



International
Labour
Organization



► **Disability employment quotas:**

Lessons for Indonesia from ASEAN and East Asia

► **Disability employment quotas:**

Lessons for Indonesia from ASEAN and East Asia

© International Labour Organization 2026.

First published 2026.



Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International. See: creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0. The user is allowed to reuse, share (copy and redistribute), adapt (remix, transform and build upon the original work) as detailed in the licence. The user must clearly credit the ILO as the source of the material and indicate if changes were made to the original content. Use of the emblem, name and logo of the ILO is not permitted in connection with translations, adaptations or other derivative works.

Attribution – The user must indicate if changes were made and must cite the work as follows: ILO, *Disability employment quotas: Lessons for Indonesia from ASEAN and East Asia*, Geneva: International Labour Office, 2026. © ILO.

Translations – In case of a translation of this work, the following disclaimer must be added along with the attribution: *This is a translation of a copyrighted work of the International Labour Organization (ILO). This translation has not been prepared, reviewed or endorsed by the ILO and should not be considered an official ILO translation. The ILO disclaims all responsibility for its content and accuracy. Responsibility rests solely with the author(s) of the translation.*

Adaptations – In case of an adaptation of this work, the following disclaimer must be added along with the attribution: *This is an adaptation of a copyrighted work of the International Labour Organization (ILO). This adaptation has not been prepared, reviewed or endorsed by the ILO and should not be considered an official ILO adaptation. The ILO disclaims all responsibility for its content and accuracy. Responsibility rests solely with the author(s) of the adaptation.*

Third-party materials – This Creative Commons licence does not apply to non-ILO copyright materials included in this publication. If the material is attributed to a third party, the user of such material is solely responsible for clearing the rights with the rights holder and for any claims of infringement.

Any dispute arising under this licence that cannot be settled amicably shall be referred to arbitration in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). The parties shall be bound by any arbitration award rendered as a result of such arbitration as the final adjudication of such a dispute.

For details on rights and licensing, contact: rights@ilo.org. For details on ILO publications and digital products, visit: www.ilo.org/publns.

ISBN: 9789220436431 (print); 9789220436448 (web PDF)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54394/00033285>

Juga tersedia dalam Bahasa Indonesia: *Kuota ketenagakerjaan bagi penyandang disabilitas: Pelajaran bagi Indonesia dari ASEAN dan Asia Timur*, ISBN 9789220436752 (print); 9789220436769 (web PDF).

The designations employed in ILO publications and databases, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the ILO concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. See: www.ilo.org/disclaimer.

The opinions and views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the opinions, views or policies of the ILO.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the ILO, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

Printed in Indonesia

► Foreword

Ensuring equal access to decent work for persons with disabilities remains a critical priority for achieving inclusive and sustainable labour markets. While many countries have introduced employment quota systems and related policy measures, significant gaps persist in their implementation, enforcement and overall effectiveness.

In Indonesia, important progress has been made in strengthening the legal and policy framework for disability inclusion in employment, including through the introduction of quota requirements for both public and private sector employers. However, as in many countries across Asia and beyond, translating these commitments into tangible labour market outcomes continues to present challenges. Addressing these challenges requires a deeper understanding of how quota systems function in practice, the enabling conditions that support compliance, and the innovative approaches that can enhance their impact.

This study—developed within the framework of the Global Accelerator on Jobs and Social Protection for Just Transitions—contributes to that objective by providing a comparative analysis of employment quota schemes and related policy frameworks across Indonesia and selected countries in East and Southeast Asia. By examining legal provisions, institutional arrangements, enforcement mechanisms and incentive structures, the report aims to generate evidence-based insights to inform policy dialogue and strengthen national efforts to promote disability-inclusive employment, itself critically included as part of the broader human capital and inclusion agenda under the Mid-Term National Development Framework (Priority 4) and therein assigned a dedicated ‘formal-sector employment target’. The analysis also highlights the importance of a comprehensive approach that goes beyond legal mandates alone. Effective quota systems depend on coordinated actions among governments, employers’ and workers’ organizations, and organizations of persons with disabilities. They require not only clear regulatory frameworks, but also adequate monitoring systems, supportive services, incentives for compliance, and broader strategies to remove barriers to employment.

The International Labour Organization hopes that the findings and recommendations of this study will support ongoing policy reforms, strengthen institutional capacity, and contribute to more effective and inclusive employment outcomes. By fostering dialogue among key stakeholders and promoting evidence-based policymaking, this report aims to support Indonesia and other countries in building labour markets that leave no one behind.



Simrin C. Singh

Director ILO Country Office for Indonesia and Timor Leste

► Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by the International Labour Organization (ILO) under the framework of the Global Accelerator on Jobs and Social Protection for Just Transitions. The work was supported through the project “Closing disability inclusion gaps in social protection and labour across the life cycle in Indonesia,” funded by the Joint SDG Fund under the Multistakeholder Engagement to Implement the Global Accelerator on Jobs and Social Protection for Just Transitions and the World Bank Social Protection and Jobs Compass (M-GA). The ILO gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the partners and donors supporting the M-GA for enabling this work.

