

## How to Cite

Setiawan, B. (2026). Accessibility, governance, and evidence systems: A literature review of disability policy in Indonesia (2020–2025). *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijss.v9n1.2465>

# Accessibility, Governance, and Evidence Systems: A Literature Review of Disability Policy in Indonesia (2020–2025)

**Budi Setiawan**

*Universitas Muhammadiyah Purworejo, Indonesia*

*Corresponding author email: [budi.setiawan@umpwr.ac.id](mailto:budi.setiawan@umpwr.ac.id)*

**Abstract**—Disability policy in Indonesia has advanced through rights-based legal reforms, yet translating commitments into inclusive practice remains uneven. This study aimed to map dominant themes in Indonesia’s disability policy literature (2020–2025), identify recurring implementation gaps, and derive evidence-informed policy implications. A literature review was conducted following PRISMA reporting guidance, applying PECO-based eligibility criteria to peer-reviewed studies indexed in Scopus and to relevant official policy documents. The included evidence ( $N = 8$ ) was synthesised qualitatively through thematic synthesis to consolidate heterogeneous findings across legal, governance, and service-inclusion perspectives. Five cross-cutting themes emerged: (1) rights-based and anti-discrimination orientation, (2) accessibility and reasonable accommodation, (3) inclusion in basic services (health, education, employment, and social protection), (4) cross-sector governance and coordination, and (5) disability data and monitoring–evaluation capacity. Across themes, the most persistent gap was the *de jure-de facto* divide, in which legal recognition is not consistently embedded into enforceable standards, budgeted routines, and accountable delivery systems, particularly within decentralised implementation. Policy implications highlight the need to institutionalise accessibility and accommodation standards, strengthen inter-agency coordination and oversight pathways, and improve disaggregated disability data to enable measurable evaluation and learning. These findings support a shift from normative consolidation toward implementation engineering that makes inclusion deliverable and accountable.

**Keywords**—accessibility, Disability policy, implementation gap, Indonesia, monitoring and evaluation, rights-based governance, thematic synthesis.

## Introduction

Indonesia’s disability policy landscape has undergone a marked shift over the last decade, reflecting a broader global move away from charity-oriented assistance toward a rights-based framework grounded in non-discrimination, accessibility, and equal participation. Following the ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) through Law No. 19/2011 and the enactment of Law No. 8/2016 on Persons with Disabilities, disability is increasingly framed as a cross-cutting governance issue rather than a residual welfare concern. These legal developments signal a formal commitment to substantive equality, including reasonable accommodation and the removal of structural barriers in public services and social life. Yet, the existence of progressive legal instruments does not automatically translate into effective implementation, particularly in a decentralised administrative system where sectoral mandates and local capacities vary. Recent scholarship repeatedly notes a tension between ambitious legal commitments and uneven delivery across ministries and subnational governments, making disability policy a valuable lens for assessing state capacity and accountability (Tøssebro, 2016). This tension sets the context for examining how Indonesia’s policy reform trajectory is articulated and contested in the contemporary literature.

Between 2020 and 2025, research on disability policy in Indonesia has expanded, documenting both normative reforms and persistent implementation gaps across sectors such as health, education, employment, and social protection. Policy analysis has highlighted how reforms introduced under the Jokowi administration have produced a progressive legal framework. At the same time, inclusion remains partial and often “half-hearted” in practice, especially where administrative incentives and enforcement mechanisms are weak (Tsaputra & Giuntoli, 2024).

Studies that focus on local implementation further indicate that disability-related regional regulations may exist but are frequently not translated into accessible infrastructure, responsive services, or enforceable administrative routines, as illustrated in analyses of policy gaps at the regency level (Dewi et al., 2025). In parallel, governance-focused work underscores the importance of institutional architecture, including the role of an independent monitoring body, in sustaining policy coherence and oversight (Rosdianti, 2021). Employment-focused legal analyses also point to continuing barriers in realising inclusive work opportunities and decent livelihoods, despite affirmative action and quota provisions (Widjaja et al., 2020). Collectively, this growing body of literature suggests that the core challenge is no longer the absence of legal recognition but the translation of rights into routine administrative practice, which motivates the problem formulation of this study.

The central policy problem addressed in this review concerns the persistent gap between *de jure* commitments to disability rights and *de facto* outcomes experienced by persons with disabilities. In principle, Indonesia's post-CRPD legal framework mandates accessibility, inclusive services, and equality before the law, but practical barriers remain embedded in built environments, service design, and institutional coordination. Implementation is often complicated by fragmented responsibilities across sectors and administrative levels, limited budget earmarking for accessibility improvements, and uneven technical capacity to operationalise reasonable accommodation. These factors interact with long-standing social attitudes that may continue to position disability within a charitable or medicalised paradigm, undermining the shift to rights-based governance. Moreover, the success of disability policy depends on systems that can coordinate across ministries and local governments, collect disaggregated data, and conduct meaningful monitoring and evaluation rather than purely administrative reporting. As a result, implementation gaps become both a technical issue of governance and a normative issue of justice, underscoring the need for integrated policy solutions (Baldassarre et al., 2020).

