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Abstract. The purpose of this research is to analyze the process of expanding commoning that happens when children produce playgrounds in the streets. The responsibility imposed by the award received by Depok with the title of the child-friendly city is questioned in this research. We use the theory of expanding commoning by Stavrides to analyze the continuity of production of children’s playgrounds in the street. The research method used is a qualitative method by conducting a discourse on the theory of common space and correlating the theory of expanding commoning with the theory of lived space. We conducted field observations in two different streets to make a comparison about which street’s characteristics produce continuous lived space. Our study shows that access for children to use other people's resources, to control the programming of space, and to reach out to the social space easily are the factor that makes expanding commoning continue to happen. This research is expected to be able to broaden the knowledge about the concept of child-friendly settlements.

1. Introduction
According to Lefebvre [1], every human being has rights to be fulfilled by the city. The United Nations (UN) formulated The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) that supports the notion [2]. It includes the right of every human being to have freedom, equality, security, and comfort during their time in this world. Sustainable Development Goals by the UN give a clear notion about "Sustainable Cities and Communities" in SDG-11 [3]. SDG 11 stated that the city has to accommodate the right of every individual by being inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable [3].

Then, the UN formed UNICEF as a world organization that focuses on the welfare of children and mothers. Their mission is to fight for children's rights. UNICEF released the initiative to invite every city, district, and community to commit to becoming a city that facilitates the needs and rights of children. The name of the initiative is Child-Friendly Cities (CFC) [4].

In responding to the challenges in the future, Indonesia has adopted the CFC initiative through the policy of Child-Friendly Districts/Cities or Kabupaten/Kota Layak Anak (KLA) [5]. KLA is a form of responsibility of the state to children in Indonesia to fulfill children's rights as part of child protection measures. With the existence of KLA, the city or district must be able to develop its territory in a child-oriented manner. Initiatives launched by the government include policies, programs, activities, and regional zones. One of the indicators of KLA is the availability of creative spaces that can be used by
all children outside of their school time. The implementation of this indicator should be the availability of a Child-Friendly Playground or Ruang Bermain Ramah Anak (RBRA) following the standards set by the government to fulfill the children’s growth and development needs through play activity [5].

Meanwhile, Depok is one of the cities that has been awarded as a city with a KLA title at the 3rd level for 3 consecutive years, 2017, 2018, and 2019 [6]. However, from direct observation in Depok, it appears that children are using their free time in spaces that are not intended for playing and creative activities. It could be a sign that Depok has not been friendly to a child for all this time.

The previous study shows that children use unusual places to be their playgrounds such as parking lots, hydrant holes, urban forests, building corridors, and alley spaces [7]. Children playing activities in unconventional places is an act from children to claim their right to play in a city that does not provide the space for them. Street as a playground has become a resource that is co-managed by the children and other users to get the children the right to play. According to Stavrides [8], a street space could be identified as a "common space". It is not only a space for the circulation of people, vehicles, and goods but can be used as a space for economic transactions or play activities [9,10].

The phenomenon of street or alley being used as a playground was investigated by Furneaux and Manaugh [10]. They argue that an alley is a great playground to practice independence and creativity because it is a safe location and provides plenty of space for children to play. However, this research was conducted in Canada, and the research method used semi-structured interviews to collect their data. Other research conducted in Indonesia also used the interview method and focused more on the perceptions and behaviors of children in the street [11–13]. However, the research conducted with field observation to study the process of the production of a playground in the street has not been done yet. Therefore, the process of children’s playing will be investigated using field observation methods and unstructured interviews to investigate children's playing experiences. According to Neuman [14], the field observation method is a method to investigate the process in empirical evidence. The process becomes important in this study to demonstrate how children co-manage the street into a playground. The process of co-managing resources is known as "commoning".