The study is authored by Imogen Howells, Independent Consultant under the technical guidance of and with contributions from Diego Rei, Employment and Labour Market Policy Specialist in the ILO Country Office for Indonesia and Timor-Leste. Esteban Tromel, Senior Disability Specialist within the Gender, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Branch (GEDI) at the ILO Headquarters, and Hiranía Wiryasti, National Project Coordinator at the ILO Country Office for Indonesia and Timor-Leste significantly contributed to the design and revision of the study. Colleagues from the ILO Country Office for China and Mongolia, the ILO Country Office for Indonesia and Timor-Leste, the ILO Country Office for Malaysia, the ILO Country Office for the Philippines, the ILO Office for Singapore, and the ILO Country Office for Thailand, provided valuable logistical and technical support.

The ILO gratefully acknowledges the informants of this study—representatives of relevant ministries, employers’ and workers’ organizations, organizations of persons with disabilities, and ILO colleagues—who participated in consultations and interviews and contributed their valuable time and expertise. A full list of contributors is provided in Annex.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Labour Organization or its constituents.

► Table of contents

Foreword	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Table of contents	v
Abbreviations and acronyms	vii
1. Introduction	1
2. Context: Employment and participation of persons with disabilities across the lifecycle	2
2.1. Labour force participation of persons with disabilities	2
2.2. Education, skills, and school-to-work transitions of persons with disabilities	2
2.3. Institutional support measures and continuity of employment for persons with disabilities	3
3. Comparative analysis of legal frameworks	4
3.1. Overview of legal approaches to inclusive employment and use of quota systems	4
3.2. National legal frameworks governing employment quota schemes	6
4. Enforcement, compliance and the role of accompanying measures	11
4.1. Institutional arrangements for impactful quota systems	11
4.2. Key features of successful compliance mechanisms	11
4.3. Employment promotion and support measures	15
5. Gaps, challenges, and policy reform for Indonesia's quota system	17
5.1. Legal and regulatory coherence	17
5.2. Institutions and support systems	19
5.3. Compliance and monitoring architecture	20
5.4. Broader inclusion ecosystem	21
6. Conclusions and options for next steps	23
References	26
Bibliography of legal references by country	29
Annex: List of Interviewees	31

► List of tables

Table 3.1. Core legal and policy features of employment quota systems for persons with disabilities	5
Table 4.1. Compliance and enforcement mechanisms in disability employment quota systems	13
Table 6.1. Summary of options for next steps and key actors	23

► List of boxes

Box 3.1. Typology of quota and non-quota models	4
Box 3.2. Post-Law no. 8 of 2016 regulatory landscape relevant to employment quotas	7
Box 4.1. Preferential procurement strategies	15

► Abbreviations

APO	Asian Productivity Organization
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
Bappenas	Ministry of National Development Planning (Indonesia)
BKN	National Civil Service Agency (Indonesia)
BP BUMN	Supervisory Body of State-Owned Enterprises (Indonesia)
BPI Danantara	Daya Anagata Nusantara Investment Management Agency (Indonesia)
BPJS Ketenagakerjaan	Social Security Agency for Employment (Indonesia)
CDPF	China Disabled Persons' Federation
CPNS	Civil Service Candidate (Indonesia)
CRPD	UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
DEP	Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Thailand)
EASNIE	European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education
GPA	Government Procurement Agreement (Thailand)
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMPACTxAsia	Impact investment and inclusion initiative in Asia
JEED	Japan Organization for Employment of the Elderly, Persons with Disabilities and Job Seekers
JKK	Employment Injury Insurance (Indonesia)
KEAD	Korea Employment Agency for Persons with Disabilities
KND	National Commission on Disabilities (Indonesia)
LKS Tripartit	Tripartite Cooperation Institution (Indonesia)
MSF	Ministry of Social and Family Development (Singapore)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OPD	Organizations of Persons with Disabilities
Perda	Regional Regulation (Indonesia)
Permenaker	Minister of Manpower Regulation (Indonesia)
PermenPANRB	Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Regulation (Indonesia)
PP	Government Regulation (Indonesia)
RAN PD	National Action Plan for Disability Inclusion (Indonesia)
RPJMN	National Medium-Term Development Plan (Indonesia)
RPJPN	National Long-Term Development Plan (Indonesia)
SOE	State-Owned Enterprise
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
ULD	Disability Service Units (Indonesia)
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
WLKP	Mandatory Company Manpower Reporting (Indonesia)

► 1. Introduction

Across East and Southeast Asia, persons with disabilities have lower labour force participation rates and poorer employment outcomes than their peers without disabilities. To create conditions for inclusive employment, it is essential to take an ecosystem perspective. This means looking at the economy; social attitudes; cultural beliefs; employment and social policy and services; as well as accessibility. This report takes a holistic approach to disability quotas, to shift the focus from individual employability alone to an ecosystem of factors that support or create barriers to inclusive employment and quota fulfilment.¹

Many countries use employment quotas as one of a range of tools within the ecosystem. They are a form of affirmative action that promotes labour force inclusion of persons with disabilities. Quota systems aim to stimulate labour demand by requiring employers to employ persons with disabilities as a percentage of their workforce. The degree of success of quota systems in promoting disability-inclusive employment outcomes varies, and different measures have been adopted to increase the likelihood of attaining the desired goals. These include enforcement and incentive arrangements; employer, employee and job-seeker support services; data and reporting systems, and mechanisms to support retention and return to work.