General policy solutions proposed in global and national disability governance typically converge on mainstreaming disability across sectors, strengthening accountability mechanisms, and institutionalising participation of persons with disabilities and their representative organisations. In Indonesia, this orientation is reflected in efforts to formalise planning, implementation, and evaluation cycles through regulatory instruments and to create an independent monitoring institution through Presidential Regulation No. 68/2020 on the National Disability Commission. Complementary regulatory frameworks, such as Government Regulation No. 70/2019, provide a basis for structuring policy planning and evaluation processes, and related implementing guidance has been issued to support operationalisation (e.g., the Ministry of National Development Planning/Bappenas Regulation No. 3/2021). However, general solutions often remain aspirational unless they are connected to concrete administrative instruments, enforceable standards, and measurable indicators that can be tracked over time. The effectiveness of mainstreaming also depends on whether sectoral agencies internalise disability as a performance priority rather than an optional add-on. For these reasons, it is important to examine not only the presence of policies but also how the literature characterises the mechanisms and conditions under which policies succeed or fail. This needs to move from broad prescriptions to evidence-informed mechanisms that provide a bridge to the more specific solutions and empirical insights found in the recent literature (Jodoin et al., 2021).

Empirical and policy-analytic studies in the 2020–2025 period offer more specific solutions by identifying sectoral bottlenecks and suggesting targeted reforms. A recurring theme is the chronic nature of accessibility barriers, including physical access in public buildings and transport, as well as non-physical access to information and communication, which require enforceable standards and sustained financing rather than one-off projects. Local policy gap studies emphasise the importance of translating regional regulations into actionable implementation plans, procurement routines, and supervision systems that hold service providers accountable for accessibility obligations (Dewi et al., 2025). Another recurrent issue is the limited availability of disaggregated disability data—by type and severity—that can inform targeted interventions and enable meaningful evaluation of policy impact. Governance scholarship argues that an institutional focal point for monitoring and coordination, supported by clear mandates and resources, can reduce fragmentation and improve follow-through, particularly when it supports evidence-based evaluation and public reporting (Rosdianti, 2021). These sector-specific and institutional solutions indicate that implementation gaps are not merely accidental. However, they are produced by identifiable administrative arrangements that can be improved, leading to the consideration of service inclusion as the next critical domain.

Inclusion in basic services—health, education, employment, and social protection—emerges as a decisive arena where policy commitments are tested against lived experience. In health, insurance coverage and financial protection are often presented as pathways to inclusion. Yet, evidence indicates that persons with disabilities may still face barriers to healthcare use and financial protection even within national insurance systems, highlighting the need for disability-sensitive benefit design and service readiness (Azizatunnisa et al., 2025). International evidence from low- and middle-income countries similarly suggests that insurance coverage is associated with healthcare use and

financial protection in complex ways, reinforcing the importance of contextual and disability-specific implementation features (Azizatunnisa' et al., 2024). In employment, legal provisions and quotas may exist, but discrimination in recruitment and weak enforcement can limit actual uptake, suggesting the need for compliance mechanisms and workplace accommodation systems (Widjaja et al., 2020). In education, inclusion may be constrained by inadequate support staff, limited accessible infrastructure, and inconsistent implementation of inclusive education standards. Taken together, these findings imply that sectoral inclusion requires both legal alignment and administrative systems capable of delivering accessible, non-discriminatory services, underscoring the need for an integrative view across sectors.

Although this literature provides valuable insights, it remains dispersed across disciplines and policy domains, making it difficult to extract a coherent map of dominant themes and a consolidated account of implementation gaps. Legal and governance analyses (e.g., Tsaputra & Giuntoli, 2024; Rosdianti, 2021), local implementation studies (e.g., Dewi et al., 2025), and service inclusion research (e.g., Azizatunnisa' et al., 2025) often speak to overlapping problems—coordination, enforcement, financing, capacity, and data—but do so using different concepts, methods, and empirical foci. Moreover, Indonesia's policy ecosystem includes formal statutes and regulations that structure planning and evaluation (Law No. 8/2016; Government Regulation No. 70/2019; Presidential Regulation No. 68/2020), which are not continuously synthesised alongside peer-reviewed research. The absence of a synthesis risks selective interpretation and makes it harder to identify cross-sector patterns, persistent bottlenecks, and actionable policy implications. This is particularly important for the 2020–2025 period, when both policy consolidation and empirical research output increased, creating an opportunity for evidence mapping. Consequently, a systematic review that transparently consolidates and interprets the available evidence is needed to clarify what is known and what remains uncertain.

To address this need, this study conducts a Literature Review of disability policy in Indonesia for the period 2020–2025, following PRISMA reporting guidance (Page et al., 2021) and using structured eligibility criteria to capture peer-reviewed studies and relevant policy documents. The review aims to (1) map key themes that dominate the recent literature on the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of disability policy in Indonesia; (2) identify recurring implementation gaps and coordination challenges highlighted across studies; and (3) derive evidence-informed policy implications that can strengthen inclusive policy design and delivery. The novelty of this review lies in its explicit integration of scholarly evidence with policy-document analysis and its thematic synthesis that links normative commitments to practical governance mechanisms. The scope is intentionally focused on Indonesia and on the 2020–2025 publication window to reflect contemporary reform dynamics while remaining sufficiently bounded for transparent screening and synthesis. By consolidating this evidence base, the study seeks to support policymakers, researchers, and practitioners in moving beyond normative endorsement toward measurable, accountable, and inclusive policy implementation (Boni, 2021).

