The Urban Governance Model in Regional Cluster Construction and Regional Coordinated Development: A Case Study of the Greater Bay Area

Shuquan Wang

International Joint Audit Institute, Nanjing Audit University, Nanjing, China
xins7417@163.com

Abstract. This study systematically examines the urban governance model emerging from the development of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area (GBA) and its driving mechanisms for regional coordinated development. As a strategic initiative under the "one country, two systems" framework, the GBA has cultivated a distinctive governance system while advancing multi-dimensional coordination across economic, social, spatial, and ecological domains. Using a qualitative case-study approach, this research draws on a systematic literature review, policy text analysis, and a comparative study to analyze the model's core components, operational logic, and practical outcomes. Findings reveal that the GBA has established a composite governance model characterized by "multi-level strategic coordination, networked multi-actor co-governance, incremental rule and policy alignment, and digitally enabled smart governance." The mechanism mode can be summarized as: dynamic collaboration in the constantly adjusted common planning, policy pilot and innovation, interest bargaining and balancing. All these provide effective support for industrial upgrading of the region ,spatial optimization,social integration as well as ecological co-management .Meanwhile constraints are found to exist lagging behind soft connectivity due institutional differences at network structure imbalance inside governance network between different levels&sectors ,imperfect interest coordination mechanism unsustainable in long run. These factors currently hinder deeper regional integration.

Keywords: Greater Bay Area, City Cluster, Urban Governance Model, Regional Coordinated Development, Collaborative Governance, Network Governance

1. Introduction

Against the backdrop of profound adjustments in the global economic landscape and intensifying regional competition, city clusters have become core vehicles for nations to enhance their comprehensive competitiveness. China is actively constructing a modern metropolitan area system by implementing major regional strategies to optimize the national spatial layout and promote high-quality development. The construction of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area (GBA), as a national strategy, signifies not only the creation of a world-class economic growth pole but also an exploration of achieving deep coordination and integrated development across

administrative boundaries, legal systems, and social institutions within the complex institutional environment of "one country, two systems, three legal jurisdictions." This process inherently constitutes a systemic innovation of traditional regional governance models. Existing research predominantly focuses on the GBA's economic performance, spatial structure evolution, or the effectiveness of cooperation in specific sectors, while relatively neglecting an in-depth deconstruction of the governance model that drives these outcomes. In fact, the efficacy of the GBA's coordinated development fundamentally depends on its ability to build a new urban governance system that effectively integrates multiple stakeholders, resolves institutional conflicts, and stimulates market and societal vitality. Therefore, analyzing the GBA itself as a "governance laboratory," understanding the generative logic, structural characteristics, operational mechanisms, and challenges of its governance model, holds significant theoretical and practical importance. This study aims to fill this research gap by constructing an analytical framework of "structure-process-tool-outcome" to systematically address the following core questions: What interconnected core dimensions constitute the GBA's urban governance model? Through what innovative mechanisms do these dimensions operate, and how do they specifically impact multi-dimensional coordinated development in economic, spatial, social, and ecological terms? What structural tensions and adaptive dilemmas does this model face in practice? By exploring these questions, this study seeks to deepen theoretical understanding of the governance logic of Chinese mega-city clusters under complex institutional conditions and, practically, to provide pathway references for the GBA and other regions to enhance collaborative governance efficacy and overcome integration bottlenecks.

2. Literature review

Current research on regional coordinated development and urban governance has accumulated a rich foundation, providing this study with multi-dimensional theoretical underpinnings. In the study of regional coordinated development, academia has expanded from an early focus on economic convergence and industrial division of labor to a comprehensive examination of multi-dimensional systems encompassing spatial integration, social fusion, and ecological-environmental co-governance. Research methods have also become increasingly sophisticated, evolving from traditional statistical analysis to social network analysis to map inter-city relational structures [1], to the construction of comprehensive indicator systems to assess synergy levels [2], and to the use of spatial econometric models to identify spillover effects [3]. These advancements provide methodological support for the scientific evaluation of the GBA's coordinated development outcomes. In the study of urban governance models, faced with the complexity of cross-jurisdictional public affairs, theories such as collaborative governance [4], polycentric governance [5], and network governance have become increasingly prominent in academic circles. These theories are beyond the explanation scope of the traditional bureaucratic paradigm. They emphasize various actors between government and market or government and society who form cooperative networks through negotiation, bargaining, and resource integration to solve common problems. In the research context of the GBA, scholars have begun applying these theories to analyze the form and evolution of its cooperation networks [6], and have astutely pointed out that "soft connectivity" (i.e., the alignment of rules, standards, and policies) is key to determining the depth of integration [7]. However, most existing studies treat governance as a background or external condition, rarely systematically deconstructing the GBA as a holistic, dynamically evolving "governance model." There is a particular lack of integrated analysis of the complete chain: "how the institutional environment shapes the governance structure—through what mechanisms the governance structure operates—how the operational mechanisms produce multi-dimensional synergistic outcomes."