This study provides a comparative analysis of Indonesia's quota system alongside selected ASEAN and East Asian countries: China, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand.² It aims to distil key design features, governance arrangements, and enforcement mechanisms to inform realistic and feasible amendments to Indonesia's approach. Findings are based on desk research of national laws, regulations, and policies, as well as relevant literature. They are complemented with a comparative analysis of international practices and stakeholder consultations (see Annex). Key informant interviews were conducted with 27 government institutions, employers' and workers' organizations, organizations of persons with disabilities (OPDs), and development partners between January 2026 and April 2026. The findings and recommendations were further refined and validated through multi-stakeholder consultation workshops held in Jakarta on 10 March 2026 and online on 28 April 2026.

The study is structured as follows. Following the introduction (**Section 1**), a brief overview is provided of labour force participation for persons with disabilities across the lifecycle, considering how the quota can impact inclusion (**Section 2**). **Section 3** examines legal approaches and frameworks governing disability inclusive employment and use of quotas in the eight countries under study. **Section 4** builds on this analysis to examine impactful approaches to enhance quota compliance. Finally, **Section 5** provides an examination of gaps, opportunities and possible ways forward in Indonesia to optimize use of the quota and enhance employment outcomes. **Section 6** concludes with a summary of the findings and suggestions for possible next steps.

1 The interaction of our individual characteristics - gender, age, type of disability, education, socio-economic background, and geographic location - with the ecosystem shapes access to opportunities and equality of outcomes in the labour force (UNESCAP 2018). Well designed and inclusive systems can mitigate the effects of layered disadvantage, breaking down barriers and promoting equitable and inclusive outcomes (ILO 2019; UNESCAP 2021).

2 The country selection in this study was made based on discussion with Indonesian stakeholders and was driven by the desire to study Asian countries which have made marked progress or developed innovative systems in the application of employment quotas including countries from ASEAN which have a comparable situation to the Indonesia one.

► 2. Labour market barriers and enabling conditions for disability employment quotas

2.1. Disability employment gaps and labour market exclusion

The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) has been ratified by all eight of the countries under study and affirms the right of persons with disabilities to work on an equal basis with others (Article 27). Yet labour market outcomes of persons with disabilities are constrained globally, including within the countries analysed here. Available disability-disaggregated labour market data show that persons with disabilities have consistently lower labour force participation and employment rates than their peers without disabilities (HI 2021; ILO 2019). Persons with disabilities who are in the labour force are more likely to be concentrated in informal, own-account, or low-paid work, with more limited access to stable wage employment and social protection (ILO 2019; UNDP 2022).

These patterns are particularly pronounced for women with disabilities, who experience compounded disadvantages linked to gender norms, caregiving responsibilities, occupational segregation, and lower access to education and training (HI 2021). The type of disability also intersects with employer perceptions and behaviour. Persons with psychosocial or intellectual disabilities, and those with multiple impairments, often face greater barriers to recruitment and retention, reflecting stigma, limited availability of tailored supports, and gaps in employer-facing advisory services (HI 2021; ILO 2019). Interview evidence gathered for this study confirmed that even where quotas or incentives exist, employers frequently prioritize candidates perceived as requiring minimal accommodation, shaping unequal access within the diverse population of persons with disabilities.

Structural barriers to inclusion in the world of work include discrimination and stigma, inaccessible workplaces and transport, limited access to education and training affecting the actual or perceived productivity of persons with disabilities; employment or administrative services lacking capacity to cater to persons with disabilities; and governance arrangements on employment and inclusion that are not aligned to the CRPD, or that are patchy and fragmented. On the demand side, employer behaviour and labour market structures shape access to employment. Employers may lack information and understanding of disability inclusion,³ reasonable accommodation,⁴ and available support measures, contributing to cautious or exclusionary hiring practices (Accenture 2018; HI 2021; ILO 2019). These challenges are more acute in labour markets characterized by high levels of informality or a predominance of small and medium-sized enterprises, where formal obligations, incentives, or support services may have limited reach (UNESCAP 2021).

2.2. Education, skills, and school-to-work transitions of persons with disabilities

Access to education and skills development is a central determinant of employment outcomes. Quota enforcement presupposes the existence of a sufficiently broad pool of persons with disabilities who are skilled and equipped to participate in the labour market. One of the elements affecting that is the existence of inclusive education systems and accessible skills development pathways to support effective school-to-work transitions (ILO 2014; UNESCAP 2021; Duryea et al. 2024).

Globally, persons with disabilities are less likely to complete secondary and post-secondary education, reflecting persistent gaps in inclusive education systems (Plan International 2013). Barriers to education include physical inaccessibility, limited availability of reasonable accommodation, lack of disability-sensitive teacher training, and the continued use of segregated or special education settings that have weak links to labour market demands (HI 2021; UNESCAP 2021).