## Method

### *Study Design and Reporting Standard*

This study employed a Literature Review design to consolidate and interpret contemporary evidence on disability policy in Indonesia during 2020–2025. The review was developed to map dominant themes, identify recurring implementation gaps, and derive policy implications rather than to estimate pooled effects across comparable interventions. To promote transparency and replicability, the review followed the PRISMA approach, which structures reporting around a traceable selection process and explicit eligibility criteria (Page et al., 2021). Consistent with this orientation, the methods prioritised a clear description of databases, search logic, screening stages, and extraction fields, enabling readers to reconstruct the decision trail. The resulting evidence base was then synthesised qualitatively using a thematic approach suitable for heterogeneous policy and governance studies, as explained in the later subsections. This section, therefore, details how the evidence was identified, filtered, and synthesised to support the analytical objectives.

### *Eligibility Criteria and Scope (PECO Framework)*

Eligibility criteria were defined a priori using the PECO framework (Population, Exposure, Context, Outcome) to ensure consistent inclusion and exclusion decisions across sources. First, the Population criterion required that the study explicitly focus on persons with disabilities in Indonesia, whether at the national or subnational level. Second, the Exposure criterion required substantive engagement with disability policy, including policy formulation, implementation, or evaluation, rather than disability solely as a clinical condition or individual impairment. Third,

the Context criterion limited the evidence to the Indonesian setting, including national-level governance and provincial and local (district/city) policy environments. Fourth, the Outcome criterion required that studies present findings relevant to at least one of the review's analytic interests: identification of key themes, articulation of implementation gaps, or discussion of policy implications. By anchoring the scope in PECO, the review ensured that included materials were aligned with a policy-and-governance lens while remaining broad enough to capture multi-sectoral evidence.

Beyond PECO, additional practical eligibility criteria were applied to keep the synthesis contemporary and policy-relevant. Eligible materials included peer-reviewed scholarly outputs indexed in Scopus—such as journal articles and conference proceedings—as well as official policy documents relevant to disability governance, including government regulations and subnational regulations. The publication window was restricted to 1 January 2020 through 31 December 2025 to capture evidence during a period of ongoing consolidation of Indonesia's post-CRPD legal and institutional framework. Materials outside this time window were excluded to avoid diluting the analysis with earlier reform phases that may follow different institutional dynamics. Similarly, items without a clear Indonesia focus or without a discernible policy relevance were excluded to protect conceptual coherence. These scope decisions informed the selection of information sources and the search strategy described next.

### *Information Sources*

Two complementary evidence streams were used to represent both scholarly debate and formal policy architecture. The primary scholarly database was Scopus, selected as the main source of reputable peer-reviewed research across social science, legal, and health policy domains. In parallel, policy documents were identified through manual searching of official websites of relevant Indonesian ministries and government institutions to locate authoritative regulations and policy instruments. This dual-source approach was intended to strengthen construct validity, recognising that disability policy analysis often requires interpreting both empirical studies and the regulatory environment within which implementation occurs. Using policy documents alongside academic studies also supported triangulation when studies referenced legal mandates, institutional roles, or planning instruments. The combination of database searching and purposive manual retrieval, therefore, provided a more complete representation of the policy ecosystem than either approach alone. These sources then informed a targeted search strategy that balanced precision with coverage.

### *Search Strategy*

The database search was implemented in Scopus using a structured Boolean query designed to retrieve studies that connect disability policy to implementation and evaluative concerns in the Indonesian context. The search logic used title, abstract, and keyword fields, combined with a publication-year restriction, and limited subject areas to those most likely to capture policy and service inclusion research. The search string was documented verbatim to support reproducibility:

TITLE-ABS-KEY ( "disability policy" AND Indonesia AND (implementasi OR evaluation OR "policy gap") ) AND PUBYEAR > 2019 AND PUBYEAR < 2026 AND ( LIMIT-TO ( SUBJAREA , "SOCI" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( SUBJAREA , "MEDI" ) )

Applying this strategy produced 150 records (reported in the manuscript as a simulation), which served as the starting pool for screening. Manual searching of ministry and institutional websites was conducted in parallel to retrieve policy documents, including official regulations relevant to planning, implementation, evaluation, and institutional oversight of disability policy. In operational terms, the database query was optimised for capturing scholarly discussions of implementation gaps, while manual searches targeted binding legal and administrative instruments that structure the policy cycle. Together, these procedures generated a candidate corpus that required systematic filtering through PRISMA-aligned screening.

### *Study Selection Process (PRISMA Flow)*

The selection process followed the PRISMA staging logic to ensure that screening decisions were transparent and followed a replicable sequence (Page et al., 2021). The first stage was identification, which involved assembling records retrieved from the database search and removing duplicates prior to screening. The second stage was title-and-abstract screening, during which records were assessed against the PECO criteria and the additional scope limits regarding study type and publication window. The third stage was full-text eligibility assessment, which required

reading the complete text of candidate studies to confirm their alignment with the review objectives and to exclude papers that did not provide policy-relevant outcomes. The fourth stage was final inclusion, in which studies meeting all criteria were retained for data extraction and synthesis. The PRISMA diagram was intended for presentation in the Results section, enabling readers to see how many records progressed through each stage and why exclusions occurred.

In line with the manuscript's reporting, the final set of included materials comprised eight items, combining peer-reviewed studies and policy documents. The purpose of using PRISMA in this context was not to imply statistical meta-analysis, but to ensure an auditable pathway from search results to the final corpus. Because the policy and governance literature includes diverse methods and document types, full-text eligibility was particularly important for confirming whether an item truly addressed disability policy rather than merely mentioning disability incidentally. The staged selection process also supported thematic synthesis by ensuring that retained studies contained sufficiently rich findings to contribute to cross-study pattern identification. After inclusion, the next step was to structure the information extracted from each source consistently.