Based on this, this study integrates the aforementioned theoretical perspectives to propose a four-dimensional analytical framework of "structure-process-tool-outcome." This framework, with its pillars of governance structure (focusing on multi-level government relations and multi-stakeholder networks), governance process (focusing on dynamic mechanisms like planning coordination and interest negotiation), governance tools (focusing on "soft connectivity" policies and digital technology applications), and synergistic outcomes (assessing effectiveness across economic, spatial, social, and ecological dimensions), aims to systematically dissect the complexity and efficacy of the GBA's urban governance model, providing clear logical guidance for subsequent in-depth analysis

3. The core dimensions, synergy-promoting effects, and internal tensions of the urban governance model in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area

3.1. Multi-level, cross-jurisdictional strategic coordination and implementation network

This dimension constitutes the "central nervous system" of GBA governance. Its core feature lies in constructing a vertically integrated system led by central top-level design and collaboratively implemented by local governments at various levels. Guided by the Outline Development Plan for the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area as the programmatic document, the establishment of high-level deliberative and coordinating bodies, such as the Leading Group for the Development of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area, has effectively translated national strategic will into collective regional action. This architecture effectively overcomes local protectionism and administrative barriers, providing a strong political guarantee and authoritative support for the planning and construction of major cross-regional infrastructure, the cultivation of a unified market, and the coordination of macro-policies. Research indicates that the operation of this system has significantly increased the frequency and network density of inter-city cooperation, moving regional synergy from loose functional linkages to more tightly knit institutional collaboration [1]. But this is also where, in practical application, it critically tenses with the fact that a unified national strategic blueprint would need highly complex and nuanced forms of localization when being implemented within the Hong Kong and Macao SARs-Special Administrative Regions operating under different social systems and legal frameworks. Discrepancies may exist between the central government's comprehensive, long-term objectives and the local governments' partial, phased demands. How to maintain strategic focus while stimulating local implementation flexibility and innovation is the core challenge to sustaining the efficacy of this network.

3.2. Networked collaborative governance structure based on multiple stakeholders

The vitality of GBA governance largely stems from extensive social and market collaboration networks that transcend the administrative system. This dimension manifests as multi-level, cross-sectoral cooperation patterns spontaneously formed by enterprises, universities, research institutions, industry associations, think tanks, and non-governmental organizations through various means, such as industrial chain collaboration, innovation alliances, industry standard-setting, and civil forums. For instance, in technological innovation, a collaborative innovation network with Shenzhen, Guangzhou, and Hong Kong as key nodes has accelerated knowledge production and transformation [8]; in professional services, various chambers of commerce actively promote mutual recognition of qualifications and alignment of standards. This networked structure greatly enriches the capillaries of regional governance, facilitates the efficient flow of production factors and the dissemination of

tacit knowledge, and enhances the inherent resilience of the regional economy and society. Its synergy-promoting effect lies in complementing purely intergovernmental cooperation by harnessing the self-organization of market mechanisms and social forces, fostering more inclusive and adaptive models of synergy. However, the accompanying tension lies in the uneven distribution of governance resources. Economic and social capital naturally cluster towards core cities and large institutions, leading to a pronounced "core-periphery" structure within the network [9]. Peripheral cities and small-to-medium entities occupy relatively weak positions within the network, struggling to access the opportunities and benefits brought by synergistic development equally. This potentially exacerbates internal development disparities within the region and poses a structural constraint on achieving balanced, region-wide synergy.