Evidence from interviews conducted for this study reinforces these findings. Stakeholders consistently highlighted that children with disabilities have lower attendance rates at primary and secondary levels than their peers without disabilities, and in educational systems requiring school completion to issue education certificates (as opposed

3 Disability inclusion refers to “promoting and ensuring the participation of persons with disabilities in education, training and employment and all aspects of society and providing the necessary support and reasonable accommodation so that they can fully participate (ILO 2015).”

4 Article 2 of the CRPD defines reasonable accommodation as: “Necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, where needed in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise on an equal basis with others of all human rights and fundamental freedoms.”

to modular systems) often leave education without recognized qualifications, work-relevant skills, or exposure to workplace environments (OECD 2022).⁵ In Indonesia, an estimated 74 per cent of children with disabilities are not attending school (UNICEF 2023).

Separation into special schools or parallel education streams is a key factor limiting access to vocational training, apprenticeships, and employer networks, leaving many young persons with disabilities unprepared to transition into open labour market employment (OECD 2022). Attending special education settings is correlated with reduced academic and vocational qualifications. It also impacts later employment pathways and is associated with a greater likelihood of working in sheltered workshops, as well as reduced financial independence and independent living. In contrast, attending inclusive education settings increases the likelihood of enrolling in higher education, and is a key factor increasing employment in working age (EASNIE 2018). Low self-confidence was also cited as a big issue for many children and adults with disabilities, due to experiences with discrimination and lack of opportunities to gain social, educational and work-based experiences. These challenges are amplified for those from low-income households or rural areas, where access to post-school training and employment services is still more limited (UNESCAP 2023).

2.3. Support systems for employment retention and labour market inclusion

Legal and policy frameworks can help mediate supply- and demand-side factors. Anti-discrimination legislation establishes baseline protections, and employment quotas, incentives, and support services aim to influence employer behaviour and expand opportunities. The reach and impact of these measures depend on their design and integration with labour market institutions, including employment services, social security systems, and vocational training and rehabilitation (ILO 2019; UNESCAP 2023).

Continuity of employment over the life cycle is also shaped by the availability of support mechanisms. In contexts where return-to-work arrangements, rehabilitation services, and workplace adjustment are limited or fragmented, workers who experience injury, illness, or changes in functional capacity may face barriers in maintaining employment continuity or re-entering the labour market (ILO 2019; UNDP 2022). These barriers are particularly salient for older workers and those in physically demanding or hazardous occupations, underscoring the importance of policies that support adaptation and retention.

⁵ There are many causes for the lower educational attainment and participation of children with disabilities which are cumulative through childhood and lead to an ever-widening gap. Causes include, stigma and discrimination meaning children are more likely to receive less quality care and attention from birth (Theirworld 2018), by the time compulsory education starts, children are already further from their potential. Additional barriers once children reach school age relate to accessibility of transport and school environments, a lack of trained educators and adapted curricula, economic strain on families, inadequate health care and support leading to more days out of school, and layered barriers for girls and other marginalized groups with disabilities (UNESCO 2026).

► 3. Disability employment quota models in ASEAN and East Asia

This section provides an overview of the quota frameworks for the employment of persons with disabilities in China, Indonesia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. It reviews national laws, regulations and policy frameworks as well as institutional responsibilities, governing inclusive employment, with particular attention to private-sector obligations where these exist.

3.1. Typology of approaches to disability employment quotas and inclusive employment

Across the countries considered, governance of disability-inclusive employment and related quota systems is shaped by international commitments and national legal and policy governance structures. All eight countries are States Parties to the CRPD, under which Article 27 on work and employment holds that persons with disabilities have the right to work, on an equal basis with others, to reasonable accommodation, and career advancement. Key related ILO Conventions include the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983 (No. 159), which China, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, and Thailand have ratified; the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111); and the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100), which all the countries included in this study have ratified.

Integration of international standards on equality and non-discrimination, and the right to work of persons with disabilities into national governance systems varies widely. In China, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Philippines and Thailand, protection against discrimination in employment is established through dedicated legislation or enforceable legal provisions, while in Malaysia and Singapore the principles are articulated through disability-specific policy frameworks, or programme-based measures.⁶ The distinction matters because legislation is enforceable through courts and provides for mandatory standards, while policies are non-binding. Consequently, employment quotas and related affirmative measures are situated within heterogeneous legal landscapes, rather than a common equality and anti-discrimination baseline.

The legal approaches observed can be grouped into five design families, reflecting differences in how legal obligations and compliance pathways are structured (see Box 3.1).

► Box 3.1. Typology of quota and non-quota models

Across the countries reviewed, disability employment policies can be grouped into five broad models based on the presence and nature of legal obligations placed on employers:

1. **Binding quota systems with levy/subsidy architectures**, where employment quotas apply to both the public and private sectors and non-compliance by private employers triggers predictable financial contributions that are recycled into employment promotion measures (China, Japan, the Republic of Korea).
2. **Binding quota systems with levy-linked alternative compliance pathways**, where employers may meet their disability-inclusion obligations through a combination of direct hiring, financial contributions, or other legally recognized alternatives (Thailand).
3. **Binding quota systems without operationalized levy or fully structured compliance mechanisms**, where employment quotas are legally established for both the public and private sectors, but where financial consequences for non-compliance are not systematically applied and administrative compliance pathways, including verification, remediation, escalation, or levy-linked redistribution, remain under-developed or fragmented in practice (Indonesia).