Many studies about the commoning process have been carried out. The research uncovers the process or workings of activities, programs, urban systems, or even the prevailing culture [15–21]. However, the process of playing activities run by children in the street has not been studied using the commoning framework. The studies that have been done using expanding commoning theory derived from Stavrides's common space theory are also still purely hypothetical [22]. There are only two studies found that uses common space and expanding commoning in empirical phenomena [19,20]. The theory of expanding commoning contains the qualities owned by the commoning process so that it becomes a continuous process, following SDG-11. According to Stavrides, common space is a threshold space that has no boundaries and can continue to grow which can be demonstrated through expanding commoning.

This study explored how the continuity of the playground that emerges on the street uses Stavride's [23] theory regarding expanding commoning. The research opened with a discourse on the correlation between expanding commoning and lived space. It is discussed next to formulate the parameters of expanding commoning that have not been explained clearly by Stavrides yet. The parameter was useful to explore the sustainability of the street space as a children's playground in Pondok Cina, Depok. This research aims to contribute to the development of Child-Friendly City/District policies in the future.

2. Theoretical background
Stavrides (26) defined three categories of spaces based on ownership. These are public space, private space, and common space. Common space is the threshold space between private space and public space. Common space does not focus only on the results, but it focuses on the process of the negotiation that shapes them. The system or pattern as a process becomes an important focus in the creation of common space. The process of forming a common space is called "commoning". According to this study [21], commoning is a process of reclaiming human rights by redefining how to use space through ongoing negotiations. Commoning is a negotiation process with the same pattern to provide a continuity that
minimizes the chaos. This process is an open and flexible process that allows newcomers to follow the pattern of the process.

Common space is a transitional space which is different from porous space [22]. Porous space still has boundaries that define and separate the functions of space, while transitional space has threshold capabilities that can change the space to have different functions and activities. Space being in the threshold state where there is no limitation on how far the space will expand into another space [20].

The process of expanding common space through commoning occurs when there are people who use it. However, to ensure that space continues to expand, humans need to engage in social interactions. According to Lefebvre [24], the production of space is when there is a social interaction that produces social space. Social interaction involves physical space and mental space to continue to occur. People negotiate with each individual when using the physical space to follow their perception from mental space by using social interaction as a tool. Lefebvre mentions social space as an organic space that is formed by the daily social interactions of the people in it. The events inside this space are not the same, not like what happens in the hierarchical space. The space that undergoes a continuous process of social space production is referred to as "lived space". Newcomers are the factor that continues to live up to the space through the negotiation process. This process will not reach a saturation point because the newcomers always have different perceptions from each individual. The novelty will continue to exist to produce activities with different forms with the same pattern or quality.

Stavrides [23] describes the quality in the common space that can push the newcomers to come and participate in expanding commoning. The qualities of expanding commoning are comparability, translatability, and egalitarianism. Comparability is the quality of providing resources that can reconcile differences in space. Translatability is the quality that creates a negotiation process conducive to suppressing conflict without compromising differences. Egalitarianism is the quality of fair and impartial authority for every individual in space. These qualities allow the expanding commoning to develop continuously.

Cayuela [19] argues that three issues need to be considered to expand the commons. First, the available resources must be flexible to use in any condition. Second, the interaction between subjects and resources must be transparent and accountable. Third, the relationship between subjects must be based on a sense of concern. These three issues issued by Cayuela provide a clear framework for the parameters of quality that Stavrides proposes. The first issue relates to comparability by emphasizing dynamic resources to accommodate all differences. The second issue relates to translatability which emphasizes a conducive negotiation process with the interaction of accountable resources. The third issue relates to egalitarianism which emphasizes the value brought by each person to build a good social relation among them.

Based on the discourse from Stavrides and Cayuela's analytical theories, we found that there were frameworks that could serve as the parameters of expanding commoning that ensure the common space to continue as a lived space. The first parameter depends on the resources as the objects. The second parameter is the negotiation process through the interaction among the subjects and to the objects. The third parameter is the distribution of authority which can be seen from opportunities in social institutions. The quality of expanding commoning in common space can be analyzed with these three parameters. In the next chapter, the three parameters will be tested on two different kinds of characteristics of streets that generate two different kinds of productions of spaces.