3.3. "Soft connectivity" construction centered on rule and policy alignment

"Soft connectivity" is the most distinctive and profound dimension of institutional innovation in GBA governance, directly confronting the fundamental institutional barriers arising from "one country, two systems, three legal jurisdictions." Its core task is not physical connection but, under the premise of respecting the institutional differences among the three places, to progressively promote the alignment, mutual recognition, and convergence of rules, standards, qualifications, and policies across numerous fields such as investment and trade, financial regulation, professional services, cross-border data flows, and public services. Specific practices include establishing cross-border data verification platforms to enhance trade facilitation, exploring mechanisms for the interconnection of financial regulatory "sandboxes," piloting the mutual recognition of professional qualifications in fields such as engineering, and promoting cross-border electronic sharing of medical records. The fundamental value of this dimension lies in systematically reducing the institutional transaction costs for the cross-border flow of production factors. It is the indispensable "institutional infrastructure" for deepening market integration and promoting social fusion, directly determining the depth and quality of integration achievable in the GBA [7]. However, its advancement process is fraught with fundamental, long-term tensions. Every "soft connectivity" initiative involves a difficult search for balance between "preserving the unique institutional advantages of Hong Kong and Macao" and "pursuing regional integration efficiency." Rule alignment often involves deep-seated legal conflicts, the redefinition of regulatory jurisdictions, and adjustments to vested interests, making the process complex, sensitive, and time-consuming. Ensuring orderly data flow while protecting national security and data sovereignty is a typical example.

3.4. Technology-enabled and deep application of smart governance platforms

The rapid development of digital technology offers unprecedented opportunities to overcome geographical and institutional boundaries and to innovate governance tools. The GBA deeply integrates technologies such as big data, the Internet of Things, artificial intelligence, and blockchain into governance scenarios, striving to build a "Smart Bay Area." Its applications include the construction of a region-wide "one-stop" online government service platform, cross-border trade financing and credit systems based on blockchain technology, integrated multi-party data environmental monitoring networks, and collaboratively linked urban traffic management "brains." The core role of these technological platforms is to enhance the precision, intelligence, and convenience of cross-jurisdictional services in the governance process. They can even partially circumvent or simplify traditional institutional obstacles through technological means, creating new

scenarios for synergy. For example, an efficient cross-border logistics information platform that enables real-time sharing of manifest and cargo status data can significantly reduce customs clearance times and lower operational costs, directly incentivizing deeper industrial chain integration [10]. However, technological enablement also brings new challenges. On the one hand, a "speed gap" exists between the rapid pace of technological innovation and the lag of laws, regulations, and regulatory frameworks, which can easily create regulatory vacuums or new risks. On the other hand, the capacity to build and operate digital platforms is not uniformly distributed within the region. Core cities and leading enterprises often gain an advantage in the digitalization process. In contrast, less-developed areas and small and medium-sized enterprises may face challenges such as high access costs and insufficient application capabilities. This may lead to the emergence of a new "digital divide" beyond physical and institutional gaps, posing a threat to inclusive synergy.

4. The innovative mechanisms of the urban governance model in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area

The effectiveness of the GBA governance model depends not only on its static structural dimensions but also on a series of dynamic, interconnected innovative operational mechanisms. These mechanisms are the key translators that convert governance concepts into collaborative practices.

4.1. Dynamic synergy and iteratively optimized planning implementation mechanism

This mechanism breaks the linear "planning-implementation" thinking, constructing a complete loop encompassing "strategy formulation, collaborative implementation, monitoring and evaluation, dynamic feedback, strategy adjustment." In practice, this is reflected not only in the extensive solicitation of input from various stakeholders during the initial planning phase but, more crucially, in establishing a standardized system for tracking, monitoring, and periodic evaluation of plan implementation. By publishing annual key task lists, regularly reporting on the progress of major projects, and introducing third-party institutions of independent assessment, blockages, deviations, or new developments during implementation can be promptly identified. Based on evaluation feedback, governance actors can flexibly adjust and optimize implementation strategies, key tasks, or even partial goals. This dynamic, iterative mechanism ensures that governance actions remain in sync with rapid changes in the internal and external environment, enhancing the strategy's adaptability and vitality and preventing a disconnect between planning documents and actual actions.

4.2. Pilot-first and error-tolerant/error-correcting policy innovation mechanism

Faced with a multitude of unprecedented challenges in cross-border governance, the GBA widely adopts a gradualist reform strategy of "pilot breakthroughs, gradual promotion." A series of reform "testing grounds" has been established in cooperation platforms like Qianhai in Shenzhen, Nansha in Guangzhou, and Hengqin in Zhuhai, as well as in specific fields such as fintech, cross-border data flows, and professional qualification certification. Within these designated areas, temporary breakthroughs beyond some existing regulatory frameworks are permitted for stress testing and institutional innovation, under controlled risks. The essence of this mechanism lies in its accompanying, clearly defined error-tolerant and error-correcting procedures. It encourages bold exploration, allowing a certain degree of tolerance for non-subjective, non-principled mistakes made during experimentation. Simultaneously, it establishes smooth exit and amendment channels for

pilot policies that prove ineffective, non-replicable, or pose significant risks after practical testing. This mechanism design significantly reduces the overall risk of region-wide institutional innovation, accumulating valuable "local knowledge" and social consensus for the steady advancement of major reforms.