⁶ In Malaysia, the Constitution does not include “disability” as a protected ground against discrimination, although the general equality principles do apply to persons with disabilities. The Persons with Disabilities Act 2008, recognizes the right of persons with disabilities to “equal opportunity protection and assistance in all circumstances” but does not refer to discrimination. In Singapore, although Article 12 of the Constitution holds that “All persons are equal before the law and entitled to the equal protection of the law” persons with disabilities are not explicitly mentioned. In addition, there is no formal legal definition of disability.

4. **Binding public-sector employment quotas with voluntary measures for the private sector**, where mandatory obligations apply to government employment and private-sector participation is encouraged through policy guidance, incentives, or programmes rather than enforceable quotas (Malaysia, the Philippines).
5. **Non-quota, incentive-based approaches**, where disability employment is promoted through voluntary participation supported by incentives and services rather than through legal hiring mandates in either the public or private sector (Singapore).

These design families coexist with national anti-discrimination laws and policies, which shape how quota and non-quota measures are interpreted and applied in practice. The extent to which these legal frameworks translate into employment outcomes depends on enforcement and incentive arrangements, institutional capacity, and supporting ecosystems, which are examined in Sections 4 and 5.

Table 3.1 summarizes the core legal features of employment quota frameworks across the eight countries reviewed, looking at the primary legal basis, scope of quota obligations (sectors with quotas), and employment target set by the quota.

► **Table 3.1. Core legal and policy features of employment quota systems for persons with disabilities**

Country	Primary legal basis	Scope of quota obligation	Employment target/ Quota level
China	Law on the Protection of Persons with Disabilities (2008); Regulations on Employment of Persons with Disabilities (2007)	Public and private employers (thresholds set at provincial/municipal level, coverage: companies over 3 years old with ≥20 employees)	1.5% of total workforce (national minimum, can be set higher and some provinces do)
Indonesia	Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities; Law No. 13 of 2003 on Manpower	Public and private employers, no threshold set	Public (2%) and private (1%) of total workforce
Japan	Act on Employment Promotion of Persons with Disabilities (as amended)	Public and private employers (≥40 employees; weighted headcount) ⁷	Private: 2.5% (rising to 2.7% June 2026); Public: 2.8% national/local level.
The Republic of Korea	Employment Promotion and Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons Act	Public and private employers (≥50 employees; weighted headcount) ⁸	Private: 3.1%; Public: 3.8% of total workforce
Malaysia	Public Service Circular No. 16 of 2010; Persons with Disabilities Act (2008, non-quota)	Public sector only	1% of total workforce (policy target, not strictly enforced)
The Philippines	RA 10524 amending RA 7277 (Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities)	Public sector mandatory; private sector encouraged (≥100 employees)	1% of total positions (public sector)

⁷ For example, employees working 30 hours a week or more, are counted as 1 worker, those working 20-30 hours, as 0.5. Employees with severe disabilities are counted double, and each worker employed for between 10-20 hours a week counts as 0.5. See [here](#) for more details.

⁸ Persons with severe disabilities are counted twice for the purposes of the quota.

Country	Primary legal basis	Scope of quota obligation	Employment target/ Quota level
Singapore	Enabling Masterplan for Disability Inclusion; Tripartite Guidelines on Fair Employment Practices	N/A	N/A
Thailand	Persons with Disabilities Empowerment Act B.E. 2550 (2007), as amended; Ministerial Regulation B.E. 2554 (2011)	Public and private employers (≥ 100 employees)	1% of total workforce

3.2. National legal and institutional frameworks for quota implementation

China

China's employment quota scheme is established under the Regulations on the Employment of Persons with Disabilities, which apply to public and private employers, and are derived from the Law on the Protection of Persons with Disabilities (2008). The Regulations require employers to hire persons with disabilities in accordance with prescribed ratios or, where this is not achieved, to make contributions to the Disabled Persons' Employment Security Fund.

The quota system is administered through a shared institutional arrangement involving Human Resources and Social Security Authorities, the China Disabled Persons' Federation (CDPF), and tax authorities. The CDPF is a state-affiliated mass organization that is primarily funded and guided by the Government and is responsible for representing persons with disabilities and administering disability policies, including employment quota implementation and certification.

The value of employer contributions for non-compliance is based on the annual average employment shortfall. In 2016, changes were introduced to the calculation formula, so that the contribution reflects the average annual wage of employees in each company, rather than the average provincial wage. This significantly increased costs of non-compliance for high paying firms and, according to informants of this study, proved a significant factor to increase compliance. Since 2016, contributions for non-compliance have been collected monthly by local tax bureaux together with social insurance contributions, instead of by employment service agencies affiliated with the CDPF, making enforcement more stringent (Hao and Li 2020) and raising the number of companies that have been meeting the quota (USCBC 2017).