3. Method

There were two research locations located in the Pondok Cina Village area, Depok. The first place was a street in a small alley and the second place was a street next to the Ciliwung River. Determination of the location was based on children's play activities found during the research. The observation was conducted on March to April in 2018. It lasted for three weeks with the interval of arrivals of two times a week with random days. Playing activities still occurred in both places on random days. Observation time was from 2 to 6 in the afternoon. It was determined based on the children's daily playing habits. It
started after school until they reached the time of the Maghrib prayer. The research subjects were the children who were playing with age range between 4 to 13 years of male and female sexes.

The research used the qualitative method. The first stage was to conduct a desk study to obtain the research framework. Then, field observations and unstructured interviews were conducted at the research location. We made comparisons based on our findings in two different streets and analyzed it using the triangulation method by comparing the theory, the findings of the discourse, and the data in the field to analyze further.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. The Performance of The Street as a Lived Space

There were two different kinds of streets that we observed as shown in Figure 1. The first location is in a small alley and the second location is near the creek. The research focuses on both locations with different spatial characteristics. From the observation, it was found that the street in the first location is a path that directly connects one area to another. The street becomes an important main circulation, although it is not always crowded. On the other hand, the street in the second place is a secondary road that does not always need to be passed because it is a path for river inspection only. There are other alternative streets to reach other areas on the other side of the street. Therefore, the intensity of pedestrians and motorcyclists that pass by is less than the first place. The lack of traffic intensity from circulation activities in the second place is also reinforced by the condition of the end of the street that is partly filled with properties belonging to residents who occupy the house in front of the street.

In terms of spatial dimensions, the space that is used in the first street is smaller than the second street as shown in Figure 2 on Diagram A. The length of the street in the first location is only 20 meters long, while the length of the second location is 50 meters long. In the first location, the street area that is used for playing is only 2.5 m wide. Meanwhile, the playground in second location is not only limited to the road area. Figure 2 on Diagram B shows the children played from the front porch of the resident's house to the river next to the street. Based on these observations, the second location is a larger playground compared to the first place because has wider space.
Another difference lies in the configurations of the surroundings of the street. Figure 3 on Diagram A shows that the house in the first location does not directly face the street because it has a height of 2 meters from the street. Meanwhile, the second location is surrounded by houses that directly face the children's playground in the street. The terrace of the house on the second street enhances the interaction that occurs while children are playing. It contrasts to the house in the first location that has indirect access to the street. It minimizes the interaction among the children and the neighborhood. Other than the terrace and the road, they could interact with other objects such as motorcycles, trees, cliffs, river, and bamboo poles as shown in Figure 3 on Diagram B.

The variety of the games played in the first location and the second location was also different. Soccer was the game that was most often played in the first location. It utilized the walls on the right and left while the game was played as shown in Figure 3 on Diagram A. Different responses were shown by children when pedestrians and motorcyclists were passing on them. When pedestrians passed through, the children continued their activities. Adjustments were made by slowing down the activities, although the children continued to move around the room and run around in groups following the direction of the ball's movement. The pedestrians kept walking while adjusting their position to the formation of children who were playing. However, when motorcyclists crossed the street, the children tried to stand aside and stopped the game temporarily. Children still needed the time to disperse so that the motorcycle continued to slow down and controlled their steering so children who were still on the street were safe.

The second game found in the first location was the carom (karambol) game. When the street was not in the peak hour, the children played carom using a board brought by one of their friends. The boards were placed on the side of the road so that traffic can still pass through the road. This game was played when the children were tired of playing soccer.

However, based on research, only soccer and carom games were being played in the first location. Unlike the second location, which was filled with various kinds of children's play activities. In addition, children spend less time playing in the first location than in the second location. Children's playtime started at around 3 pm in both study areas. However, children only played for a maximum of 1.5 hours. The street was left after the children finished the game of soccer and carom. Meanwhile, the second location was filled with playing activities until 6 pm. It indicates that the second location experienced more expanding commoning rather than the first place.