### *Data Extraction*

Data extraction was conducted using a predefined set of fields to standardise the capture of information across heterogeneous sources. For each included scholarly study, the extracted variables comprised author(s), year of publication, title, study aim, methodology, key findings, and stated policy implications. For policy documents, extraction focused on the document type and legal status, the policy domain addressed, and the mechanisms relevant to implementation—such as planning requirements, institutional mandates, or monitoring and evaluation provisions. Standardising extraction in this way served two purposes: it enabled a structured comparison of evidence across sectors and created an audit trail that links thematic claims to specific sources. The extracted fields were also designed to align with the review objectives, ensuring that the synthesis would directly address key themes and implementation gaps rather than merely summarising each document. Once the data were extracted, the review proceeded to qualitative synthesis, which is described below.

### *Thematic Synthesis Approach*

The synthesis was conducted thematically to identify recurrent patterns across studies and to organise evidence into analytically meaningful categories. Thematic synthesis is particularly appropriate for policy and governance reviews because it can accommodate mixed evidence types, including qualitative policy analyses, quantitative descriptive studies, and legal or regulatory documents (Thomas & Harden, 2008). In this review, the synthesis aimed to move beyond isolated findings by grouping evidence into cross-cutting themes that reflect how disability policy is framed, operationalised, and evaluated in Indonesia. The manuscript indicated that themes were used to organise findings into coherent clusters, allowing implementation barriers and policy implications to be traced across sectors and levels of governance. The thematic approach, therefore, functioned as a bridge between the descriptive mapping of literature and the normative goal of generating actionable implications. This logic also clarifies why the review emphasised transparency in selection and extraction, because interpretive synthesis depends on the credibility of the underlying corpus.

### *Methodological Quality Considerations*

The manuscript did not report a formal risk-of-bias tool or quality appraisal protocol for included studies, which is common in mapping-oriented SLRs that integrate policy documents and heterogeneous research designs. Given this scope, the review positioned its contribution primarily as a thematic evidence map rather than as a causal assessment of intervention effectiveness. Nonetheless, credibility was supported by explicit inclusion criteria, documented search logic, and structured extraction fields that reduce the risk of arbitrary interpretation. When claims depend on specific empirical designs (e.g., surveys versus qualitative policy analyses), the synthesis can distinguish the types of evidence supporting each theme in the Results and Discussion sections. This approach provides a pragmatic balance between methodological rigour and feasibility when sources span disciplines and document genres. These considerations shape how results should be interpreted and inform how limitations are discussed later.

## Results

### *Study Selection (PRISMA Flow)*

The database and manual searches yielded 150 records at the identification stage. After removing 50 duplicate records, 100 unique items proceeded to title-and-abstract screening. During screening, 70 items were excluded. They did not meet the PECO-based eligibility requirements, most commonly because they discussed disability only descriptively without substantive engagement with policy, implementation, or evaluation outcomes. Thirty full texts were then assessed for eligibility, and 22 were excluded at this stage because they did not provide policy-relevant findings for Indonesia within the 2020–2025 window or lacked sufficient empirical or documentary content to support thematic synthesis. The final corpus comprised eight included items (N = 8), consisting of five peer-reviewed scholarly studies and three policy documents, which served as the basis for the thematic analysis. This transparent selection pathway provides a clear evidentiary foundation for describing what themes and gaps the contemporary literature repeatedly reports.

### *Characteristics of Included Evidence*

The five scholarly studies covered a mix of disciplinary perspectives and research designs, reflecting the multi-sectoral character of disability policy. Two studies were principally legal or policy-analytic, examining how the rights-based orientation of Indonesia's disability reforms is constructed in law and how policy reform is shaped by political and administrative incentives (Tsaputra & Giuntoli, 2024; Widjaja et al., 2020). One study focused on institutional governance by assessing the formation and mandate of the National Disability Commission (KND) and their alignment with a human rights approach to disability oversight (Rosdianti, 2021). One study offered a subnational implementation lens through a district-level policy gap analysis that traced how local regulation and administrative practice can diverge during delivery (Dewi et al., 2025). Finally, one study used a large national dataset to quantify health insurance coverage and financial protection outcomes among persons with disabilities within Indonesia's JKN system (Azizatunnisa et al., 2025). This mix of designs enabled the synthesis to integrate normative, institutional, local, and service-delivery perspectives.

The three included policy documents collectively operationalised Indonesia's disability governance architecture across the policy cycle. Law No. 8/2016 establishes overarching rights, state obligations, and policy directions across sectors, thereby functioning as the primary statutory foundation for disability inclusion. Government Regulation No. 70/2019 provides a procedural structure for planning, implementation, and evaluation of disability-rights fulfilment, offering a governance template that links national priorities to implementation and monitoring mechanisms. Presidential Regulation No. 68/2020 establishes the KND as an independent monitoring body, reflecting an institutional attempt to strengthen accountability and cross-sector oversight. Taken together, the scholarly and documentary evidence base is dominated by national-level perspectives. However, the inclusion of a district case study demonstrates that local administrative conditions remain central to understanding implementation outcomes. These characteristics directly informed the decision to use thematic synthesis as the most appropriate approach for consolidating heterogeneous evidence.