4.3. Multi-stakeholder participation and interest-balancing negotiation and compensation mechanism

Regional coordinated development inevitably involves realigning interests. Establishing effective interest-balancing mechanisms is the foundation for sustainable cooperation. The GBA is exploring the transition from ad hoc, case-by-case negotiations to a more institutionalized framework. Its explorations are evident at multiple levels: in cross-city joint infrastructure development or industrial park cooperation, attempts are made to establish cost-sharing and benefit-sharing models based on investment ratios, resource inputs, or benefit calculations; in ecological and environmental protection, discussions have begun on horizontal ecological compensation mechanisms based on the valuation of environmental products, enabling economically benefiting regions to provide compensation to conservation regions; regarding potential tax base displacement due to industrial gradient transfer, cooperative schemes such as tax revenue sharing are also under study. The fully developed system of rules on balancing interests that would apply to all has not yet been formed, but the attempts at setting up regular negotiating platforms and articulating principles in the coordination of interests show governance in the GBA confronting and addressing motivational issues of synergistic development meanwhile attempting internalization of positive externalities brought about by cooperation.

4.4. Multi-layered and socialized consensus-building mechanism

Formal institutional cooperation requires a deep social consensus as its foundation. GBA governance emphasizes cultivating and utilizing diversified social communication channels beyond inter-governmental cooperation mechanisms. A series of semi-official or civil platforms, such as the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area Entrepreneurs Union, University Alliances, Think Tank Cooperation Networks, Youth Innovation and Entrepreneurship Competitions, and Cultural and Art Exchange Seasons, have emerged. These platforms provide business elites, academic experts, young talent, and the general public with spaces for dialogue, exchange, and cooperation that transcend administrative boundaries. Through continuous interaction, mutual understanding among the three societies in development concepts, professional culture, lifestyle, and even identity is enhanced, misunderstandings are reduced, and consensus is fostered. This socialized consensus-building is a subtle, gradual process. While it does not directly produce policy documents, it can foster a favorable public opinion environment and provide a solid socio-psychological foundation for formal institutional innovation and policy implementation, effectively reducing the social friction costs of reform.

5. The impact mechanisms of the urban governance model on regional coordinated development in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area

The GBA's unique governance model exerts substantive and profound multi-dimensional impacts on regional coordinated development through complex transmission pathways. Its mechanisms of action are manifested explicitly in the following four key areas.

5.1. Economic and industrial synergy: from geographical agglomeration to innovation ecosystem construction

The governance model primarily drives economic synergy through two mutually reinforcing pathways: "reducing institutional transaction costs" and "optimizing the regional innovation ecosystem." "Soft connectivity" measures, such as customs facilitation and mutual recognition of rules and standards, directly reduce barriers and uncertainties in the cross-border flow of goods, capital, and people. This allows market signals to be transmitted more smoothly throughout the Bay Area, guiding the deep restructuring and optimal layout of industrial and supply chains based on each city's comparative advantages, thereby forming a tighter network of industrial division of labor. Concurrently, the networked governance structure and supporting talent mobility policies greatly facilitate the cross-border flow and free combination of high-end innovation factors such as knowledge, technology, and venture capital. The activity of industry-university-research collaborative networks accelerates the linkage between basic research, application development, and industrialization, propelling the GBA's transition from a "world factory" model reliant on factor inputs to a "global hub of scientific and technological innovation" driven by knowledge and innovation. The rise of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong innovation and technology corridor is the most representative outcome of this impact mechanism [8].