Indonesia

Indonesia's disability employment quota is established under Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities, which provides the primary and most up-to-date legal framework for disability rights and inclusion since its ratification of the CRPD. The Law introduced binding employment quotas for both public and private sector employers, requiring at least 2 per cent of the workforce to be persons with disabilities in government institutions and state-owned enterprises; and at least 1 per cent in private companies. Employment quotas are situated within the broader rights-based framework, as Law No. 8 of 2016 incorporates CRPD-aligned principles of equality, non-discrimination, and accessibility. It also builds on earlier legislation, including the Law No. 13 of 2003 on Manpower ("Manpower Law") under which Article 5 holds that every worker has equal opportunities, without discrimination, to secure employment.

Implementation of the employment quota is institutionally differentiated by sector. In the private sector, oversight rests with the Labour Inspection division of the Ministry of Manpower, while responsibility for employment services rests with the Job Placement division. These functions are further supported by Disability Service Units (ULDs), operating within local manpower offices and established under Government Regulation No. 60 of 2020 and Minister of Manpower Regulation (Permenaker) No. 21 of 2020. *Siap Kerja* ("ready to work") is the Ministry of Manpower's integrated digital employment services platform, used by local manpower offices, including ULDs, to manage vacancy information, training opportunities, and job-matching services including for persons with disabilities. These employment services indirectly contribute to increasing the participation of persons with disabilities in the workforce

and, in doing so, support efforts to meet the mandated employment quota. In addition, the Social Security Agency for Employment (BPJS), through its Inclusive Job Centre, also provides services to connect persons with disabilities with suitable employment opportunities.

In the public sector, operational responsibility for civil service compliance lies with the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, working in conjunction with the National Civil Service Agency (BKN), which manages recruitment and personnel administration systems. Following the issuance of Law No.1 of 2025 on the Third Amendment to Law No. 19 of 2003 on State-Owned Enterprises, which established the Daya Anagata Nusantara Investment Management Agency (BPI Danantara), the governance structure of state-owned enterprises has evolved. The Ministry of State-Owned Enterprises remains the primary authority for policy and oversight, while regionally owned enterprises fall under provincial and district governments.

The Law on Disability anticipates the issuance of implementing regulations and complementary measures to operationalize quota obligations, including employer guidance, incentives, and sanctions. As yet, regulations that have been issued such as the Minister of Manpower Regulation (Permenaker) No. 21 of 2020 and Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Regulation (PermenPANRB) No. 27 of 2021, refer to quotas, confirming the respective private and public sector quota rates (1 and 2 per cent) and, in the latter case, define some operational guidance for prioritization of vulnerable groups, including persons with disabilities. However, parameters and operational procedures for employment quota implementation are not fully defined (see also Box 3.2).

Overall, while post-2016 regulations have strengthened the disability rights ecosystem and established institutional mechanisms such as ULDs and provincial oversight structures partially referencing quotas within their mandate, critical elements for quota implementation such as exact calculation method, e.g., who counts (full-time, part-time, contractors, over what time span, averaging period for employment headcounts, minimum employment duration), standardized reporting format/system (how, by what date, defined audit or inspection procedures and sanction triggers) and certification of disability (medical certificate, national disability ID) are not yet, or not fully, defined.

► Box 3.2. Post-Law No. 8 of 2016 regulatory landscape relevant to employment quotas

Since the adoption of Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities, Indonesia has issued a range of implementing regulations and policy instruments to operationalize disability rights. These include:

- Government Regulations (PP) No. 52 of 2019 on social welfare for persons with disabilities and No. 70/2019 on planning, implementation, and evaluation of respect, protection, and fulfilment of disability rights, which establish horizontal planning and coordination obligations across sectors.
- Government Regulation (PP) No. 60 of 2020 on Disability Service Units (ULDs) in the Labour Sector, provides an enabling framework for employment services, job matching, and workplace accommodation while reiterating that employers must hire in line with 1% or 2% quotas. There are now over 260 ULDs operating across Indonesia under local Manpower Offices.
- Presidential Regulation (Perpres) No. 67 of 2020 on the Requirements and Procedures for Conferring Awards in the Respect, Protection and Fulfilment of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities introduced recognition mechanisms and awards for good practice.
- Presidential Regulation (Perpres) No. 68 of 2020 on the National Disabilities Council, established the Council which has a general mandate on monitoring, evaluation and advocacy concerning the respect, protection and fulfilment of the rights of persons with disabilities.
- Minister of Manpower Regulation (Permenaker) No. 21 of 2020 concerning the establishment of Disability Service Units (ULDs) by local governments.
- Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Regulation (PermenPANRB) No. 27 of 2021 requires disability applicants to submit a video demonstrating daily activities.
- Regional Regulations, Governor Regulations, and Mayor Regulations are available in some areas in Indonesia including DKI Jakarta, Surabaya, DI Yogyakarta and others.⁹

⁹ For instance, Regional Regulation (Perda) No. 62/2019 concerning the the Protection and Fulfilment of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Southeast Sulawesi, or Regional Regulation (Perda) No.4/2022 concerning Implementation of Respect, Protection, and Fulfilment of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Jakarta.

