本文引用格式 / PLEASE CITE THIS ARTICLE AS

Zhao, Q., & Zhou, K. (2020). Research on the Community Co-production Practices: A Case Study of London and Changsha. Landscape Architecture Frontiers, 8(5), 46-59. <https://doi.org/10.15302/J-LAF-1-020037>

合作生产理念下的社区实践研究
——伦敦和长沙案例分析

RESEARCH ON THE COMMUNITY
CO-PRODUCTION PRACTICES:
A CASE STUDY OF LONDON
AND CHANGSHA

赵群荟
湖南大学建筑学院城乡规划学硕士研究生

周恺*
湖南大学建筑学院城乡规划系副教授、系主任

ZHAO Qunhui
Master Student at Department of Urban and Rural Planning, School of Architecture, Hunan University

ZHOU Kai
Associated Professor and Chair at Department of Urban and Rural Planning, School of Architecture, Hunan University

*通讯作者
地址：湖南省长沙市岳麓区湖南大学建筑学院
邮编：410082
邮箱：zhoukai_nju@hotmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.15302/J-LAF-1-020037> 收稿时间 RECEIVED DATE / 2020-07-06 中图分类号 / TU984 文献标识码 / A

摘要

“合作生产”指公民与政府共同生产社会公共服务的过程，是公共管理领域在应对全球财政紧缩中实现国家－社会资源整合的重要模式创新。21世纪以来，合作生产已成为国外城市治理、社区治理、城市规划等领域的热点议题。鉴于中国学界对合作生产的研究在规划实践中尚缺乏明确指向，本文认为注重全过程参与的社区规划工作中有必要引入合作生产理念。基于国内外文献梳理，研究首先引介了合作生产的概念并提炼其理论要点，其次以英国伦敦巴金－达格纳姆区和中国长沙市丰泉古井社区为例，探讨了合作生产在社区规划、社区治理实践中的作用和形式。最后，针对当前中国社区规划实践急需突破的瓶颈，研究提出三点优化建议：1）将居民以“作为消费者的生产者”来培育自组织力量；2）以“内容创新”为目标展开行动赋能；3）通过包容公共价值与私人价值倡导价值互融。

关键词

合作生产；社区实践；社区规划；社区参与；公共服务；伦敦；长沙市

ABSTRACT

Co-production, the process where the citizens and the government co-produce the public services, is an essential innovative model on national-social resources integration in the field of Public Administration, responding to the global fiscal austerity. Since the beginning of the 21st century, co-production has become the research hotspot abroad in such fields as urban governance, community governance, and urban planning. There is an absence of studies on the application of co-production in the community planning practices in China. Thus, in-depth exploration on the co-production valuing the whole-process participation is expected. After reviewing the domestic and foreign literature, the author first introduces the connotation of co-production, reviews its key theory implications, and then discusses the roles and forms of co-production in the community planning and community governance practices based on the case study of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham and the Fengquan Gujing Community in Changsha City. The research comes up with three suggestions to the current problems in China’s community planning practices: 1) fostering the self-organizations by viewing “the producers as consumers”; 2) empowering communities with “content innovations”; and 3) encouraging value integration with inclusiveness of public values and private values.

KEYWORDS

Co-production; Community Practices; Community Planning; Community Participation; Public Services; London; Changsha City

基金项目

国家自然科学基金面上项目“城市收缩治理的理论模型、国际比较和关键规划领域研究”（编号：52078197）

RESEARCH FUND

General Program of the National Natural Science Fund of China on The Governance of Urban Shrinkage: Theoretical Models, International Comparisons and Key Planning Issues [No. 52078197]

编辑 冉玲于 翻译 肖杰 田乐

EDITED BY RAN Lingyu TRANSLATED BY XIAO Jie Tina TIAN

① “公地”泛指与公共性相关而非私有的事物或资源（如渔场、森林、公园等），具有一定的竞争性，但无排他性或呈现弱排他性。

① Commons generally refers to things or resources that are held in common rather than owned privately (such as fishing grounds, forests, and parks), which are competitive, but have no or weak exclusivity.

1 引言

如何动员多元社会力量参与公共事务已经成为城乡规划和公共管理领域的重要话题。近年，公共管理领域的“合作生产”（co-production，又称“共同生产”）模式逐渐兴起，通过政府与公民的协同作用促进公共产品供给的有效性与个性化，成为了实现国家—社会资源整合的重要策略。

最初，合作生产的概念由2009年诺贝尔经济学奖获得者埃莉诺·奥斯特罗姆于20世纪70年代提出。她在其大都市治理研究中发现，公共服务需要在公民的积极配合下进行合作生产。以公共安全为例，相较于零星、分散的巡逻警察，广大的居民组织更能对街道、公园和住宅区展开仔细且频繁的监视^[1]。奥斯特罗姆认为，不管是权力集中的单中心结构，还是自由的市场化方式，都可能无法兼顾效率与公平；政府只有借助社会力量推动合作生产，才能利用有限的财政开支来满足不断增长的服务需求。合作生产、自主治理和多中心治理等概念共同构成了奥斯特罗姆的“公地治理”理论^{①[2]}。

合作生产也是国际公共管理范式从福利国家时代的“公共行政”（Public Administration）向新自由主义思潮下的“新公共管理”（New Public Management）和“新公共治理”（New Public Governance）演进的关键转向^{[3]-[5]}。与主张通过科层制权力体系，或运用合同外包、民营化、绩效管理促进公共管理的思维不同，新公共治理范式下的合作生产跨越了公共行动与私人行动、志愿行动之间的边界^[6]，成为一种旨在应对21世纪多元化环境和复杂主体关系的新模式^[7]。合作生产注重实施公共服务及后续管理过程中的公众参与，因此也引发了城乡规划研究者的关注，特别是在涉及不同利益相关者的城市治理与社区规划领域^[8]。

部分中国公共管理学学者已经就合作生产开展了综述性研究，有关实证分析则多关注于教育、医疗、养老等公共服务实例^{[9]-[11]}，少有针对性对社区发展的研究视角。基于此，本文首先引介合作生产概念并提炼理论要点，进而结合英国伦敦和中国长沙的案例探讨了将合作生产引

1 Introduction

To Urban and Rural Planning and Public Administration, how to encourage the engagement of diverse social forces into public affairs becomes an important topic. Wherein, the co-production model—promoting the effectiveness and individuation of public goods supply via the collaboration between the government and citizens—has recently attracted an increasing attention to strategically approach the integration of national-social resources in the field of Public Administration.

In the 1970s, the co-production concept was first proposed by Elinor Ostrom, the 2009 Nobel Prize-winning economist. She found that in metropolis governance the co-production of public services requires citizens’ active participation. To public security, for example, compared to a limited number of patrolmen, community organizations can perform a more frequent and thorough surveillance on the blocks, parks, and residential quarters^[1]. Ostrom holds that neither the mono-centralized structure nor the free market approach could strike the balance between efficiency and justice. Only by relying on social forces to promote co-production could the government meets the growing needs of services with a limited budget. Concepts including co-production, self-governance, and polycentric governance constitute Ostrom’s commons governance theory^{①[2]}.

Co-production witnesses a critical shift of international public administration paradigm from Public Administration in the era of welfare state towards New Public Management and New Public Governance under the impact of neo-liberalism^{[3]-[5]}. Different from the propositions that resort to the bureaucratic power system, contracting-out, privatization, and performance management for better management, co-production in the New Public Governance paradigm blurs the boundaries among public actions, private actions, and volunteering actions^[6], and was conceived to cope with diverse environments and complicate subject relations in the 21st century^[7]. Co-production values both the delivery of public services and the public participation in the follow-up management. It attracts the attention of the Urban and Rural Planning academia, particularly in the field of urban governance and community planning where different stakeholders are often involved^[8].