The games in second location were not only soccer games. It is shown in Figure 2 on Diagram b that shows the location of activities that usually take place at the second place, such as soccer (no. 1), forts game (no. 2), throwing firecrackers game (no.3), playing mud (no. 4), climbing tree (no. 5), descending river bank (no. 6), and others. These are all games that could be played in a linear or parallel way. In the first location, you have to wait for one game to finish first before continuing with other games. There were also several vendors of snacks, drinks, and accessories that attracted children to gather and buy merchandise. Therefore, social interactions in the second location were playing together, watching other people's games, economic transactions, and chatting.

From the findings obtained, the second location becomes a livelier place than the first location. This is evidenced by the many activities that occur through social interactions carried out in the form of play activities. The characteristics of the different locations between the first and second locations are one of the triggers for the different activities that occur in the two locations. However, to clarify how playing activities become more alive in the second location, playing activities will be analyzed using three parameters that have been determined in the theoretical background section. In the next chapter, the three parameters will be explained to determine the quality of the two spaces that produce different types of space using the expanding commoning parameter.

4.2. Expanding the playground in the street
The first parameter is to analyze the resources as an object that children use for playing. Many resources are available in the second location. The second location has pathways, rivers, and residence terraces as their play areas. Objects such as bamboo, motorbikes, stairs of resident's houses, soil, trees, river cliffs, river water, and many more could be used by children to play. The spatial configuration of the objects
and the substance of materials in the second location are more diverse than in the first location that provides unusual ways to be used. Changes in material substance also occur in the second location due to natural elements that occasionally interact with natural phenomena, such as rain or rising river water levels. This phenomenon opens up opportunities for children to play in other ways. Meanwhile, the first location does not open up opportunities for children to play other than football and carom games due to the lack of resources in the first space.

From the analysis, they could play with so many possibilities. It is related to the resources in the second location that are available for them to play with. Private goods and public goods were allowed to be used as children's play equipment. Private goods belonging to residents, such as terraces and private motorbikes, were taken over for use even only for temporary. Public goods such as pathways with the function of circulation space were also used by children to play. As well as with soil, river cliffs, and trees which were natural elements. In the second place, children were allowed to use these resources and changed the material's substance or position of the object. Children tend to explore objects, especially objects that are easy to change to arouse their analytical thinking skills in solving problems [25]. Incumbents were motivated to continue producing a space for playing and newcomers were encouraged to enter the playground with so many available choices. Distributing the right to use objects and spaces to children from one to another is a way to enlarge the children's playground because children do not own as much property as adults do. Hence, access to utilize resources becomes important for them.

Moving on to the second parameter, it seeks to understand the pattern that was generated while the interaction of children playing with objects and other friends happened. There were only two types of playing activities in the first location. Even on certain days, only one playing activity happened, namely soccer games. The pattern of the activities that occur in the first location was rigid and static because there was no novelty of the activities that children could do in that place. Meanwhile, the pattern of the playing activities that occur in the second location was dynamic. Their movements on one activity were dynamic and unpredictable. The order and types of activities carried out each time were different. Activities that children could do were not playing alone but included watching other children playing, having economic transactions, or chatting with other children who were not playing either. At the same time, various activities could happen simultaneously. The children's formation also changed when activities changed. Children who previously only watched then became involved in playing at another time. It was the same with the children who played earlier and then just sitting on one object while buying snacks. The many possibilities that could occur created a fluid pattern of activity. The pattern of play activities was constantly changing with different children allowing for entry and exit from playing to engaging in other activities.