Further responsibilities relating to disability employment are distributed across multiple institutions. The Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas) provides overall policy planning and coordination within national development frameworks. The National Commission on Disabilities (KND), was established under Law No. 8 of 2016 and operationalized through Presidential Regulation (Perpres) No. 68 of 2020, performs an advisory and supervisory function, promoting compliance with disability rights standards across government; its mandate is administrative rather than enforcement oriented. Broader disability policy coordination, including social assistance and livelihood programmes benefiting persons with disabilities, falls under the Ministry of Social Affairs.

Indonesia's quota framework also sits alongside national development and policy planning instruments, including the National Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPN), and the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN), which provides a five-year strategic framework for national development priorities including disability inclusion 2025-2029. Notably, the RPJPN sets the target that by 2045, 60 per cent of employed persons with disabilities will be engaged in the formal sector; with a shorter-term goal outlined in the RPJMN that by 2029, 12 per cent of workers with disabilities will be in the formal sector, up from the 2025 baseline of 10 per cent. In addition, the National Action Plan for Disability Inclusion (RAN PD), outlines specific policies and programmes to promote rights and inclusion of persons with disabilities, including in employment.

However, while disability inclusion is consistently recognized as a development objective, the employment quota itself has not been explicitly linked to these policy frameworks. References to employment of persons with disabilities tend to focus on programme-based interventions, skills development, and social assistance, with limited articulation of how quota obligations are to be implemented, monitored, or enforced across sectors. As a result, the quota operates largely outside the formal planning architecture, raising questions of policy coherence.

Japan

Japan's disability employment quota system is governed by the Act for Promotion of Employment of Persons with Disabilities, 1960, as amended. The Act and its regulations establish differentiated quota rates for public and private sectors which have increased over the years and provide a detailed legal basis for a levy-subsidy system. Private enterprises with 40 or more employees must ensure 2.5 per cent of the workforce is comprised of persons with disabilities; this rate is set to expand over 2026 to 2.7 per cent in firms with 37.5 or more employees (Matsumoto 2025). Private companies with 100 or more employees that do not meet quota requirements are required to pay a levy per month per unfilled position. The size of companies subject to levies has decreased from 300 employees in 2015 (Matsumoto 2025). Companies with 100 employees or fewer who exceed the quota by 4 per cent¹⁰ can receive a financial reward per month per person (21,000 yen per month, JEED website), while companies that exceed the statutory quota are eligible for an adjustment allowance of about 29,000 yen per month per additional person with a disability employed. In addition, companies may access subsidies and financial support for workplace accommodation, job creation, and retention measures.

Formal responsibility for quota administration lies with the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, with operational support provided by the Japan Organization for Employment of the Elderly, Persons with Disabilities and Job Seekers (JEED). The legal framework explicitly links quota obligations to employment promotion and support measures. Japan has adopted a standalone non-discrimination law: the Act for Eliminating Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities, 2016, which prohibits discriminatory treatment, and establishing requirements to provide reasonable accommodation in employment. Reasonable accommodation provisions applied mainly to the private sector, until a 2024 which extended the provisions to fully cover the private sector (IOE 2024). This Act is primarily enforced through administrative guidance. Together, these instruments situate quota schemes within a comprehensive legal framework combining affirmative action with equality and non-discrimination principles.

The Republic of Korea

The Republic of Korea's quota system was established under the Act on the Employment Promotion and Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons, 2011 which sets binding employment quotas for both public and private employers. The quota for the private sector applies to companies with 50 or more regular employees and is scheduled to increase from 3.1 per cent to 3.3 per cent in 2027, following an eight-year freeze. The public sector quota has risen from 3.4 per cent in 2019, to 3.8 per cent in 2024 and is set to be increased to 4 per cent in 2029. The Act provides for a levy mechanism under which private companies with 100 or more regular monthly employees¹¹ that do not meet

¹⁰ Accumulated over the fiscal year

¹¹ Regular employees are considered workers who are employed for 16 or more days per month, and for not less than 60 hours unless they are persons with severe disabilities.

quota requirements must make financial contributions calculated based on the shortfall and a standard minimum levy payment per missing worker (approximately South Korean Won 1 million¹² per month). The levy funds are used to finance employment services, wage subsidies, and vocational rehabilitation.

Quota implementation responsibilities are shared between the Ministry of Employment and Labour and the Korea Employment Agency for Persons with Disabilities (KEAD), a statutory body with a dedicated mandate to support employment of persons with disabilities. Korea's disability-inclusive employment system combines the quota's affirmative action measures with rights-based non-discrimination protection. The Act on the Prohibition of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities and Remedy against Infringement of Their Rights, 2007, prohibits discrimination in employment and establishes obligations for employers to provide reasonable accommodation. Enforcement of non-discrimination obligations relies on complaint-based mechanisms, with oversight by the National Human Rights Commission, alongside administratively enforced quota and levy arrangements.

Malaysia

Malaysia's disability employment framework is anchored in the Persons with Disabilities Act, 2008, which establishes a rights-based approach to disability inclusion but does not prescribe a binding employment quota in the public or private sector. A public sector quota of 1 per cent employment of persons with disabilities has been established through administrative circulars, including the Malaysian Public Service Circular No. 16 of 2010 and policy guidance. Circular No. 16 specifies that each public-sector agency must ensure 1 per cent of its workforce consists of persons with disabilities, covering all forms of employment, and notes that reporting takes place twice a year, in what appears to be a snapshot basis.