Most of existing Chinese studies on Public Administration are research reviews, and evidence-based studies mainly focus on public services in education, health care, and old-age care^{[9]-[11]}, with less concerns on community development. This paper first introduces the connotation of co-production, reviews its key theory implications, and then explores the possibility of introducing co-production into community planning and

入社区规划、社区治理实践的可能性。最后，针对当前中国社区规划实践的瓶颈进行了问题诊断，并提出了优化建议。

2 合作生产概念剖析

公民与政府共同推动公共事务的行动随处可见。例如，市民参与的城市垃圾分类工作、医疗服务中的志愿者服务、知识分享、众筹活动、社区居民对儿童和老人的自发看护，以及社区绿化的“私养公助”^②等。合作生产即是将政府（服务提供者）和公民（服务使用者）共同的投入转化为公共产品与服务的过程^{[12][13]}，这一概念的核心内涵包括：

1）“合作”，即多主体之间的协调互动。大卫·博伊尔和迈克尔·哈里斯^[14]认为，合作生产包含了一种平等互惠的关系，相关主体包括服务提供者（专业人员）、服务使用者，以及服务使用者所在的家庭或其邻里；既需要强调公民在公共服务配给中的重要性，同时也要肯定第三部门^③的促进与动员作用^{[15][16]}。

2）“公民主体性”，即在保障各项权利的前提下，不断提升公民的社区意识与参与能力^[17]。一方面，公民自愿加入合作生产过程^[15]；另一方面，公民、社区需在合作生产中给予积极的投入^[12]。

3）“生产”，不仅涉及早期研究中聚焦的服务实施过程，还应涵盖公共服务的整个发生阶段，包括规划、设计、资助、管理、实施、监督与评估等环节 / 阶段^[18]。

4）“结果”，即合作生产强调获得产出与影响。结果可以是公共服务、公共产品或制度，也可以是对个人与社会的影响，如相互习得的经验、知识、能力等。约翰·奥尔福德将合作生产视为共同创造价值的活动，包括个人获得的价值与公共价值^[19]。

5）“制度化”，即从非正式的集体行动转向有组织的、长效稳定的制度结构^④，形成明确的权责关系，保证有效负责的政府角色，并提升公众的责任感和公民意识^{[20][21]}。合作生产需要建立公众监督与问责机制、政府监管与资金保障制度等支撑体系，以保障弱势群体在城市治理与决策中的权益^[21]。

总而言之，对比当下常见的政府主导、资本主导或公私合作的城

community governance practices combining with case studies in London and Changsha City. The paper ends with suggestions for the current problems in China’s community planning practices.

2 Implications of Co-production

It is a common practice that citizens and the government work together on public affairs, such as garbage sorting, volunteering of medical service, knowledge sharing, crowd-funding, care for children and the senior, and “private-public assistance”^② for community green spaces. Co-production turns the joint inputs of the government (service provider) and citizens (service user) into public goods and services^{[12][13]}, including the following connotations:

1) “Cooperation,” i.e. coordination and interactions among several subjects. According to David Boyle and Michael Harris^[14], co-production involves the equal and mutually beneficial relationship among service providers (professionals), service users and their family and neighbors. It not only highlights the role of citizens in public service provision, but also recognizes the promotion and mobilization of the third sector^③^{[15][16]}.

2) “Citizen subjectivity,” i.e. to guarantee citizens’ all kinds of rights while enhancing their community awareness and participation capacity^[17]. It requires, on the one hand, citizens’ engagement into co-production practices^[15], and, on the other hand, the inputs from citizens and communities^[12].

3) “Production” does not simply mean the service delivery as what early studies concentrated on, but the whole process of public services, including planning, design, sponsorship, management, implementation, supervision, and evaluation.^[18]

4) “Results” are the output and influence of co-production. They can be public services, goods, and institutions, or the impact on individuals and the society (such as the experience, knowledge, and skills learned through social interactions). John Alford considers co-production a joint value-creation activity, including individual values and public values^[19].

5) “Institutionalization” means the establishment of organized and stable institutions or structures^④—instead of informal collective actions—which defines the rights and obligations to ensure the efficiency and accountability of government and to enhance the public’s sense of ownership and citizenship^{[20][21]}. To guarantee the rights and interests of disadvantaged groups in urban governance and decision-making, co-production requires a series of supporting systems, ranging from public supervision and accountability mechanisms to municipal systems of supervision and fund guarantee^[21].

To sum up, compared to the government-led, capital-led or

② 社区绿化的“私养公助”指在政府或社区的有效管理和引导下，小区居民自主供养、维护身边的小型公共绿地，从而促进社区绿地供给的个性化、多样化和有效性。

③ 第三部门指既不属于政府公共部门（第一部门），又不属于营利企业（第二部门）的所有社会组织，具备公益性、志愿性和非营利的特征。

④ 阿努拉达·乔希和米克·摩尔将“制度化的合作生产”定义为：通过国家机构和有组织的公民群体之间长期有效的关系来实现公共服务供给。

② The “private-public assistance” for community green spaces refers to that under the effective management and guidance of the government or the community, residents can independently support and maintain the small-scale public green spaces within the community. It helps promote the individualization, diversification, and effectiveness of community green spaces.

③ The third sector is the social organizations that neither belong to the government (i.e. the first sector) nor the profitable enterprises (i.e. the second sector), which are established for public welfare, in a voluntary and non-profit way.

④ Anuradha Joshi and Mick Moore define “institutionalized co-production” as the provision of public services under the long-term effective relationship between state institutions and organized citizen groups.

⑤ 来源于英国国家统计局2018年的数据。

⑤ The data are sourced from the Office for National Statistics in UK, 2018.

市治理模式，合作生产有助于构建更具活力、更有温度的市民社会，也与中国建设“以人民为中心”的城市和“共建共治共享”的社会治理理念契合。

3 案例研究：社区层面的合作生产

社区作为城市治理的基本单元，为公众直接参与公共事务提供了机会。一方面，社区规划强调公共部门、第三部门，以及社区居民在共创美好社区实践中的投入，重视空间营建与社会治理的协同^{[22][23]}。另一方面，合作生产致力于将居民引入公共服务或事务的共同行动中，以“建立一个强大、有韧性且相互支持的社区”为目标^[24]。可见两者关系密切，社区规划中的参与式实践符合合作生产的内涵，而合作生产所蕴含的参与有效性高、行动导向性强、公众主动性明显等特性^[25]也能更好地促进社区实践的开展。

不同发展语境下的社区参与实践有着不同的特点。国外实践普遍主张通过合作生产改善公共“软”服务，创造人人参与、人人共享的包容社区^{[17][26]}。相关研究案例不仅借鉴合作生产概念，推进了传统公共服务部门与公共空间的模式变革^[27]，还提出了许多创新的议题，如时间银行^[14]、社区花园食物生产^{[26][28]}、社区创客空间^[28]、开源平台与参与式治理^[28]、参与式能源供应^[29]等。与此同时，近年来中国实践推行的“共同缔造”、社区营造等模式主要以物质空间设计和改造为抓手，以居民为主体，通过切实的参与式行动形成社区共识、共建美好家园^[30]。

为探讨合作生产具体是如何在国内外实践中发挥作用的，本文以英国伦敦巴金—达格纳姆区和中国长沙市丰泉古井社区为研究案例展开分析，前者侧重搭建由合作生产项目组成的参与式系统网络，后者则是基于“儿童友好型城市”^[31]理念的社区实践。

3.1 伦敦巴金—达格纳姆区合作生产实践

巴金—达格纳姆区位于英国伦敦东部，人口21.2万^⑤，面积约36.09km²。复杂多元的人口结构和高比例的低收入群体使得该地区就业率和教育水平较低，无家可归者比例及犯罪率居高不下。

public-private partnership-based urban governance models, co-production works more efficiently to strengthen the vitality and harmony of society, which matches contemporary China’s goal to build “people-first” cities and to improve social governance through “co-building, co-governance, and sharing.”