5.2. Spatial and infrastructure integration: from physical connectivity to functional network shaping

The impact of governance lies in "guiding spatial structure through strategic planning" and "driving network formation through major projects." The collaborative planning mechanism ensures that the layout of major infrastructure—transportation, energy, information, and communications—is coordinated with overall regional efficiency and reshaping of economic geography in mind, avoiding duplicate construction and fragmented development. The ongoing "Greater Bay Area on the Rail" strategy pursues not only the physical densification of railway and intercity rail networks but also, through comprehensive development concepts like "Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)," transforms transportation hubs into urban functional nodes. This guides the agglomeration of population, industry, and public service facilities along transport corridors, thereby shaping a polycentric, networked, and intensive spatial pattern of urban agglomeration. The governance mechanism ensures that mega-projects spanning multiple administrative units, such as the Shenzhen-Zhongshan Link and the Pearl River Delta Water Resources Allocation Project, can progress steadily amidst complex interest coordination, substantially enhancing the region's overall spatial carrying capacity and operational efficiency.

5.3. Social and public service integration: from convenient mobility towards a common living circle

The governance model is committed to a dual-track approach of "consolidating the foundation of social identity" and "promoting the sharing of public services for people's livelihoods." The social and cultural integration mechanism, through sustained youth internship and employment programs, innovation and entrepreneurship competitions, and cultural exchange activities, enhances mutual understanding, emotional bonds, and a sense of cultural belonging, and gradually fosters a common "Bay Area resident" identity among residents of the three places, particularly the younger generation. In the realm of public services, governance innovation focuses on "cross-boundary

service handling" and "rule alignment." Through policy breakthroughs and the construction of information platforms in key livelihood areas such as education, healthcare, social security, and elderly care, the scope and depth of Hong Kong and Macao residents receiving local treatment on the mainland, and mainland residents accessing convenient services in Hong Kong and Macao, are gradually expanding. Examples include pilots allowing Hong Kong and Macao residents to participate in mainland social insurance and elderly individuals to access cross-border elderly care services, representing solid steps towards the goal of building a "quality living circle ideal for living, working, and traveling."

5.4. Ecological and environmental protection: from fragmented management to an initial framework for joint conservation and governance

Confronting ecological and environmental issues characterized by the strongest negative externalities and transboundary nature, the governance model has begun to establish a "preliminary institutional framework for regional collaborative action." Through the establishment of cooperation mechanisms for joint prevention and control of air pollution, comprehensive management of key river basin water environments, and marine ecological environmental protection, attempts are made to unify regional environmental quality targets and some emission standards, share environmental monitoring data and early warning information, and jointly carry out ecological restoration and conservation projects. These measures signify a shift from the past environmental management model, rigidly bounded by administrative divisions and fragmented across departments, towards a collaborative governance system based on natural geographical units and pollution transmission patterns.There are still difficulties in deep water areas such as unified standards, joint law enforcement and ecological compensation , however, the regular environmental cooperation platforms between three places and emergency joint response mechanism have been established ,in common environm ental challenges like comprehensive management of Pearl River Estuary waters and regional ozone pollution ,the transformation of GBA from a passive"post-facto response"mode to an active governance model of "ex-ante prevention and in-process collaboration " is initiated .

6. Problems in the process of the urban governance model promoting regional coordinated development in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area

Despite notable achievements in governance innovation, the practice of promoting coordinated development in the GBA still exposes several deep-seated, structural problems and challenges that constrain the advancement of integration towards higher levels and quality.

6.1. Institutional root-cause problems: the long-term nature and complexity of deep integration under "one country, two systems"

This is the most fundamental and enduring constraint facing the GBA's coordinated development. Differences in legal systems, social management institutions, industry regulatory standards, and values are deeply embedded in the social structures of the three places. Current achievements in "soft connectivity" are primarily concentrated in "shallow" economic areas, such as trade and investment facilitation, and are often incremental policy innovations.Progress remains slow and becomes exceptionally difficult once it has 'deep' institutional cores, such as the mutual recognition and enforcement of judicial decisions, comprehensive linkages of social security systems, security management rules for cross-border data flows, and government procurement markets to be mutually

opened. The persistent existence of this deep-level institutional divide determines that the GBA will remain a region of "differentiated integration" or "limited fusion" for the foreseeable future. Complete, barrier-free factor mobility and an absolutely uniform policy environment are difficult to achieve, objectively setting an invisible yet very real "ceiling" for the ultimate depth and breadth of coordinated development.

