This research should examine both formal mechanisms like public-private partnerships and informal networks of collaboration across sectors. Practice should develop more sophisticated approaches to cross-sectoral coordination that leverage the distinctive capacities of different sectors while creating coherent approaches to complex problems. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted both the potential and challenges of cross-sectoral coordination, offering valuable lessons for future consolidation initiatives that operate across traditional sectoral boundaries.

Capacity building for consolidation represents another important direction for practice, particularly in developing countries where institutional constraints often limit the feasibility of ambitious consolidation initiatives. Rather than focusing exclusively on structural consolidation, practice should develop approaches that build governmental capacity for coordination and integration regardless of formal organizational structure. This capacity building might include investments in information systems, interagency coordination mechanisms, personnel training, and institutional development that enable agencies to work together effectively even when structurally separate. Research should examine the effectiveness of these capacity-building approaches compared to traditional consolidation, particularly in contexts where formal merger is politically or administratively infeasible.

Finally, adaptive governance approaches represent a crucial direction for both research and practice, as the increasing complexity, uncertainty, and dynamism of contemporary governance challenges demand more flexible and adaptive organizational approaches. Future research should examine how consolidation initiatives can incorporate adaptive management principles, allowing organizations to evolve and reconfigure in response to changing circumstances and emerging knowledge. Practice should develop consolidation approaches that balance stability with flexibility, creating structures that provide coordination and integration while remaining adaptable to changing needs and conditions. The Netherlands' Environmental Assessment Agency, with its hybrid structure combining elements of hierarchical control with network flexibility, offers one model of how this balance might be achieved.

As we conclude this comprehensive examination of agency consolidation, it is clear that governmental re-

organization will remain an important tool for public administration in the future, even as its forms and functions evolve. The evidence presented throughout this article suggests that consolidation is neither a panacea for governmental challenges nor an inherently flawed approach to be avoided. Instead, it represents a specific strategy with particular benefits and limitations that must be carefully weighed in each context. The most effective approaches to consolidation will be those that build upon the lessons of past experience while adapting to emerging challenges and opportunities, creating governmental structures that balance efficiency with accountability, coordination with specialization, and stability with adaptability.

The future of agency consolidation lies not in pursuing bigger government for its own sake but in creating governmental structures that effectively serve public purposes and address societal challenges. This requires moving beyond simplistic assumptions about size and structure to a more sophisticated understanding of how different organizational forms can contribute to effective governance in different contexts. By approaching consolidation as one tool among many for achieving governmental effectiveness, and by applying the evidence-based principles identified in this analysis, policymakers and practitioners