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With the increasing importance of communities in social management and social life, community governance has gradually become a focus in theoretical and practical fields. This paper reviews relevant studies on community governance in recent years to sort out the connotations of community and community public service and takes Hangzhou Qicai community, one of the first pilot "Future Communities," as a research sample to explore the governance model of community public service and selection criteria of community governance model from nine living scenarios, with a view to providing new ideas for modern grassroots governance, community construction, and operations under the framework of multiple subjects.
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Introduction

Community service plays a vital role in China's grassroots governance. With the objective needs of economic and social development and the changing economic and social forms of cities, there is a growing demand for community services, which constantly drives the transformation of traditional community service models.

To keep the balance between equity and efficiency, public welfare and efficiency in community services have become urgent issues to be solved, involving the issues of supply
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system reconstruction and service facility layout, as well as the problems of business function guidance and subject participation mechanisms. The diversified supply of services and cooperative governance came into being in this kind of context.

In recent years, many cities, such as Shanghai and Hangzhou in China, have carried out community life circles and the planning of community society block practices to push forward community service innovation. In China, Zhejiang Province proposed the concept of "future community" in 2019, focusing on the three-dimensional value including coordinates of humanization, ecology and digitalization, harmony and shared governance, green intensification, and wisdom sharing as the connotation features, highlighting the central axis of high quality of life. Further building nine major scenarios, including future neighborhoods, education, health, entrepreneurship, architecture, transportation, a low-carbon economy, service, and governance, many scholars have discussed it from different perspectives.

They have different views on the primary connotation of community and community public services. Under the government's latest planning, is there a new meaning of community, community public services? What models of community governance will exist in the future? What are the choices for the governance logic of different governance models? This paper attempts to provide preliminary answers to the above questions.

The basic connotation of community

The concept of "community" was first introduced by the German sociologist Tennies (2010). He defined "community" as a social organization formed by natural will and characterized by familiarity, sympathy, trust, interdependence, and social adhesion.

Based on this description, different experts and scholars have defined different concepts of community. In China, the idea of community is widely used and alienated in its connotation, as the community is not a social concept based on the natural willingness of Tonnies but a management unit with administrative functions.

The Chinese government has directly borrowed the original, purely academic idea of community to name the unit of governance of grassroots society (Jing, 2009; Wei, 2000). Therefore, this paper argues that the community in Chinese society is a "legal community," i.e., a legal territorial social community, not necessarily a naturally formed community, and therefore the boundaries of the community are administrative boundaries. Of course, most administrative boundaries are also naturally formed in history and are identical to naturally formed ones (e.g., natural villages or street unit communities with a specific historical tradition).

To a large extent, street offices and residents' committees, which are grassroots management bodies, are called communities. Therefore, we consider communities as grassroots governance units with a fixed geographic area and administrative functions.

The basic connotation of community public service

There are many connotations of public services in urban communities; for example, Tang (1992) believes that community public service refers to regional social services that promote public welfare and improve the quality of life with facilities and projects under the unified planning and guidance of the government, with community organizations at certain
levels as the main body or reliance. It is based on self-help, mutual assistance, and extensive mass participation, highlighting all community members' key targets.

According to Bu (2004), community public service is developing various resources, providing multiple products and services for the community, meeting the needs of residents, increasing the community's welfare, and improving the standard of living and quality of life of residents. "People-centered" is a principle that the government, market, and society all follow, and they all work together to help people.

They use the administrative mechanism of the government, the mutual aid mechanism of society, and the business mechanism of the market. In addition, the Zhejiang Provincial Government officially issued the "Pilot Program for the Construction of Future Communities in Zhejiang Province," which points out nine scenarios of future community public services, namely: architecture, neighborhood, health, education, transportation, governance, entrepreneurship, low-carbon economics, and service. Communities are grassroots governance units with a fixed geographic scope and administrative functions.

This paper says that community public service is the process of providing community residents with architecture, neighborhoods, health and education, transportation, governance, low-carbon economics, and services under the guidance of unified government planning, with help from market and social forces.

Changes in community public services

The "unit system characterized the founding of the new China from 1949 to the early 1980s," and community public services were mainly a combination of units, street offices, and resident committees, mainly due to the planned public economy. As the basic functional unit of social governance, the unit assumed the main social management and social service functions. The unit provided employees in it with almost all the public services demanded at the time, such as employee medical care, children's education, employee insurance, childcare, and retirement (Chen, 1990; Xiao, 2012).