6.2. Structural and implementation problems: network imbalance, incentive incompatibility, and implementation difficulties

Structural tensions exist within the governance system. Firstly, the imbalance of the governance network leads to an unfair distribution of synergistic benefits. Market- and society-driven cooperation networks naturally cluster in areas of high efficiency, reinforcing the "siphon effect" of core cities such as Hong Kong, Shenzhen, and Guangzhou. The net outflow of capital, talent, and other factors of peripheral towns may exacerbate their development "corridorization" or "dependency," creating a contradiction with the "balanced" and "shared" goals of coordinated development [9]. Secondly, the problem of vertical and horizontal incentive incompatibility is prominent. The central government's regional strategy focuses on the overall, long-term picture, while local governments' performance evaluations remain closely tied to indicators such as local economic growth and fiscal revenue. Cities are at different stages of development, leading to significant differences in their priorities, willingness to invest, and expectations for short-term gains from collaborative projects. This results in the selective weakening, delay, or formalization of some top-down coordinated tasks at the local implementation level, manifesting as an "implementation gap" between "hot planning and lukewarm implementation" or "many agreements but few breakthroughs."

6.3. Mechanism safeguard problems: insufficient institutionalization of interest coordination and sustainability challenges

The sustainability of regional coordinated development relies on stable, fair, and predictable mechanisms for interest coordination and compensation. Currently, the GBA is in an exploratory stage of construction for this key mechanism. For core interest issues such as tax base loss and GDP attribution due to cross-city industrial transfer, restrictions on development rights and opportunity costs borne by ecological conservation areas, and the massive cost allocation and long-term operational benefit distribution of cross-regional major infrastructure projects, reliance is mostly on ad-hoc, case-by-case negotiations and political coordination. There is a lack of a universally accepted, transparent calculation formula and arbitration rules. This institutional deficiency makes the foundation of cooperation relatively fragile; the depth and breadth of collaboration are easily affected by changes in local leadership, economic cycles, or short-term conflicts of interest. Furthermore, the current momentum for synergy largely depends on policy impetus from the central government and investment-driven large projects. How to stimulate the endogenous collaborative drive of market and societal actors, forming a self-sustaining, self-reinforcing model of coordinated development rather than long-term dependence on external policy "transfusions," is a fundamental issue concerning long-term viability.

6.4. Dynamic adaptability problems: governance resilience and capacity building in responding to new challenges

The GBA's development environment is dynamic and uncertain. Externally, it faces challenges such as anti-globalization headwinds, intensified geopolitical competition, and the restructuring of international economic and trade rules. Internally, it must cope with the pains of industrial transformation and upgrading, an aging population and demographic shifts, new social governance issues arising from technological innovation, and extreme weather risks induced by climate change. In responding to sudden major public crises, managing social risks triggered by rapid technological iteration, and formulating long-term sustainable development plans spanning decades, the existing governance model faces severe tests of its strategic foresight, rapid cross-jurisdictional crisis response coordination, and systemic learning and adaptive evolution capabilities. How the governance system can build sufficient institutional elasticity and resilience to ensure not only the uninterrupted progress of synergy amid complex and changing environments but also to learn from experience and achieve iterative upgrades is a critical capability gap that determines whether the GBA can realize its long-term strategic vision.

7. Discussion

The analysis of the GBA's governance model and its challenges reveals a critical juncture for its future evolution. The discussion focuses on potential development pathways to address the identified dilemmas, drawing on governance theory and comparative regional experiences. First, to address the fundamental tension under "one country, two systems," future governance must evolve from seeking blanket integration towards sophisticated "modular alignment." This involves identifying specific, high-value sectors and constructing dedicated, insulated institutional bridges or "regulatory corridors" [7]. These targeted modules would allow deep integration in priority areas without requiring wholesale legal harmonization, thereby respecting constitutional differences while unlocking strategic synergies. The success of pilot zones like Qianhai and Nansha provides a template for future development. Still, the next step is to scale these modular successes into a more interconnected ecosystem of specialized cooperative regimes.

Second, to mitigate network imbalance and enhance execution, a "multi-scalar metagovernance" approach is essential. The central government's role should partially shift from direct coordination to that of a metagovernor, designing and steering the rules of the collaborative game [4]. This involves refining the performance evaluation system for local officials to include robust metrics for regional contribution and cross-border project outcomes, thereby aligning local incentives with regional goals. Concurrently, empowering sub-regional alliances can foster balanced, bottom-up cooperation, reduce over-reliance on core cities, and create new nodes of growth and collaboration within the network.