3 Case Study: Co-production at the Community Level

Communities are the elementary cells in urban governance, and people can easily participate into community-level public affairs. In this regard, community planning requires joint inputs from the public sector, the third sector, and community members for the synergy in spatial construction and social governance^{[22][23]}, which echoes the goal of co-production to engage residents in public service delivery or public affairs, thus “building the strong, resilient, and mutually supportive communities”^[24]. Such participatory community planning practices would demonstrate advantages in efficiency, action orientation, and public initiative^[25].

Community participation practices have different characteristics in different contexts. In foreign countries, co-production is introduced to improve the “soft” public services and to build inclusive communities that embrace participatory and sharing activities^{[17][26]}. Co-production is also used to facilitate mode reform in the traditional public service sector and the construction of public spaces^[27], having facilitated many innovative initiatives such as “time banks”^[14], food production in community gardens^{[26][28]}, co-working space in community^[28], open source platforms and participatory governance^[28], and public participation in energy provision^[29]. Moreover, the modes such as Community Co-building Initiative and Building Community advocated by Chinese government rely on the residents’ engagement in the participatory actions of spatial design and renewal, so as to broaden resident’s common ground and build beautiful communities^[30].

To further explore the mechanisms of co-production among the domestic and foreign practices, this paper profiles case studies on London Borough of Barking and Dagenham and the Fengquan Gujing Community in Changsha City, China. The former demonstrates the building a participatory network of co-production programs, and the latter is a community-level practice of the “Child Friendly Citites”^[31].

3.1 Co-production in London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Located in eastern London, Barking and Dagenham covers an area of 36.09 km² with a population of 212,000^⑤. The complex and diverse demographic structure and the large proportion of low-income groups lead to low employment and education level, and a large population of the homeless and a high crime rate.

1. 伦敦巴金—达格纳姆区合作生产
1. The working loop in the case of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

© 赵蔚蕊，周哲
1

为了提升社区参与活动的包容性，区议会以赋能居民、重塑社区凝聚力为目标，提出了名为“每人每天行动”（Every One Every Day）的合作生产倡议，于2017年起实施，并专门成立了践行该倡议的社会组织——“参与式城市基金会”（Participatory City Foundation，简称PCF团队）。倡议将社区服务（包括食物、教育、医疗、就业、能源）视作与图书馆、公园、广场、街道等公共空间同等重要的公共需求，主张由居民与专业团队共同设计、实施并评估每一个项目，创造共同工作、学习、生活与娱乐的活力社区^{[32][33]}。主要实践包括（图1）：1）建设由居民主导的、集合了大量本地创意项目的“参与式生态系统”；2）打造使项目顺利开展的“支撑体系”；3）基于以上两大体系，形成“每人每天行动”的9个阶段。

3.1.1 参与式生态系统

参与式生态系统是以项目和居民为节点，通过人与项目、项目与项目、人与人之间的联系形成的网络，支持居民主导并不断发起、实施创意项目。项目的创意理念均来源于本地居民各自的知识、经验和

To make the community participatory activities more inclusive, the local council launched the Every One Every Day co-production initiative to empower the residents and build community cohesion. The initiative was first implemented in 2017 and a dedicated social organization Participatory City Foundation (“PCF team” hereafter) was founded. According to the initiative, community services (including food, education, medical care, employment, and energy) are as important as public realms (such as libraries, parks, squares, and blocks). All the co-production programs call for joint design, implementation, and evaluation by residents and professionals, to strengthen the community’s vitality in work, study, life, and entertainment^{[32][33]}. The entire initiative is structured by 1) building “participatory ecosystems” that are led by the residents and integrate many creative local programs; 2) developing “support platforms” that ensure the smooth implementation of programs; then 3) establishing a working loop with 9 stages (Fig. 1).

3.1.1 Participatory Ecosystems

The participatory ecosystems constitute a network of programs, residents, and all kinds of inter-connections, which supports residents launching and implementing creative programs based

表1: 巴金－达格纳姆区合作生产项目总结
Table 1: Summary of co-production programs in London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

类型 Type	实践 Practice	内容 Content	类型 Type	实践 Practice	内容 Content
烹饪 Cooking	社区厨房 Neighborhood kitchen	共同烹饪食物，分享食谱； 轮流制作婴幼儿食物，照看孩子； 组织青少年周末为父母做饭 Cook together and share receipts; Make baby food and take care of kids in turns; Ask teenagers to cook for their parents on weekends	学习、分享与 办公 Learning, sharing and working	演讲学校 Lecture school	搭建演讲社区，使人们可以从诗歌朗诵与演讲中汲取灵感 Build a "lecture community" where people can cultivate themselves by reading poems and studying from lectures
	食物分享 Food sharing	邀请营养师及厨师教学； 在社区室内空间组织聚餐交流； 在社区室外空间组织聚会、游戏与表演 Invite nutritionists and cooks to teach cooking; Organize dinners and exchanges in indoor spaces of the community; Accommodate parties, games, and performances in outdoor spaces of the community		物品分享 Goods sharing	婴儿用品与玩具分享； 建设社区公共书架，分享图书； 生活用品与工具储存空间分享 Share baby supplies and toys; Build community public bookshelves and share books; Share daily supplies and tool storage spaces
绿地多用 Multiple-use of green spaces	社区花园 Community gardens	将空地改造成菜地、游戏角、花园等； 共同设计与建造植物与蔬菜种植区； 推广都市农业，生产本地健康食物； 分发种子，举办种植活动 Convert vacant plots into vegetable patches, game corners, gardens, etc.; Co-design and co-create plantation and vegetable fields; Promote urban agriculture and produce healthy local foods; Distribute seeds and organize planting activities		联合办公 Co-working	自由职业者可免费在社区公共空间（“每人每天”商店与工作仓库）工作，相互学习与交流； 建立自由职业者与家庭劳动者之间的联系，提供更多创业机会 Freelancers can work in community public spaces (Every One Every Day shops and Warehouses) for free to learn and communicate with each other; Build connections between freelancers and family workers, provide more entrepreneurial opportunities
	养殖 Cultivation	建立蜜蜂学校和养蜂场；建立鸡舍，分享鸡蛋 Build bee schools and apiaries; Build chicken coops and share eggs	儿童服务 Children's services	儿童活动 Children activities	一系列兼具娱乐与教育功能的亲子活动，比如DIY、棋牌游戏、瑜伽、舞蹈等 A series of parent-child activities with entertainment and educational programs, such as DIY, board games, yoga, and dance
	堆肥 Compost	利用食物垃圾、树叶杂草和其他废物生产有机肥料 Using food waste, leaves, weeds, and other wastes to produce organic fertilizers		合作育儿 Cooperation parenting	替代保姆看护，居民互相照顾儿童； 家长之间分享育儿经验 Residents babysitting each other's kids; Share parenting experiences with each other
学习、分享 与办公 Learning, sharing and working	创意工作坊 Creative workshops	缝纫工作坊； 其他工艺美术方面的手工作坊 Fabric workshop; Other arts handicraft workshops	休闲活动 Leisure activities	游戏街 Play street	为居民尤其是儿童创造一个安全、开放的街道环境，供他们玩耍、聚会或表演 Create a safe and open street environment for residents, especially children, to play, gather, and perform
	贸易学校 Trade school	以交换来获取技能和知识的学校，即通过向老师分享所需物品来获得课程 A school where community members can acquire skills and knowledge by sharing goods what the teacher need		摄影工作坊 Photography workshop	学习摄影技能，展示摄影作品 Learn photography skills and display photographic works
	技能学校 Technical schools	咖啡制作学习； 计算机和互联网技能学习 Coffee making learning; Computer and Internet skills learning		电影工作坊 Film workshop	帮助居民学习电影制作，为居民自制的电影举办放映会 Help residents learn filmmaking and hold screenings for self-taken films