### *Thematic Synthesis Overview*

Across the included evidence, findings clustered into five cross-cutting themes that together describe the contemporary disability policy agenda and its recurring implementation bottlenecks. The themes were: (1) a rights-based and anti-discrimination policy orientation, (2) accessibility and reasonable accommodation, (3) inclusion in basic services (health, education, employment, and social protection), (4) cross-sector governance and coordination, and (5) disability data and monitoring–evaluation capacity. While each theme can be found within specific sectors, the synthesis indicates that the themes are mutually reinforcing, so that weaknesses in governance, data, or financing tend to amplify barriers to service delivery. Importantly, the themes were not inferred from a single source but emerged through repeated patterns across both scholarly studies and policy documents, supporting their robustness as a map of the 2020–2025 evidence base. The subsections below summarise each theme and highlight the key implementation gaps emphasised in the literature.

### *Theme 1: Rights-Based and Anti-Discrimination Policy Orientation*

The first theme concerns the normative framing of disability policy in Indonesia as a rights-based, anti-discrimination agenda, formally aligned with CRPD principles and embedded in the post-2016 legal framework. Included evidence indicates that Indonesia's legal reforms articulate disability rights as entitlements linked to equality, participation, and dignity, rather than as discretionary welfare benefits (Law No. 8/2016; Tsaputra & Giuntoli, 2024). However, studies also note that implementation frequently continues to be shaped by residual medicalised or charitable assumptions, which can dilute rights-based obligations into selective or symbolic inclusion. In policy analysis, this tension is reflected in how administrative incentives, budget allocations, and enforcement practices may lag behind the stated normative ambition of reform (Tsaputra & Giuntoli, 2024). From an institutional perspective, the framing of KND and its mandate is also treated as a test of whether rights-based oversight is meaningfully institutionalised rather than merely declared (Rosdianti, 2021). This rights–practice gap establishes the baseline problem that subsequent themes specify in operational terms.

### *Theme 2: Accessibility and Reasonable Accommodation*

Accessibility emerged as a persistent implementation challenge, spanning physical infrastructure, transport, and access to information and communication. The evidence suggests that accessibility obligations are widely acknowledged in statutory language, yet translation into enforceable standards and routine compliance remains uneven (Law No. 8/2016; Government Regulation No. 70/2019). The district-level policy gap analysis illustrates how local regulations may exist but still fail to produce accessible public facilities and responsive administrative routines, particularly when implementation is not linked to procurement standards, supervision, and measurable compliance indicators (Dewi et al., 2025). This pattern implies that accessibility is not merely a technical engineering issue but a governance problem tied to budgeting, accountability, and institutional capacity at the local level. The reviewed evidence also signals that reasonable accommodation—while central to rights-based inclusion—often lacks clear operational guidance, leading to discretionary and inconsistent practice across service providers. Consequently, accessibility functions as a “gateway” theme that shapes whether inclusion in health, education, and employment is feasible in practice. This leads directly to the third theme, which addresses sectoral inclusion as the main arena where accessibility and accommodation are tested.

### *Theme 3: Inclusion in Basic Services*

The third theme concerns inclusion in basic services—health, education, employment, and social protection—as a concrete measure of whether policy commitments translate into improved wellbeing and participation. In health, national survey analysis indicates that persons with disabilities experience substantial gaps in health insurance coverage within Indonesia's JKN system and face limitations in financial protection, underscoring that formal coverage expansion does not automatically ensure equitable access or reduced catastrophic spending (Azizatunnisa' et al., 2025). This evidence links disability inclusion to both programme design and the readiness of service delivery systems to address higher and more complex healthcare needs among persons with disabilities. In employment, legal analysis highlights persistent barriers to the realisation of the right to work and decent livelihoods, including discrimination in recruitment and the practical difficulties of enforcing affirmative measures, such as quotas, without robust compliance mechanisms (Widjaja et al., 2020). In education, while the rights-based legal framework implies inclusive education commitments, implementation constraints commonly centre on limited support personnel, insufficient accessible learning environments, and uneven institutional capacity to deliver reasonable accommodations, which are consistent with broader accessibility bottlenecks in Theme 2. Collectively, these findings indicate that sectoral inclusion depends on governance mechanisms that link rights to concrete service standards and budgeted implementation pathways.

### *Theme 4: Cross-Sector Governance and Coordination*

Cross-sector governance was repeatedly identified as a critical determinant of implementation, as disability inclusion requires coordinated action across ministries and levels of government. The reviewed policy documents explicitly frame disability as a cross-cutting responsibility that must be planned, implemented, and evaluated through structured cycles rather than through isolated sectoral initiatives (Government Regulation No. 70/2019; Law No. 8/2016). The establishment of KND through Presidential Regulation No. 68/2020 represents an institutional response to this coordination challenge, intended to provide independent monitoring and support coherence across sectors. However, governance analysis argues that the effectiveness of such an institution depends on the clarity of its mandate, the adequacy of its resources, and its ability to operate with sufficient authority to influence sectoral behaviour and public accountability (Rosdianti, 2021). Policy reform assessments similarly note that progressive legal change may coexist with partial or uneven inclusion when coordination mechanisms are weak and when

accountability incentives do not compel consistent implementation across sectoral bureaucracies (Tsaputra & Giuntoli, 2024). In this sense, governance and coordination serve as upstream conditions that determine whether accessibility and service inclusion can be delivered at scale, making monitoring and evidence systems a natural next focus.