At the same time, the types of community services are gradually enriched and diversified, and the targets of community public services are formally expanded from the disadvantaged and marginalized groups to all residents in the community (Jing, 2009; Haibing, 2003).

Case study of town community public service governance

We look at a town in Hangzhou with a total population of 300,000. 165,000 people live in the town, and 135,000 people live outside the town. The town has 1,179 industrial enterprises, including 266 large or middle-level enterprises. It achieved a total industrial output value of 39.5 billion yuan in 2019, with total fiscal revenue of 2.187 billion yuan and general public budget revenue of 1.227 billion yuan. The town is ranked in the top 100 for comprehensive national strength in China.

Hangzhou Qicai Community future community public service governance

To better serve the town's residents, the town government began preparations to establish Hangzhou Qicai Community in 2018, and in 2019, Hangzhou Qicai Community became the first batch of future community pilot creation projects in Zhejiang Province, one
of the first 24 future community pilots in Zhejiang. It aims at how the building, neighborhood, health, education, transportation, governance, entrepreneurship, low-carbon economy, and service of nine major life scenarios will work together in the future.

Table 1 - Specific service contents and governance subjects of nine scenarios
(compiled by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Scenes</th>
<th>Service Content</th>
<th>Governance Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Water, electricity, coal, roads, sewerage, convenience services</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping malls, new residences</td>
<td>Government planning, enterprise development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>old house renovation, school, neighborhood public space, park</td>
<td>Government bidding, funding, enterprise construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rainbow track</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Annual Festivals</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural centers, libraries</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood support, community volunteer activities</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 digital societies, group of 12 civic associations</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Community Hospitals</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community health service stations, community health records, Community Aging</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Senior Services, monitoring of chronic disease population</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Education</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community cultural promotion, community-run 4:30 classes</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training, such as dance, etc.</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Public Transportation TOD</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sky Link</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Owners' self-governance platform</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Party Building, Household Management</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Talent Apartment</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Incubation</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon</td>
<td>Waste Separation</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Health Management</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smart Parking Cloud</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Public Service Center</td>
<td>Government and corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial support, property services, express services</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It's called the "model room" of Zhejiang's future community construction pilot. Based on this, Hangzhou Qicai Future Community is chosen as a case study.

Hangzhou Qicai Future Communities focuses the efforts of all parties on the process of preparation and implementation, with the government taking the lead and letting the government and market coordinate. In the process of public service provision, a quasi-market mechanism is introduced to form a pattern in which multiple supply entities divide labor and competition fairly with each other, complement each other, and work closely together.

This paper analyzes and understands the nine scenarios of the Hangzhou Qicai future community public service governance model from nine major life scenarios. See the following table for details.

**Hangzhou Qicai community public governance model and model selection**

**Hangzhou Qicai future community public service governance model**

Government, enterprises, and government and enterprise cooperation are community service providers in the above nine life scenarios, but what is their governance model? This paper classifies the service governance models into four types according to the different community public service providers.

1) Direct government operation and governance

The government directly operates the governance that the government provides for the community's public services. Using the example of the Hangzhou Qicai community, we can see a wide range of government-operated services, including community security, primary and secondary schools, household registration, community health records, water, and electricity.

2) Government-led operational governance

Government-led operation and governance mean that the public services of the communities are operated and managed by the government, and the relevant labor is purchased in the operation process. For example, community health, social workers, etc. are directly bought and paid for by the government. In addition, the construction of public land in Hangzhou Qicai communities, such as parks, schools, etc., is funded by the government and built by successful developers through a bidding process. The government also purchases related consulting services in the community's planning process, etc. Seven Colors provides the public service center (civic center) of the Hangzhou Qicai community, and the government offers related civic services. The government service center realizes the convenient scenario of 24-hour unattended collection and 12-hour manned collection.

3) Government + Market Cooperative Governance

Cooperative governance between government and market refers to exchanging and sharing governance resources between parties to solve everyday affairs. For example, the public transportation TOD project in the Hangzhou Qicai community is a government-enterprise project in which the original 9,952 m² site of the former transit center is renovated and updated into a modern TOD public transportation building. The first floor is converted into allocated land according to the plot ratio and transferred to the government for free as a bus station after the construction is completed, while the second floor and above are used for community public welfare services, culture, recreation, and commercial operations.
For example, the Hangzhou Qicai Community Civic Cultural Center is planned and subsidized by the government, and the X Group of companies is responsible for the daily operation and management of the center. The Civic Cultural Center is the cultural living room of the Hangzhou Qicai community, providing an origin for the activities of various clubs and residents. For example, Hangzhou Qicai community library is provided with books by Hangzhou City Library Management, and daily operation and management are carried out by X Group. In addition to the daily provision of library services, professional social workers, university student volunteers, and enthusiastic parents in the communities provide after-school tutoring and care services for elementary school students.