想法，并最终由PCF团队与社区居民合作完成设计。丰富多样的项目活动（表1）^{[32][33]}既能吸引不同人群的主动参与，也能让每个人平等地获得知识与技能，同时鼓励大家共同创造、共享益处、为社区作贡献。人们可同时参与实施多个项目，这些项目既包括烹饪、蔬菜种植、儿童看护等与日常生活息息相关的活动，也包括咖啡制作、演讲学校、摄影学习等拓展性活动。除了专业团队会向居民提供指导建议外，经

on their own knowledge, experience, and ideas, with the help of the PCF team. The variety of programs (Table 1)^{[32][33]} attract greater participation of different groups, and each participant is allowed to acquire knowledge and skills, encouraged to co-create and share. Residents can take part in several programs at the same time, ranging from daily activities (such as cooking, vegetable farming, and child care) to training programs (such as coffee making, lecture school, and photography). Besides professionals, experienced residents can help and guide the

验成熟、能力较强的居民也会帮助和引导新的加入者（图1）。此外，为了与居民合作评估每年的年度项目工作进展，“每人每天行动”从可行性、包容性、价值创造、融合度以及可推广性5个维度设计了一套完整的项目评估体系，通过一系列和居民切身幸福相关的定量指标（如参与人数与地理分布，参与时长，项目类型与数量，以及种植的蔬菜、烹饪的膳食、分享的技术设备、社区产业等服务产出数量等）与定性指标（如教育、凝聚力、幸福感、健康、韧性等需要深度访谈获得的综合影响指数）来验证该模式的发展潜力，以资切实有效地构建一个大型的参与式生态系统。截至2019年末，“每人每天行动”倡议共开展了200余个项目，已有5 000余名居民参与到这些项目的设计、实施及评估过程中。

3.1.2 支撑体系

支撑体系的主要作用是推动参与式生态系统中合作生产项目的有效实施，由跨学科的专业团队和系列“基础设施”构成。

专业团队包括运营团队和生态系统建设团队。前者负责常规行政管理，确保整个合作生产过程的健康和安全；后者则加入项目规划设计、运行、研究和沟通等环节，且具备在多地点、多项目中以多角色身份展开工作的实力与适应力。

“基础设施”包括理念、资金、制度、数据等支持要素，也包括“每人每天”商店和“工作仓库”等活动空间^⑥。这些活动空间由居民参与设计、布置，且向每位居民免费开放。不同于传统的零售店铺，“每人每天”商店是可供开展活动、会议，且可用作社区厨房的“社区客厅”。“工作仓库”被视为伦敦首个大型创客空间，能够为居民提供设备工具、工作空间和学习机会——包括了展厅、数字化制作室、陶艺工作室、木材加工坊、数字实验室、共享厨房与餐厅、儿童DIY空间、缝纫工作坊、都市花园等功能分区。

3.1.3 小结

巴金—达格纳姆区的合作生产模式由政府政策支持、专业团队运营、居民主动生产共同构成。广泛的居民参与是项目的核心，依托支撑体系，他们从相对被动的服务接受者转变为合作项目的发起者与实

newcomers (Fig. 1). At the same time, to co-evaluate the annual progress with the residents, Every One Every Day comes up with a complete project evaluation system that covers 5 aspects, namely feasibility, inclusivity, value-creation, systemic integration, and replicability. The potential of co-production is verified with a series of quantitative indicators (amount and geographic distribution of participants, participating hours, program type and amount, and the amount of e.g. vegetable production, meals bulk cooked, sharing equipment, starting businesses, and other service production) and qualitative indicators in education, cohesion, happiness, health, and resilience. In this way, a large-scale participatory ecosystem can be built. By late 2019, the initiative had launched over 200 programs and over 5,000 people had participated in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the programs.

3.1.2 Support Platforms

The support platforms include an interdisciplinary professional team and a series “infrastructures” that ensure the implementation of co-production programs within the participatory ecosystem.

The professional team consists of an operation team and an ecosystem building team: the former takes charge of the administration to ensure the healthy process and safety during co-production, and the latter is responsible for program planning, design, implementation, investigation, and communication, able to play different roles in accordance to the variety of sites and programs.

The “infrastructures” refer to not only supporting concepts, funds, institutions, and data, but also the activity spaces such as Every One Every Day shops and Warehouses^⑥, which are designed by and for residents. Unlike the traditional retail shops, Every One Every Day shops can be used as activity and meeting venues and the “living room” of the community kitchen. Viewed as the first large-scale co-working space in London, the Warehouses can house a range of equipment and tools and offer working spaces and learning opportunities for residents. It is composed of Gallery, Exhibition Hall, Digital Making Studio, Ceramics Studio, Wood Workshop, Digital Studio, Everyone’s Kitchen, Canteen, Mini Makers Space, Fabric Workshop, Urban Garden, etc.

3.1.3 Summary

The co-production in London Borough of Barking and Dagenham is supported by government policies, run by the professional team, and implemented by residents. Guided by the support platforms, the co-production programs place

⑥ 关于活动空间的详细场景请访问“participatorycity”官方网站。
⑥ For detailed usages of these activity spaces, please visit “participatorycity” official website.

⑦ 数据来源于中国社区网中“湖南省长沙市芙蓉区定王台街道丰泉古井社区”的项目介绍页。

⑦ The data come from the project introduction page of “Fengquan Gujing Community, Dingwangtai Street, Furong District, Changsha City, Hunan Province” in China Volunteer Community Service Network website.

施者，以自身发展和创造集体价值为导向来提出、设计、实施和评估这一系列改善日常生活、健康状况与生态环境的创新项目，形成参与式生态系统，达到共同创造多元活力社区的目标。

3.2 长沙丰泉古井社区的合作生产实践

尽管中国尚未出现以“合作生产”为名的社区参与项目，但一些研究团队所开展的社区实践已不再局限于“居民参与规划设计，公共部门提供服务”的传统形式，而开始注重和鼓励居民身体力行投入社区的建设与管理中，显现出合作生产的元素。文章以长沙市丰泉古井社区为例，调查并分析了儿童友好社区共建中的合作生产行动。

丰泉古井社区地处长沙市五一商圈，因有一座200年历史的“丰泉古井”而得名，是长沙市古城街巷、古迹留存最集中的社区之一。社区面积1.29km²，共有居民约5 500人，流动人口占70%，儿童约400人^⑦。作为一个典型流动人口社区与历史街区，该社区呈现出人口构成复杂但发展极具活力的特征。2015年以来，社区党委为满足居民对社区公共空间和美好人居环境的诉求，引导居民共建共享，引入了长沙市共享家社区发展中心（后文简称“共享家团队”）、湖南大学儿童友好城市研究室等第三方团队，开展了一系列改善公共空间、提升社区归属感与凝聚力的参与式项目（表2，图2）^[34]。例如，社区党委利用社区闲置警务室，邀请共享家团队入驻，组织居民共建了“丰泉书房”，并发动居民积极投入运营和提供服务。儿童友好城市研究室入驻社区后，开展了以儿童参与为核心的各类空间微改造及相关公共活动。这些活动中的诸多实践都包含了合作生产过程。

3.2.1 合作主体、生产阶段与结果

该案例中的合作主体包括社区党委、社区小学、高校、社会组织与社区居民。社区党委和社区小学除发挥动员与宣传作用外，往往还为项目的筹办提供资金与场地支持。高校和社会组织作为专业团队在

the locals at the epicenter of making diverse and vigorous communities, as program initiators and executors, instead of passive recipients of services. They achieve individual growth in the pursuit of collective values by coming up with proposals and plans, implementing, and evaluating of innovative programs. A participatory ecosystem is finally shaped with the improvement of living quality, health levels, and ecological environment.

3.2 Co-production in Fengquan Gujing Community, Changsha City

In China, although no program is proposed under the name of co-production, participatory community practices carried out by several research teams have gone beyond the traditional mode that community members only take part in planning and design phases and the services are largely provided by the public sector. These practices emphasize and encourage residents’ participation in community building and management under co-production ideas. This paper here discusses the co-production actions of child friendly community building in Fengquan Gujing Community of Changsha, Hunan Province.