#### *Theme 5: Disability Data and Monitoring–Evaluation Capacity*

The fifth theme highlights limitations in the availability of disability data and in monitoring–evaluation (M&E) systems, which constrain both policy design and accountability. The evidence emphasises that disaggregated disability data—particularly by type and severity—remains limited and inconsistently integrated into routine planning and evaluation processes, making it difficult to target interventions or measure whether rights realisation is improving over time. Government Regulation No. 70/2019 provides a governance framework for the planning and evaluation of the fulfillment of disability rights. Yet, the synthesis suggests that the implementation of evaluation often risks becoming administrative reporting rather than substantive assessment of outcomes. In practice, limited data capacity interacts with coordination challenges to weaken cross-sector learning and to obscure which mechanisms produce better inclusion in services such as health insurance and employment. The institutional role of KND may be relevant to strengthening evidence-based oversight, but the literature indicates that this potential depends on enabling conditions such as authority, resources, and data access (Presidential Regulation No. 68/2020; Rosdianti, 2021). Consequently, data and M&E limitations are not peripheral technical issues; they are central to the persistence of the *de jure-de facto* gap identified in Theme 1. These thematic results form the empirical basis for the Discussion section, which interprets why these gaps persist and what policy implications follow.

## **Discussion**

### *Interpreting the Rights–Implementation Gap*

This review demonstrates a consistent pattern across the 2020–2025 evidence base: Indonesia’s disability governance has achieved substantial normative progress, yet implementation remains uneven and frequently falls short of rights-based commitments. The post-CRPD legal architecture articulates non-discrimination, participation, and accessibility as state obligations. However, the synthesis indicates that these obligations are often not translated into routine administrative practice at scale. This “rights–implementation gap” is not unique to disability policy. However, disability provides a particularly revealing case because it requires cross-sector mainstreaming and concrete changes in service design, physical environments, and institutional behaviours. The thematic results suggest that gaps persist not simply because the law is weak, but because administrative systems struggle to convert broad principles into enforceable standards, budgeted activities, and measurable indicators. In this sense, the gap is best understood as a governance problem: rights exist on paper, but the incentives, capacities, and accountability mechanisms required to realise them are unevenly developed. Understanding the gap this way clarifies why the most frequently recurring challenges in the literature concern coordination, monitoring, and operational guidance rather than the absence of legal commitments.

The synthesis also indicates that the rights-based orientation can be diluted by residual paradigms that position disability primarily as a medical condition or as an object of charity. Such paradigms may persist within service delivery institutions and public administration, shaping discretionary decisions about who receives accommodations and how resources are allocated. Where disability is treated as an “add-on” rather than a mainstream responsibility, sectoral agencies may comply symbolically—through policy statements or pilot projects—without redesigning core processes and performance targets. This dynamic aligns with policy analyses that describe progressive legal frameworks coexisting with partial inclusion, particularly when enforcement and administrative incentives are weak. Importantly, this does not imply that rights-based law is ineffective; rather, it signals that law alone is insufficient without mechanisms that embed rights into procurement rules, service standards, budget lines, and evaluation systems. A practical implication is that Indonesia’s disability governance agenda requires a shift from normative consolidation to implementation engineering, with a focus on institutions and instruments that make inclusion deliverable. This interpretive framing provides a foundation for explaining why accessibility and reasonable accommodation emerge as persistent bottlenecks.

### *Accessibility as a Systemic Governance Challenge*

Accessibility appears in the evidence not as a discrete technical issue but as a systemic governance challenge with wide spillover effects. The results show that accessibility limitations shape inclusion in health, education, and employment, functioning as a “gateway” condition for participation and service uptake. When public buildings, transport systems, and information channels are not accessible, rights-based entitlements remain inaccessible in practice even when programmes exist. The literature also suggests that accessibility often fails because it is not operationalised as a compliance requirement integrated into infrastructure planning, procurement, licensing, and supervision. In decentralised settings, local governments may have varying levels of technical knowledge, budgetary capacity, and political incentives to prioritise accessibility, resulting in uneven outcomes across regions. Consequently, the same national legal obligations can yield divergent local realities, reinforcing the need for clearer operational standards and stronger mechanisms to ensure compliance.

The reviewed evidence suggests that reasonable accommodations face similar operational difficulties, often lacking concrete guidance for implementation within specific institutions. Without clear standards, accommodation decisions can become discretionary, inconsistent, and dependent on local leadership or ad hoc advocacy. This pattern is likely to be reinforced when disability data are weak, as service providers may not anticipate demand or plan accommodations systematically. The institutionalisation of accommodation—through standard operating procedures, staff training, budgeted provisions, and complaint-resolution mechanisms—would therefore be crucial for moving from principle to practice. While the review did not evaluate the effectiveness of specific interventions, the thematic results suggest that implementation progress is most likely when accessibility and accommodation are embedded in routine administrative systems rather than treated as exceptional measures. This insight also helps interpret why service inclusion outcomes, such as health insurance coverage and financial protection, remain unequal.

### *Sectoral Inclusion Depends on Programme Design and Service Readiness*

The synthesis indicates that sectoral inclusion is shaped by both programme design and service readiness, with health and employment providing illustrative examples. Evidence on health insurance indicates that formal coverage mechanisms do not guarantee equitable use or financial protection for persons with disabilities, suggesting that benefit design, referral pathways, and provider readiness must be disability sensitive. This can include ensuring physical access to facilities, ensuring communication accessibility, and implementing clinical pathways that address the complex and chronic needs more prevalent among persons with disabilities. From a policy standpoint, the critical implication is that “universal” systems may reproduce exclusion if they are not designed and implemented with disability-specific barriers in mind. In this regard, disability policy is not a standalone sector; it is an integrative requirement that reshapes how mainstream services must operate. The thematic results therefore support policy recommendations that focus on mainstream system redesign rather than parallel disability-only services.