The unexpected pattern of children's activities when playing is a method by children to explore the environment around them through their bodies [26]. The surrounding environment supported this unpredictable pattern of children's activities. There were not many pedestrians and motorcyclists found in the second place. So, the children took control of the space because of minimal interruption from the outsider. In addition, residents who live in the second place also understood that there were going to be visuals or audio that would be uncomfortable when children were playing. It can be said that children get access to control the programming of space differently according to their needs and at their own pace even with all of the disturbances. It solved the children's problem of limited space to move around because of the small size of the house and the density of the existing buildings in their area.

The third parameter is a parameter that seeks to understand the social relationship in the community that can define conditions related to fair and equal opportunities in institutions. In the first place, boys dominated the playground without any girls and younger children to be found. Meanwhile, girls and younger children were found in the second place. Then, the number of children was found more in the second location than in the first location. These discoveries indicate that the second location offers a better opportunity than the first location.

However, the relationship between children with the communities in both locations was not problematic. The communities in the first and second locations did not close themselves off from the arrival of newcomers. Unequal distribution of the child in the children's playground is caused by external
factors. It happens because the position of the first location is far away from the place they were live in. Girls need to spend more time at home because they are responsible for taking care of the household needs, so they need a playground that closes enough to their house. The safety factor also prevents children from going too far from their own homes. Younger children experience restraints to go due to safety factors. As a result, younger children cannot play too far or minimally from supervision.

The discussion relates to the study that found that the proximity of the residence to the children's playground makes children free from parental restraints [10]. It minimizes negative events such as crime, accidents, and discrimination targeting their identity. The younger children are supervised by the neighbors who are on the terraces watching the children. Meanwhile, girls can return to their homes in the middle of playing with the help of neighbors who call them right away when their parents need help. The physical condition in the first location, such as the houses that are taller than the street and the street facing the back of the houses, have become barriers for children to access the play space. It is unlike the second location that has direct access to the play space. Hence, access to reach the social environment easily is significant for them to socialize with their other friends because they already have many restraints. It means that children can enter a social environment that has a bigger scale than their family.

Therefore, the variety of resources, the dynamics of interactions, and the opportunity to join a social environment are more accessible in the second location. It causes the second location to be livelier than the first location. Access is important for children because they have so many limitations that could prevent them from doing such an activity, like playing.

However, among all of the accesses that we have discussed, the neighborhood could be a significant aspect. It is because access to utilize other’s resources and access to control the space are given by neighbors as an outsider to the child. Other than that, access to get into the playground have to be supported by a safe environment. It only can happen if there is a sense of intimacy within neighbors that creates mutual trust, togetherness, and solidarity [27]. It leads to an understanding and safe environment. We found that the sense of intimacy in the second location was better than in the first location. The physical environment also plays a role in increasing the sense of intimacy. It causes the lack of intimacy between the residents that surround the street in the first location. It is not surprising that children prefer to play in the second location.

5. Conclusion
Children do not own much access because of their limitations. However, everyone, including children, should be able to enjoy their city as they need to. Due to the city's incapability of providing them, children have to seize their rights by themselves. They produce a playground in unusual places such as streets to claim the right to play in the city. However, the production of children's playgrounds can occur because access is open to them. Access to utilize other people's resources, access to control the space, and access to reach the social environment are the factors of the production of play space. These accesses overcome children's limitations, such as the lack of own properties, lack of space for activities, and lack of freedom.

A city should bridge the weaknesses that children have with the needs that they should satisfy. But in fact, the city is not able to meet the children's rights. It is because they do not understand the limitations of the children. With this research, we hope that the city will be able to understand children eventually. Therefore, The Child-Friendly Cities initiative would not just be a slogan. This initiative can give benefits that could be felt by all children inclusively. But no less important, we hope that the initiative will sustain for the long run with a concrete step. Not just as a euphoria lacking of impact. However, this study has limitations related to data collection methods and the results obtained. This causes the research data to not be able to answer the aspects contained in Ostrom's design principles. We hope that further research can reveal governance approaches between the children using updated Ostrom’s design principles. Therefore, more knowledge about the children's play system on the street can be obtained.
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