Located in the Wuyi Commercial Zone of Changsha City, Fengquan Gujing Community is named after a 200-year old well. The community also boasts a large number of ancient alleys and relics. Covering an area of 1.29 km², the community homes nearly 5,500 residents, 70% of whom are migrant population and 400 of whom are children^⑦. The demography of the community is vigorously complex. To satisfy the appeal for more community public spaces and a better living environment, the local Party Committee began to encourage community co-building since 2015. The third-party teams such as Changsha Sharing Home Community Development Center (“Sharing Home team” hereafter) and Child Friendly City Lab of Hunan University were invited to co-launch a wide range of participatory programs to improve public spaces and strengthen residents’ sense of belonging and unity (Table 2, Fig. 2)^[34]. The Party Committee invited the Sharing Home team, together with the residents, to turn the idle police room in the community into the Fengquan Library which will be run and serviced by residents. The Child Friendly City Lab has organized various space micro-regeneration actions that encourage children’s participation. All these programs require co-production.

3.2.1 Co-production Entities, Phases, and Results

The entities of co-production in this case include the Party Committee, primary schools of the community, colleges and universities, social organizations, and residents. Apart from the role in mobilization and promotion, the Community Committee and primary schools provide funds and venues for the programs.

表2：丰泉古井社区活动项目
Table 2: Activity programs in Fengquan Gujing Community

实践 Practice	合作主体 Entities	内容 Content
丰泉书房 Fengquan Library	社区党委、社会组织、居民共同建设 Co-built by the Party Committee, social organizations, and residents	社区党委发起，共享家团队组织居民共建空间 Initiated by the Party Committee, the Sharing Home team organizes residents to build spaces together
	社区党委、高校、社会组织、居民共同运营 Jointly-operated by the Party Committee, colleges and universities, social organizations, and residents	居民志愿者参与日常值班，专业团队不断创新服务形式，邀请儿童及家庭进行各类兼具趣味性 with 教育功能的活动 Residents as volunteers of daily duty; Professional teams constantly innovate service forms, and invite children and families to various fun and educational activities
“小小墙绘师，共绘丰泉梦”系列活动 Series activities of “little wall-painters, big dreams of Fengquan”	社区党委、高校、居民合作 Collaborations among the Party Committee, colleges and universities, and the residents	共同设计、实施“四季轮转”街角立体墙绘方案 Co-design and co-create “The Cycle of Four Seasons,” a 3D-wall-painting project
	社区党委、高校、东茅街小学、居民合作 Collaborations among the Party Committee, colleges and universities, Dongmao Street Primary School, and residents	实施“东茅街魔术墙计划”； 邀请儿童学习社区历史，分享社区点滴； 带领儿童寻找印象深刻的空间或标志，组织儿童手绘“丰泉故事”； 提取元素、设计墙绘，最终和儿童共同完成墙绘 Implement the Dongmao Street Magic Wall Project; Invite children to learn the history of the community and share stories of community life; Guide children to find impressive spaces or signs, and organize children to draw pictures about “Fengquan Stories”; Help children extract elements, design wall painting, and finally create the painted walls
街巷游戏节 Alley Game Festival	社区党委、高校、居民合作 Collaborations among the Party Committees, colleges and universities, and residents	倡议社区居民为儿童提供“一小时无车社区”； 利用“运动+游戏”的活动形式，居民与儿童共同营造自由又安全的街巷场所 Launch the “one-hour car-free communities” for children; In the form of “sports + games,” residents and children work together to create a free and safe street environment
社区口袋花园 Community pocket gardens	社区党委、高校、居民合作 Collaborations among the Party committees, colleges and universities, and residents	播种计划：发动儿童收集植物种子、木材等闲置材料和工具；儿童作为“小小设计师”，绘出心中的花园、制作趣味景观小品，最后播种改造； 维护行动（播种数月后）：组织儿童清理花园垃圾、修剪枝叶，并增加一些儿童自制的创意玩偶与标志物 The Seeding Project enables children to collect unused materials and tools such as plant seeds and wood, who can also draw the gardens what they like, as “little designers,” make landscape features, and finally sow and transform; Maintenance actions (months after planting) includes organizing children to clean up the gardens, trim the branches, and add self-made creative dolls and signs

注
根据湖南大学儿童友好城市研究室提供的资料整理。

NOTE
According to the data provided by the Child Friendly City Lab of Hunan University.

街巷游戏节
Alley Game Festival

© 湖南大学建筑学院儿童友好城市研究室
2-1

“四季轮转”立体墙绘节
"The Cycle of Four Seasons" 3D-wall-painting project

© 湖南大学建筑学院儿童友好城市研究室
2-2

东茅街魔术墙计划
Dongmao Street Magic Wall Project

© 湖南大学建筑学院儿童友好城市研究室
2-3

口袋花园
Pocket gardens

© 湖南大学建筑学院儿童友好城市研究室
2-4

- 2. 丰泉古井社区的活动场景
- 2. The activities organized in the Fengquan Gujing Community

培育儿童知识和技能、组织策划活动等专业服务方面发挥作用。

居民具体的“生产”行为包括：1）共同设计并实施空间改造方案，创造属于全体居民及儿童专属的公共领域；2）在专业团队的带领下维护微空间。活动的许多创意来源于居民对社区的集体记忆与个人想法，营造微空间的材料多来源于由儿童从社区中收集的闲置物品。但是，目前由居民主动发起的合作活动占少数，且还未能实现居民对项目的长期维护、合作监督与评估。

这类实践活动对丰泉古井社区的影响是多维度的，既包括空间、服务这样的有形产出，也包含对个人、组织与社会的影响。儿童友好城市研究室将儿童视为最有效的“社区小能手”，培育了一批相对稳定且极具热情的亲子家庭志愿者，可见“儿童友好”是这些活动所创造的价值核心。对于当下中国所面临的邻里关系淡漠、参与意识和能力薄弱等合作生产困境，发展以儿童为关键主体的合作生产，具有促成良好的合作氛围、带动其他居民广泛参与、建设儿童友好型社区等现实意义，同时也可对未来市民社会的形成打下根基。

3.2.2 小结

丰泉古井社区项目的稳步运行离不开专业团队长期扎根基层的努力及社区党委、小学等委托主体的支持。然而，丰泉书房、涂鸦墙和口袋花园的后续管理维护仍需依赖居委会和高校团队，但这些力量主体的精力有限，公共空间易出现利用不充分、闲置、缺乏维护，甚至遭到破坏等问题。

社区公共空间作为公共财产，可持续运行的背后是“公地的治理之道”——即利益相关群体需制定更有效的、不受干扰的、权责明晰的监督与管理制度。随着制度的完善及居民自主组织能力的提升，需要逐渐减轻专业人员的工作量，使其仅发挥关系协调、方法支撑的作用，社区内部具备创意、想法的居民应承担某些项目的发起者和运营者角色。

Social organizations and colleges and universities contribute to knowledge sharing, skill development, and event planning for children.

Residents' production actions include 1) co-designing and co-implementing space renewal plans to create public places for all community members or dedicated to children, and 2) maintaining the regenerated micro-spaces guided by the professional team. Many creativities come from residents' collective memories and individual ideas about the community. Idle items collected by children from the community are used as materials used for micro-space creation. However, only a small number of the co-production programs are initiated by residents, who are also absent in the long-term operation, supervision, and evaluation of the programs.

These practices have multi-dimensional impact on the community, including tangible outputs (spaces and services) and the influence on individuals, organizations, and the society. The Child Friendly City Lab views children as the most productive “community helpers” and fosters several enthusiastic volunteer families. All such actions aim to create a child friendly community. In China, the challenges to co-production include loose neighborly ties and low participation awareness and capacity. In response, children as the key entity of co-production programs in fostering a sound cooperation ambience, mobilizing adult residents, and building a true child friendly community. These endeavors also lay a foundation for the society civilization in the future.