In employment, the evidence suggests that legal rights and affirmative measures can be undermined by weak enforcement, persistent discrimination, and insufficient workplace accommodation. Quotas and rights provisions may exist, but without compliance monitoring, sanctions, and incentives, employers may treat them as non-binding norms. Further, even where recruitment occurs, retention and job quality may depend on workplace adjustments, accessible transport, and inclusive organisational culture. The employment case, therefore, reinforces the argument that implementation requires tools that influence actor behaviour—through inspection, reporting, procurement leverage, and support systems—rather than relying solely on normative statements. Together, health and employment demonstrate that sectoral inclusion is a function of multiple interdependent conditions, including accessibility, governance, and data, underscoring the central role of cross-sector coordination.

### *Coordination, Institutional Architecture, and the Role of KND*

A dominant message in the reviewed literature is that disability inclusion is structurally cross-sectoral, requiring governance arrangements that can coordinate priorities, align standards, and sustain accountability across ministries and levels, national and local. Government Regulation No. 70/2019 explicitly frames disability rights fulfilment within the planning, implementation, and evaluation cycles, signalling recognition that coordination must be institutionalised. However, the persistence of implementation gaps suggests that practical constraints, such as unclear division of responsibilities, limited inter-agency incentives, and uneven local capacity, can weaken formal coordination requirements. When coordination is weak, accessibility improvements may not be integrated into infrastructure planning, disability data may not be shared across agencies, and service inclusion may depend on isolated sectoral initiatives rather than a coherent national strategy. The synthesis thus supports a governance

interpretation: implementation bottlenecks reflect not only resource limitations but also fragmented authority and misaligned administrative routines.

The establishment of the National Disability Commission (KND) through Presidential Regulation No. 68/2020 represents an institutional attempt to strengthen oversight and rights-based monitoring. The reviewed evidence implies that KND's potential contribution lies in enabling independent monitoring, amplifying participation, and supporting cross-sector accountability. Nevertheless, the literature also highlights that the effectiveness of such an institution depends on enabling conditions—a clear mandate, access to data, adequate resources, and the ability to engage both sectoral agencies and subnational governments. If KND's authority is limited or if its recommendations are not linked to policy levers and budget processes, its capacity to reduce fragmentation may remain constrained. This suggests that institutional architecture must be considered alongside policy instruments: oversight bodies require pathways to influence planning, budgeting, and evaluation to translate monitoring into improvement. The governance theme, therefore, leads directly to the question of how evidence systems—data and monitoring—evaluation—can be strengthened to support accountability.

#### *Data and Monitoring–Evaluation as Preconditions for Accountability*

The synthesis identifies disability data and monitoring–evaluation capacity as central constraints on implementation and learning. Without disaggregated and reliable data, policymakers cannot accurately identify needs, target interventions, or track progress across diverse disability types and contexts. Weak data systems also limit the capacity to evaluate whether policies reduce exclusion in measurable ways, thereby allowing symbolic compliance to persist. Government Regulation No. 70/2019 provides a procedural basis for evaluation, yet evidence suggests that evaluation risks becoming administrative reporting unless indicators are linked to outcomes and service quality. The review, therefore, implies that strengthening disability data is not an optional technical enhancement but a foundational condition for rights realisation. It enables performance measurement, cross-sector learning, and accountability mechanisms that can shift implementation from episodic initiatives to sustained improvement.

A further implication concerns the integration of data and evaluation into planning and budgeting cycles. When accessibility standards and inclusion targets are not translated into costed plans and monitored indicators, they compete poorly with other priorities and remain vulnerable to political and fiscal shifts. Conversely, when indicators are institutionalised—through national planning guidance, sectoral performance metrics, and transparent reporting—disability inclusion becomes more difficult to ignore. This suggests a coherent policy pathway: strengthen disability data; define measurable indicators across sectors; embed them in planning and budget frameworks; and use independent oversight to monitor progress and publicise gaps. Although the review's evidence base is limited in size, the thematic convergence across sources supports the plausibility of this pathway as an evidence-informed direction for policy strengthening. This also clarifies the limitations of the review and areas where future research is needed.

#### *Limitations and Future Research Directions*

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the included corpus is relatively small ( $N = 8$ ), reflecting strict eligibility criteria and the focus on 2020–2025, which may limit the breadth of perspectives captured. Second, the review integrates heterogeneous evidence types, including legal analyses, policy documents, and empirical studies, which supports thematic mapping but limits the ability to make causal claims about policy effectiveness. Third, the search strategy relied primarily on Scopus indexing and manual retrieval of policy documents, potentially missing relevant studies in other databases or grey literature. Fourth, the review did not use a formal quality appraisal tool, so conclusions should be interpreted as patterns of reported themes rather than weighted by methodological robustness. These limitations are common in policy-mapping reviews, underscoring the importance of transparency and careful interpretation.