Providing public services through a partnership between the government and the private sector is more costly for enterprises, making it more challenging to return their investment. So why are businesses still ready to collaborate with the government in this endeavor? The TOD projects at bus stations, civic culture centers, and library tube projects bring a lot of regular foot traffic to the malls next to them, making them more sticky. It is the exchange and sharing of governance resources between the government and the enterprises, and the government and the enterprises share and exchange the labor force and money to achieve a win-win situation.

4) Market-run governance

Market operation and management mean that enterprises provide community-related services, and the government is less involved in the process, such as property services, courier services, related commercial support services, parking services, etc.

Choice of community public governance model

In the public governance of communities, the governance models can be divided into direct government operation and management, government-led operation and administration, government-market cooperation and administration, and market operation and governance with different degrees of market participation of service providers. What are the criteria for selection?

This paper gives the two most important indicators: equity and efficiency. Specifically, seeing the figure below, the vertical coordinate indicates equity; the higher up, the greater the demand for equity. And the horizontal coordinate indicates efficiency; the higher to the right, the greater the need for efficiency. The four boxes on the diagonal show the four modes of governance.

The first type of direct government-run governance is when public services are provided to all community residents, such as water, electricity, gas pipelines, household registration, medical records management, community security, community road sanitation, compulsory education, and so on. We focus more on the issue of equity in this kind of service. We are not arguing that efficiency is not essential, but when equity is much more important than efficiency, we have to choose direct government-run governance.

In the second government-led operation mode, public services such as schools, civic and cultural centers, the construction of talent centers, the renovation of old neighborhoods, and the construction of public spaces such as parks, convenience facilities, civic centers, etc. are also mainly considered fairness issues, but this time the issue of efficiency should also be considered when we have to choose the government-led operation mode. The benefits of this model are:
First, it will concentrate the government's main focus on the "management" function, which can promote the government's decentralization and administrative system to deepen reform.

Second, it makes up for the lack of government expertise and helps to improve the quality and productivity of services. This is a management model of resource integration: make good use of the best external specialized resources to reduce costs, improve efficiency, and give full play to the government's management functions.

In the third government-market cooperative governance model, public services such as library management, civic and cultural centers, and other public services were provided by the government. Similar services have relatively low fairness requirements but relatively high efficiency requirements.

Therefore, you can choose the government-market cooperative governance model if the focus is on efficiency. The cooperative governance process between the government and the market depends on the ratio of equity and efficiency; if the requirements of efficiency are high, more and deeper market forces can be involved. The benefits of this model are: first, it focuses on the government's energy in the function of "management," promotes the decentralization of the government, and deepens the reform of the administrative system. Second, it can make up for the lack of professional capacity in the government and improve the quality of services and production efficiency.

Third, it absorbs social resources and makes up for the lack of government funds. More efficient in meeting the various needs of community residents.

The fourth is a market-led model. Such public services are more about efficiency and less about equity, such as courier services, community property services, commercial support services, training services outside of compulsory primary education, advanced retirement in the community, advanced medical services, etc. Such services should choose the market-led model. In this way, despite meeting the basic service needs of community residents, it can also complete the higher-level needs of residents and make up for the lack of essential services provided by the government.

Summary

The future community holds the people's aspiration for a better life and must adhere to the people-centered concept to plan, build, and operate. Zhejiang's future community is a systematic and comprehensive big operation that needs a complete set of perfect system designs to guarantee the balance of interests of multiple subjects. The government should develop standards and scenarios and give guidance and incentives to developers and social issues through system and policy innovation so that multiple subjects can plan, build, and operate together.

Through the analysis of Hangzhou Qicai future community cases, this paper proposes four models of future community public service governance and the criteria for model selection, providing some reference for the construction and operation of domestic community service complexes and community life circles.

Still, the organizational relationships and institutional reshaping behind them need to be further studied in depth. The modernization of China's grassroots governance system and governance capacity will gradually improve the future community's service mechanism and operation guarantee. The future community is expected to solve the "unbalanced supply of
public services and insufficient demand for a better life" and create a modern, future-oriented, and better-living home.
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