3.2.2 Summary

The smooth operation of co-production programs in Fengquan Gujing Community relies on long-term efforts by the professional team, and the support from the Party Committee and primary schools. The follow-up management and operation of Fengquan Library, graffiti walls, and pocket gardens requires the efforts of the neighborhood committee and colleges and universities—If no adequate attention of the both entities is paid to these programs, the regenerated public spaces may be in a poor usage or maintenance, or even get damaged.

The sustainable operation of community public spaces requires an efficient, uninterrupted, and well-defined supervision and management system co-designed by all stakeholders. As the system improves and residents' self-organization capacity enhances, the operation of co-production programs would be less dependent on the professionals who can only act as coordinators and methodology consultant; residents who have greater creativity and insights shall work as initiators and operators of several programs.

4 合作生产理念下的社区实践建议

4.1 培育自组织力量：从“生产—消费分离”到“作为消费者的生产者”

社区合作生产过程的参与主体一般包括政策制定者、行政管理者、第三方团队和社区居民。在传统公共管理逻辑中，前三类专业人员是公共服务的常规生产者，居民则是“被动接受”的消费者^{[5][20]}。在合作生产过程中，社区居民成为了“作为消费者的生产者”^[13]。而对于前三类专业人员而言，其工作重点是为社区可持续的共同行动创造有利条件，即为社区赋能。在社区发展的综合规划与特定服务的设计、资助、实施、管理、监督、评估等各个环节中，这些专业人员会依据特定服务内容发挥不同程度的引导、协调、培育、鼓励、支撑、监督作用^[35]。

除长沙丰泉古井社区外，北京新清河社区规划^[36]、上海“社区花园”实践^[37]、广州与厦门“共同缔造”^{[38][39]}、泉州古城社区营造^[40]、长沙其他儿童友好社区规划^[41]等社区规划均可看出，近年来中国社区规划研究进展迅速。诸多学者都从实践中总结得出，社区规划师、社会组织和研究团队的“引导”“启发”“中介”角色固然重要，但从治理逻辑出发，最终重塑社区“自组织能力”才是关键，如此才能有效避免专业力量退出后社区实践便难以为继的问题。分析发现，通过合作生产视角可以进一步明晰居民在社区规划中的定位，使其以合作生产者的角色发起或推动某些行动、创造并共享空间与服务——当前国内研究者对居民角色的期望，实则正是合作生产的理想主张。

4.2 实现行动赋能：从参与“程序创新”到共谋“内容创新”

在中国当前的社区或街道微更新项目中，由前沿学术团队或社会组织介入的社区营造实践较好地实现了“程序创新”。例如，通过搭建议事协商机制、开展工作坊、举办营造活动等路径，这些社区实践在确保居民能公平获取信息、充分听取居民意见、发动居民投入社区事务或微改造、培养参与兴趣等方面都取得了显著成效。但是，这些实践仍未实现以社区力量自主促进新制度或新实践的目标——这也是

4 Suggestions on the Community Co-production Practices

4.1 Foster Self-organizations: From Production-Consumption Separation to Producers as Consumers

The entities of community co-production practices include policy-makers, administrators, the third-party teams, and community members. According to traditional public management theories, the first three types of entities are the producers, while the last one is “passive recipients”^{[5][20]} who become producers as consumers in co-production^[13]. The key task of professionals from the first three entities is to create favorable conditions for sustainable community co-actions, i.e. empowering the community. At such steps as community development planning, and the design, sponsorship, implementation, management, supervision, and evaluation of certain services, the professionals would guide, coordinate, foster, encourage, support or supervision accordingly^[35].

Apart from the case of Fengquan Gujing Community, the practices such as the community building in New Qinghe Community in Beijing^[36], the Community Garden in Shanghai^[37], the “Community Co-building Initiative” in Guangzhou and Xiamen^{[38][39]}, the Gucheng Community Building in Quanzhou City^[40], and other child friendly community building cases in Changsha^[41] all demonstrate the rise of related planning research in China. Based on practices, scholars conclude that, despite of the guiding, inspiring, and agency roles of community planners, social organizations, and research teams, the essence of community re-shaping is to enhance the self-organization capability of community. This theory is to ensure the sustainability of community practices without the help of professional strength. Research suggests that the co-production model better positions residents in community planning, encouraging them to initiate or promote related actions and to create and share the spaces and services as co-producers—such expectations to residents held by Chinese researchers fit the propositions of co-production.

4.2 Empowering Communities: From Process Innovation to Content Innovation

Among the current micro-regeneration projects of communities or blocks, process innovation is realized with the interventions of cutting-edge teams or social organizations. Negotiation mechanisms, workshops, and creation events ensure that residents have equal access to information, make their voice heard, contribute to community affairs or micro-regeneration, and foster their participation willingness. However, as a challenge to China’s community planning, these practices fail to empower residents to develop new institutions and practices. After years of research

⑧ “搭便车问题”指在公共产品生产与消费中，由于不支付任何成本的参与者可以享受到与支付者完全等价的物品效用，因此制约着公共物品供给成本分担的公平性与持续性，容易导致市场失灵，最终影响市场效率。

⑧ “Free-rider problem” refers to the fact that in the production and consumption of public goods, because participants who do not pay any cost can enjoy the benefits of goods that are completely equivalent to the payers, it restricts the fairness and sustainability of cost sharing of public goods supply, easily leads to market failure and ultimately affects market efficiency.

现阶段中国社区规划所面临的难点。因此，在多年的程序创新研究之后，治理范式开始积极寻求“内容创新”。程序创新侧重组织形式、方法、规章、流程的设计，而内容创新需要在此基础上进一步强调通过公民自身能力来促进实践成果的有效性，切实优化公共服务、解决社会问题、促进个人和社区的全面发展^[42]。

事实证明，合作生产注重提升和利用居民在政治、社会、经济、文化多个方面的能力（包括知识、经验、技能），或有利于推动社区规划的“内容创新”。首先，合作生产可通过创造各种参与机会来整合利用当地知识、经验和技能，使居民能真实有效地促进社区公共服务的优化，创造性地解决问题。在伦敦案例的“每人每天行动”中，居民通过主持与新创项目来提供服务，以支持其他邻里；在长沙案例中，儿童不经意的创意活化了社区微空间。这些都是对居民各方面能力的培育、调动与利用过程。其次，合作生产不仅是为提高公共事务的参与度，更会注重公民和社区的自身发展，而不是为了参与而参与。该理念减少了对专业部门等外部资源的依赖，为个人成长提供了：1）社会机会，即通过主动参与、合作的过程融入邻里社交网络，促进自我和社区健康全面发展；2）经济机会，即提升居民和社区就业创业的能力，发展社区地方产业。基于合作生产共谋“内容创新”，或许是当前中国社区规划实现行动赋能的可资借鉴之路。

4.3 倡导价值互融：包容公共价值与私人价值

以培育社区居民生活的公共性为出发点，当前中国的社区规划实践大多希望通过建设公共空间、合作公共事务、组织公共活动来营造公共精神，发展社会网络。然而，政府、公民和其他主体所持有的价值取向存在差异，公民寻求的私人价值与公共部门主张的公共价值可能会出现冲突。真正意义的公共价值必须基于个体的价值诉求，并同时保障集体的共同价值。基于公共性来塑造居民社区精神意义固然重大，但纯粹以利他动机主导的激励机制很难长期驱动居民参与公共事务，且难免出现“搭便车问题”^{⑧[43][44]}或其他集体行动困境。

on process innovation, the governance paradigm begins to shift towards “content innovation.” The process innovation focuses on organizational patterns, methods, regulations, and procedures; while the content innovation emphasizes the effectiveness of residents’ production practice, in hope of optimizing public services, addressing social issues, and promoting the all-round development of individuals and the society^[42].