Future research can strengthen the evidence base by producing more rigorous evaluations of disability policy instruments and their mechanisms of effect in Indonesia. Priority areas include quasi-experimental or mixed-method studies examining how specific accessibility interventions, enforcement mechanisms, or budgeting reforms alter service inclusion outcomes. Comparative subnational studies would also be valuable for identifying which institutional configurations and incentive structures produce better implementation in districts and provinces. In addition, research that foregrounds the participation of persons with disabilities and organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) can illuminate how policy design and accountability are shaped by lived experience and advocacy. Finally, methodological work to improve disability measurement and to integrate disability modules into administrative data systems would directly support the monitoring and evaluation agenda identified in this review.

Taken together, these directions can help move Indonesian disability governance from normative consolidation toward measurable, enforceable, and equitable implementation.

## Conclusion

Indonesia's disability policy ecosystem in the 2020–2025 literature is characterised by firm normative commitments alongside persistent implementation bottlenecks that constrain real-world inclusion. The evidence consistently portrays a de jure-de facto gap in which rights-based principles are affirmed in law but not consistently embedded in routine administrative practice across sectors and administrative levels. The thematic synthesis indicates that accessibility and reasonable accommodation remain foundational constraints, as they determine whether persons with disabilities can meaningfully access and use mainstream services. Sectoral inclusion in health, education, employment, and social protection is therefore not only a question of policy presence but of service readiness, operational standards, and enforceable compliance. In addition, fragmentation of responsibilities and variable local capacities in a decentralised system repeatedly appear as upstream drivers of uneven delivery. These patterns suggest that the central challenge is to translate legal commitments into implementable instruments, measurable standards, and accountable delivery systems.

The review also shows that cross-sector governance and evidence capacity are decisive conditions for improving policy performance over time. Institutional arrangements such as the National Disability Commission can strengthen oversight and coordination. However, their influence depends on enabling conditions, including mandate clarity, resource adequacy, and effective pathways to shape planning and budgeting routines. The persistence of limited, inconsistently disaggregated disability data constrains targeting and evaluation, and increases the risk that monitoring becomes administrative reporting rather than outcome-focused accountability. A key implication is that policy strengthening should prioritise institutionalising measurable indicators, integrating disability inclusion targets into sectoral performance systems, and improving disability data for planning and evaluation. Future research should move beyond mapping toward rigorous evaluation of specific policy instruments and implementation mechanisms, including comparative subnational studies that identify what administrative configurations deliver better inclusion outcomes. Overall, this review consolidates contemporary evidence into a coherent thematic map that can support more measurable, enforceable, and equitable disability policy implementation in Indonesia.

## References

- Azizatunnisa', L., Kuper, H., & Banks, L. M. (2024). Access to health insurance amongst people with disabilities and its association with healthcare use, health status and financial protection in low-and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *International journal for equity in health*, 23(1), 264.
- Azizatunnisa', L., Probandari, A., Kuper, H., & Banks, L. M. (2025). Health insurance coverage, healthcare use, and financial protection amongst people with disabilities in Indonesia: Analysis of the 2021 National Socioeconomic Survey. *The Lancet Regional Health – Southeast Asia*, 39, 100631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lansea.2025.100631>
- Baldassarre, B., Konietzko, J., Brown, P., Calabretta, G., Bocken, N., Karpen, I. O., & Hultink, E. J. (2020). Addressing the design-implementation gap of sustainable business models by prototyping: A tool for planning and executing small-scale pilots. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 255, 120295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120295>
- Boni, Y. (2021). Agro tourism objects development as effort relieving poverty during COVID 19 pandemic. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 153-161. <https://doi.org/10.31295/ijss.v4n1.1624>
- Dewi, S. M., Qodarsasi, U., Sally, N. U., Syamsudin, M. H., & Maskur, M. A. (2025). Disability law reform in Indonesia: Analyzing policy gap implementation in Kudus Regency. *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, 6(3), 1411-1442.
- Government of Indonesia. (2011). *Law No. 19 of 2011 on the Ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)*.
- Government of Indonesia. (2016). *Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities*.
- Government of Indonesia. (2019). *Government Regulation No. 70 of 2019 on Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation of the Respect, Protection, and Fulfillment of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*.
- Government of Indonesia. (2020). *Presidential Regulation No. 68 of 2020 on the National Disability Commission*.
- Jodoin, S., Savaresi, A., & Wewerinke-Singh, M. (2021). Rights-based approaches to climate decision-making. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 52, 45-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2021.06.004>

- Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas). (2021). *Regulation of the Minister of National Development Planning/Head of Bappenas No. 3 of 2021 on the Implementation of Government Regulation No. 70 of 2019*.
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., ... & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *bmj*, 372.
- Rosdianti, Y. (2021). Quo Vadis Komisi Nasional Disabilitas?. *Jurnal HAM*, 12(2), 209-226.
- Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC medical research methodology*, 8(1), 45.
- Tøssebro, J. (2016). Scandinavian disability policy: From deinstitutionalisation to non-discrimination and beyond. *Alter*, 10(2), 111-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alter.2016.03.003>
- Tsaputra, A., & Giuntoli, G. (2024). Indonesia's Disability Policy Reform under the Jokowi Government: Progressive Legal Framework versus Half-hearted Inclusion. *International Quarterly for Asian Studies*, 55(2), 245-267.
- Widjaja, A. H., Wijayanti, W., & Yulistyaputri, R. (2020). Perlindungan hak penyandang disabilitas dalam memperoleh pekerjaan dan penghidupan yang layak bagi kemanusiaan. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 17(1), 197-223.