Third, overcoming the institutional deficit in interest coordination requires establishing an independent, technically empowered "GBA Fiscal and Investment Authority" or a similar statutory body. Inspired by supra-municipal agencies in other global city-regions, such a body would be tasked with administering a regional development fund, financed by contributions from member governments and central transfers. Its mandate would include conducting cost-benefit analyses for major projects, managing a transparent formula for fiscal redistribution to compensate "loser" regions, and overseeing strategic infrastructure investments that benefit the whole. This moves interest coordination from political bargaining to rule-based, technocratic management, providing the predictability needed for long-term planning.

Finally, building dynamic adaptability requires institutionalizing "future-oriented governance capacity." This entails establishing a permanent, cross-disciplinary "GBA Foresight and Resilience Unit" within the governance architecture. This unit's role would be to systematically scan for emerging trends (technological, economic, environmental), conduct scenario planning, and stress-test existing policies and cooperative frameworks against potential shocks. Its findings should directly feed into the dynamic planning mechanism, enabling proactive policy adaptation. Furthermore, embracing adaptive governance principles means formally designing key cooperative agreements and platforms (such as data-sharing protocols) with built-in review clauses and sunset provisions, ensuring they can be updated or retired as circumstances change, thereby preventing institutional rigidity.

In conclusion, the future development of the GBA's governance model lies not in abandoning its composite, experimental character but in refining it through greater institutional precision, rebalanced incentives, empowered intermediate bodies, and embedded adaptive capacities. The transition from an era of infrastructure-led connectivity and policy experimentation to one of deep institutional innovation and resilient system stewardship will define its success in becoming a truly sustainable and globally competitive city-cluster.

8. Conclusion

This study analyzes the unique governance model of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area (GBA). It reveals a composite approach integrating strategic guidance, network collaboration, rule innovation, and technology enablement. Driven by high-quality development goals within the "one country, two systems" framework, this model operates through dynamic planning, pilot reforms, interest negotiation, and consensus-building, effectively advancing regional economic restructuring, spatial optimization, social integration, and ecological co-governance.

However, governance innovation faces persistent challenges: institutional tensions, implementation gaps, weak safeguard mechanisms, and adaptive pressures. The GBA's development is thus a long-term, complex process requiring continuous learning and adjustment.

Theoretically, the study constructs an integrated "structure-process-tool-outcome" framework that offers a new perspective on governance in Chinese mega-city clusters. In practice, it suggests prioritizing breakthroughs in "soft connectivity" (e.g., data flows, professional qualifications), establishing long-term mechanisms for coordinating interests, deepening socio-cultural exchanges, and enhancing digital governance resilience.

For other emerging city clusters in China, the GBA experience underscores that governance modernization is critical "institutional infrastructure," decisive for the effectiveness and sustainability of regional integration. Future research should track the model's evolution and engage in cross-national comparative studies to further elucidate governance pathways for city clusters.

References

[1] Tang, C., & Zhang, X. (2022). Global urban regional cooperation network structure evolution: A case study of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area. Economic Geography, 42(2), 25-34.

[2] Song, C., Sun, C., Xu, J., & Fan, F. (2022). Establishing coordinated development index of urbanization based on multi-source data: A case study of Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area, China. Ecological Indicators, 140, 108995.

[3] Wang, L., Wu, Z., Ye, H., & Feng, W. (2023). Spatial effect of transportation infrastructure on regional circular economy: evidence from Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30(17), 51112-51125.

[4] Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. Journal of public administration research and theory, 18(4), 543-571.

[5] Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond markets and states: polycentric governance of complex economic systems. American economic review, 100(3), 641-72.

[6] Wu, Y., & Feng, J. (2021). Environmental governance cooperation network in super large urban agglomerations: Structure, characteristics, and evolution—A case study of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area. Economic System Reform, (4), 80-87.

[7] Chen, L., & Zhang, X. (2023). Building a unified market: The evolution, economic laws, and transferable experiences of market integration in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area. International Trade Exploration, 39(5), 4-15.

[8] Qin, C., & Huang, L. (2020). Analysis of intercity collaborative innovation connections and influencing factors in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area. Journal of Beijing University of Technology (Social Sciences Edition), 20(6), 56-65.

[9] Peng, F. (2017). Economic space connections and spatial structure of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area and surrounding cities: An empirical analysis based on improved gravity model and social network analysis. Economic Geography, 37(12), 57-64.

[10] Lai, Y. (2025). Research on Data Fusion-Driven Collaborative Logistics Development in the Bay Area: Study of Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Cross-Border. Information Resources Management Journal (IRMJ), 38(1), 1-20.