Co-production is to enhance and leverage residents’ capacity (knowledge, experience, skills, etc.) in politics, society, economy, and culture, which are conducive to promoting content innovations in community planning. First, co-production offers diverse participation opportunities to make use of local knowledge, experience, and skills, empowering residents to improve community public services and address community issues in a creative way. In the Every One Every Day case, community members host and initiate innovative programs to provide public services and support each other. In the Fengquan case, children’s spontaneous creativity activates the community micro-spaces. All such efforts help foster and motivate residents’ various capabilities. Second, co-production focuses not only on residents’ engagement in public affairs, but also on the development of individual residents and the whole communities. What is more, co-production is also to lessen the dependence on external resources such as professionals’ intelligence, and provide individuals with 1) social opportunities to strengthen voluntary participation and neighborhood interactions to achieve overall development of individuals and the community, and 2) opportunities to increase residents’ employability and the employment of the community that help boost local businesses. Chinese scholars and practitioners devoted to the community planning should take hold of content innovations through co-production to empower communities.

4.3 Value Integration: Inclusiveness of Public Values and Private Values

Current urban planning practice in China mostly focuses on public space construction, co-management of public affairs and public events to foster the commonality of community life and public spirit, and facilitate the development of social networks. However, the different values of various entities result in conflicts between individuals (private values) and public sectors (public values). In essence, public values should focus both: It is important to shape the community spirit by strengthening commonality, but altruism-driven incentive mechanisms can hardly work productively in the long run to engage residents in public affairs, causing the “free-rider problem”^{⑧[43][44]} or other collective action dilemmas.

而合作生产的目的是促进多种类型利益价值的共同创造^{[18][19]}。在“每人每天行动”实践中，正是因为个人或家庭能够直接从中获益，才能促成不同文化背景的邻里进行社会互动，进而创造幸福、活力、韧性的社区。可见，充分满足居民的利己偏好有利于提高社区参与的成效。因此，合作生产引导下的社区规划实践应当尊重个体的价值诉求，基于利己趋向来设计参与激励机制，进而不断挖掘与培育居民的利他精神。最终，将公共价值和私人价值取向互融，实现更广泛的价值共创，即共识与善治。

5 结语

合作生产是政府与社会针对特定公共产品的规划设计、资助、实施、管理、监督或评估而展开共同行动的过程。本研究分析的两个社区案例都不同程度地体现了合作生产的实现形式。伦敦案例将巴金—达格纳姆区打造为一个参与式生态系统，系统中涵盖大规模且多样化的合作生产项目。它建立了一种政府政策支持、专业团队负责运营、居民主动生产的模式，合作生产程度高，居民自主力量强。长沙案例则以儿童友好为核心创造微空间和服务，以社区居民一致认同的价值与话题来实现空间的改善和营造。分析这些共建过程的合作生产行为有利于合作生产理论与中国社区规划实践的相互结合。总而言之，基于合作生产在社区中开展的各类平台、活动，主要手段是参与性介入，本质则是一种有组织的政府—公民合作行为。

基于本文对合作生产引导下的社区规划探讨，“专业力量退出后难以为继”“形式大于内容”“志愿者困境”^⑨是当下中国社区规划实践中急需突破的瓶颈。为弥合规划理想与现实困境之间的鸿沟，文章认为立足行动、注重实效、切实提升公众能力的合作生产理念有助于启发未来的社区规划工作。具体而言，合作生产引导下的社区规划可以包容居民基于利己的价值取向，以“生产者”的身份投入空间生产，创造并共享切实的服务内容。这同时有助于降低社区事务的行政成本和提高社区公共产品供给的有效性。基于此，社区规划的重

Co-production aims to co-create different types of values^{[18][19]}. In the Every One Every Day case, every individual or family can benefit from co-production directly, which is key to achieving the interactions among residents with different cultural backgrounds and to improving the happiness, vitality, and resilience of the community. It is safe to conclude that the satisfaction of residents' self-interests greatly facilitates the community participation. It demonstrates that community co-production practice should respect individual values, design incentive mechanisms based on community members' self-interest preferences, and foster and increase their altruistic awareness during specific actions. The integration of public values and private values will lead to a broader value creation, i.e. consensus and good governance.

5 Conclusion

Co-production is a process where the government and the society work together to plan, design, sponsor, deliver, manage, supervise or evaluate specific public goods. The cases discussed in this paper represent two forms of co-production. London Borough of Barking and Dagenham establishes its participatory ecosystems with wide-ranging and diverse co-production programs, and builds a sophisticated model by the governments and professionals, of and for the residents. The Changsha case creates child friendly micro-spaces and services, and improves such spaces based on coordinated values, interests, and agendas. Studies of the two co-production processes help promote the application of co-production theories in community planning practices in China. To conclude, co-production-based community platforms and activities, as organized government-citizens cooperation essentially, require the means of participatory intervention.

Furthermore, to cope with the problems in the community planning practices in China such as the lack of sustainability and poor operation without professionals' help, the formalism of practice, and volunteer dilemma^⑨, the authors believe that co-production ideas that emphasize actions, results, and the improvement of public competence are inspiring for the future community planning practices. To be specific, co-production-based urban planning is inclusive with individuals' self-beneficial values, encouraging residents' participation in the production of space (as producers), and create and share actual services. This helps lower the administrative cost of community affairs and increase the efficiency of public goods supply. Thus, community planning should concentrate on co-production actions, relations, processes, and the influence of outputs, so as

⑨ “志愿者困境”指集体活动中的多名参与者，每人都面临着牺牲个人的小部分利益或“搭便车”的选择困境。在社区规划实践中，确实很难要求人人或者大部分人都是关爱他人、热心公共事务的奉献者。

⑨ "Volunteer dilemma" refers to a situation where several participants in a group activity are faced with the choice to sacrifice a small part of personal interests or to "free-rider." In the practice of community planning, it is really difficult to ask everyone or most people to be a contributor who cares for others and is enthusiastic about public affairs.

心将转向行动、关系、过程和影响，进而重视本地社群及日常生活，激励人们从自身和家庭发展出发，为维持健康宜居的生活而参与进社区治理。**LAF**

致谢

特别感谢2018－2019年访问塔夫茨大学期间，朱利安·阿吉曼教授在“共享城市”研究生课程中介绍的“合作生产”理论及提供的巴金－达格纳姆区项目资料，对本文的研究选题有极大启发。感谢湖南大学建筑学院城乡规划系沈瑶教授允许参与观察、调研分析其团队的社区实践活动，并分享项目资料及个人知识。同时也感谢匿名审稿专家对本文的指导建议。

REFERENCES

[1] Ostrom, E. [1972]. Metropolitan reform: propositions derived from two traditions. *Social Science Quarterly*, 53[3], 474–493.

[2] Ostrom, E. [1990]. *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Sydney, Australia: Cambridge university press.

[3] Wang, X. [2020]. Public Service Co-production under the Public Value Perspective: Review and Prospect. *Social Sciences in Nanjing*, [2], 59-66+94. doi:10.15937/j.cnki.issn1001-8263.2020.02.008

[4] Sicilia, M., Guarini, E., Sancino, A., Andreani, M., & Ruffini, R. [2016]. Public services management and co-production in multi-level governance settings. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 82[1], 8-27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314566008

[5] Pestoff, V. [2011]. Co-production, new public governance and third sector social services in Europe. *Ciências Sociais Unisinos*, 47[1], 15-24. doi:10.4013/csu.2011.47.1.02

[6] Murray, R. [2009]. Danger and opportunity: Crisis and the new social economy. Retrieved from http://kwasnicki.prawo.uni.wroc.pl/piki/Danger_and_Opportunityv2.pdf

[7] Osborne, S. P. [2010]. Delivering public services: time for a new theory?. *Public Management Review*, 12[1], 1-10. doi:10.1080/14719030903495232

[8] Watson, V. [2014]. Co-production and collaboration in planning—The difference. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 15[1], 62-76. doi:0.1080/14649357.2013.866266

[9] Wu, J., & Xu, H. [2020]. How can collective action promote the co-production of library public service?. *Library Tribune*, 40[5], 27-37.

[10] Zhong, H. [2018]. *The coproduction of elderly care service: occurrence process and operation mechanism* (Doctoral dissertation). Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai.

[11] Lyu, F., & Pan, X. [2014]. Cooperative production based on citizen mutual aid—a new mode of public service supply. *Journal of Beijing Administrative College*, [6], 103-107. doi:10.16365/j.cnki.11-4054/d.2014.06.017

[12] Ostrom, E. [1996]. Crossing the great divide: coproduction, synergy, and development. *World Development*, 24[6], 1073-1087. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(96)00023-X

[13] Zhu, C. & Yi, W. [2017]. A review of Literature on Public Service Co-Production. *Journal of Public Administration*, 10[5], 188-201+220.

[14] Boyle, D., & Harris, M. [2009]. The challenge of co-production. Retrieved from https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/the_challenge_of_co-production.pdf

[15] Brandsen, T., & Pestoff, V. [2006]. Co-production, the third sector and the delivery of public services: An introduction. *Public Management Review*, 8[4], 493-501. doi:10.1080/14719030601022874

[16] Verschuere, B., Brandsen, T., & Pestoff, V. [2012]. Co-production: The state of the art in research and the future agenda. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 23[4], 1083-1101. doi:10.1007/s11266-

012-9307-8

[17] Bryson, J., Sancino, A., Benington, J., & Sørensen, E. [2017]. Towards a multi-actor theory of public value co-creation. *Public Management Review*, 19[5], 640-654. doi:10.1080/14719037.2016.1192164

[18] Bovaird, T., & Loeffler, E. [2012]. From engagement to co-production: The contribution of users and communities to outcomes and public value. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 23[4], 1119-1138. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-012-9309-6

[19] Alford, J. [2014]. The multiple facets of co-production: Building on the work of Elinor Ostrom. *Public Management Review*, 16[3], 299-316. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2013.806578

[20] Joshi, A., & Moore, M. [2004]. Institutionalised co-production: unorthodox public service delivery in challenging environments. *Journal of Development Studies*, 40[4], 31-49. doi:10.1080/00220380410001673184

[21] Mitlin, D. [2008]. With and beyond the state—co-production as a route to political influence, power and transformation for grassroots organizations. *Environment and Urbanization*, 20[2], 339-360. doi:10.1177/0956247808096117

[22] Rohe, W. M., & Zhang, C. [2011]. From Local to Global: One Hundred Years of Neighborhood Planning. *Urban Planning International*, 26[2], 85-98+115.

[23] Yuan, Y., Liu, Y., & Lin, J. [2015]. Review on community planning research of foreign countries in the past 15 years: a visualized analysis based on Citespace software. *Shanghai Urban Planning Review*, [04], 26-33.

[24] Albrechts, L. [2013]. Reframing strategic spatial planning by using a coproduction perspective. *Planning Theory*, 12[1], 46-63. doi:10.1177/1473095212452722

[25] Brandsen, T., & Honingh, M. [2016]. Distinguishing different types of coproduction: A conceptual analysis based on the classical definitions. *Public Administration Review*, 76[3], 427-435. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12465

[26] Petrescu, D., Petcou, C., & Baibarac, C. [2016]. Co-producing commons-based resilience: lessons from R-Urban. *Building Research and Information*, 44[7], 717-736. https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2016.1214891

[27] Brandsen, T., Verschuere, B., & Steen, T. (Eds.). [2018]. *Co-Production and Co-Creation: Engaging Citizens in Public Services*. New York, NY: Routledge.

[28] Ramos J. M. (Ed.). [2016]. *The City as Commons: A Policy Reader*. Melbourne, Australia: Commons Transition Coalition.

[29] Becker, S., Naumann, M., & Moss, T. [2017]. Between coproduction and commons: understanding initiatives to reclaim urban energy provision in Berlin and Hamburg. *Urban Research and Practice*, 10[1], 63-85. doi:10.1080/17535069.2016.1156735

[30] Li, X., Liu, X., & Huang, Y. [2018]. A new model of community participation: a case study of “Jointly Development” Workshop in Zengcuo’An, Xiamen. *City Planning Review*, 42[9], 39-44. doi:10.11819/cpr20180906a

[31] Huang, Y. [2020]. Responsibilities and roles of landscape

architects in the establishment of child friendly city. *Landscape Architecture Frontiers*, 8[2], 110-121. https://doi.org/10.15302/J-LAF-1-030013

[32] The Participatory City Foundation. [2018]. *Made to Measure: Year 1 Report for Building a Participatory Ecosystem in Barking and Dagenham through the Every One Every Day Initiative*. Retrieved from http://www.participatorycity.org/made-to-measure-1

[33] Participatory City Foundation. [2019]. *Tools to act: Year 2 Report for Building a Participatory Ecosystem in Barking and Dagenham through the Every One Every Day Initiative*. Retrieved from http://www.participatorycity.org/research

[34] Shen, Y., Yang, Kinishita, I., & Xu, M. [2018]. Theory analysis and sustainable operation mode research on participatory design in the context of community design. *Architectural Journal*, [S1], 179-186.

[35] Li, Y. [2018]. Crowd-sourcing in public management: research of current situation and future outlook. *Probe*, [5], 147-161. doi:10.16501/j.cnki.50-1019/d.2018.05.019

[36] Liu, J., & Deng, X. [2016]. Community planning based on socio-spatial production: explorations in “new Qinghe experiment”. *City Planning Review*, 40[11], 9-14. doi:10.11819/cpr20161103a

[37] Liu, Y., Fan, H., Wei, M., Yin, K., & Yan, J. [2017]. From edible landscape to vital communities: clover nature school community gardens in Shanghai. *Landscape Architecture Frontiers*, 5[3], 72-83. doi:10.15302/j-laf-20170308

[38] Li, X., Peng, H., & Huang, Y. [2018]. Participatory planning: Jointly create a better environment and a harmonious society. *Urban Planning Forum*, [1], 24-30. doi:10.16361/j.upf.201801003

[39] Huang, Z., Xu, L., & Li, J. [2018]. The Collaboration of Guangzhou Historical and Cultural City Based on Governance Context. *Planners*, 34[S2], 5-9.

[40] Liu, Z. [2019]. Community empowerment in Quanzhou: an experiment of grassroots pathways for humanist urbanization paradigm. *Urban Planning International*, 34[6], 21-26. doi:10.22217/upi.2019.511

[41] Peng, S., Zhou, C., & Zhou, Y. [2020]. The Establishment and Analyses of the Social Network of Participants in Child-Friendly Community Building—A Case of the Kids’ Gardens in Yucai No.3 Primary School in Changsha, Hunan Province. *Landscape Architecture Frontiers*, 8[2], 36-51. https://doi.org/10.15302/J-LAF-1-020024

[42] Hartley, J. [2005]. Innovation in governance and public services: Past and present. *Public Money and Management*, 25[1], 27-34. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9302.2005.00447.x

[43] Yu, H. [2006]. Analysis of the System with “Taking Convenient Car”. *Journal of the Party School of CPC Qingdao Municipal Committee and Qingdao Administrative Institute*, [03], 13-15+64.

[44] Shen, M., & Xie, H. [2009]. On the issue of public goods and its solution: a review on the public goods theory. *Journal of Zhejiang University (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, [06], 133-144.

to improve the quality of local communities and people’s daily life by encouraging residents to participate in community governance, with benefits individual and family growth.**LAF**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My special thanks go to Professor Julian Agyeman, who introduced the co-production theory and provided the documents on the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham programs at the post-graduate course Sharing City from 2018 to 2019, when the second author visited the Tufts University. Prof. Agyeman’s sharing inspires this research a lot. The authors also thank Professor Shen Yao from the Department of Urban and Rural Planning, School of Architecture, Hunan University for offering opportunities to study the community practices by her team, and for sharing program information and insights. The comments and suggestions from the anonymous reviewers are appreciated as well.