Labour market regulation falls under the Ministry of Human Resources, while disability policy coordination involves the Department of Social Welfare and the National Council for Persons with Disabilities. The Department of Social Welfare supports inclusive employment through provision of rehabilitation services, employment preparation, and social support measures, and is coordinated through the National Council for Persons with Disabilities, which provides an inter-ministerial platform for disability policy oversight. Private-sector employment is promoted primarily through programmes, incentives, and guidance rather than enforceable requirements. Malaysia has developed comparatively robust return-to-work schemes linked to its social security system, supporting retention and reintegration of workers who acquire disabilities.

The Philippines

The Philippines' employment framework for inclusion of persons with disabilities is based on the Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities (Republic Act 7277) which establishes a comprehensive set of rights and entitlements, including provisions related to work and employment. The Magna Carta was amended in 2013 by Republic Act No. 10524 which introduced the provision that "at least one per cent of all positions in all government agencies, offices or corporations shall be reserved for persons with disabilities". In the private sector, companies are "encouraged" to reach a quota of 1 per cent. The Act's wording leaves some ambiguity over the scope and calculation. For instance, it is not clear whether the quota is assessed per agency or aggregated across the whole public sector; or whether it applies only to posts to be recruited, or to all public sector positions. This was clarified in the Implementing Rules and Regulations of Republic Act 10524, which hold that the 1 per cent quota is "per agency".

Implementation of the public sector quota is overseen by the Civil Service Commission. Responsibility for private sector policy is with the Department of Labor and Employment, while the National Council on Disability Affairs plays a central role in inter-agency coordination, policy advocacy, and monitoring of disability-related initiatives across government. Together, these arrangements situate disability employment within a rights-based but largely promotional policy framework, with differentiated approaches to public- and private-sector employment. .

Singapore

Singapore does not operate an employment quota system; instead, it has taken an incentive-based approach, relying on sustained public investment and service capacity. Disability employment policy is advanced through a series of Enabling Masterplans, most recently the Enabling Masterplan for Disability Inclusion 2022–2030, which set strategic priorities for disability inclusion and guide programme development and public investment. These Masterplans emphasize voluntary employer participation, incentives, and programme-based supports and are not based on

12 ~USD 671, May 2026.

statutory hiring requirements. While Singapore promotes fair employment practices it does not have a standalone disability non-discrimination law. Non-binding policy instruments are used to promote inclusion, such as the Tripartite Guidelines on Fair Employment Practices, which all employers in Singapore are expected to adhere to and which state that employers must recruit and select employees based on merit, and regardless of a range of characteristics, including disability.

Disability policy in Singapore is led by the Ministry of Social and Family Development (MSF), while labour market regulation falls under the Ministry of Manpower. SG Enable, a government-established and publicly funded agency under MSF, serves as the focal agency for disability employment and inclusion, providing intake, assessment, referral, and employer engagement services for employers, jobseekers and employees with disabilities. It administers key support schemes, including the Open-Door Programme, which funds job redesign, workplace modifications, training, and job coaching to support inclusive hiring and retention. Frontline placement and in-work support are provided by Social Service Agencies in coordination with SG Enable (ILO 2019).

Thailand

Thailand's disability employment quota is governed by the Persons with Disabilities Empowerment Act, B.E. 2550 (2007) which establishes binding obligations for public and private employers. Section 33 of the Act provides that at least 1 per cent of the workforce in public and private sectors are to be persons with disabilities. Thailand uses a fixed annual snapshot date for quota calculation based on a headcount approach, using the number of employees in a private sector establishment, or employees in a government agency as the total. Sections 34 and 35 of the Act provides for alternative compliance arrangements, such as contracting persons with disabilities for service provision, supporting disability-related enterprises or contributing to the Fund of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities. Where employers do not fulfil the quota, and do not comply with alternative arrangements under Section 35, they are required to make a mandatory financial contribution to the Fund calculated per unfilled position, detailed through Ministerial Regulation.¹³ The payment for non-compliance set at the minimum wage rate per person below the quota. The contribution is considered low and, according to informants of this study, play little role in impacting quota compliance.

The Ministry of Social Development and Human Security is responsible overall for disability policy. The Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, under that Ministry, plays a central role in administering the disability employment framework, including oversight of quota implementation and management of the Disability Empowerment Fund. Employment services and job placement support are delivered in coordination with the Ministry of Labour and public employment services, situating quota implementation within a broader empowerment and social inclusion agenda.

¹³ The contribution is equal to minimum daily wage (set by the government across all provinces in the previous year) × 365 days × number of PWDs not employed (short of the quota threshold). See the Ministerial regulation prescribing the number of persons with disabilities that employers or owners of establishments and state agencies must employ, and the amount of money that employers or owners of establishments must contribute to the fund for the promotion and development of the quality of life of persons with disabilities, B.E. 2554 (2011)

► 4. What makes disability employment quotas effective? Lessons from regional practice

This section looks at how institutional arrangements and enforcement mechanisms affect compliance in each target country. The analysis considers legal provisions for employment quotas for persons with disabilities to be impactful when accompanied by relevant implementation mechanisms (HI 2017; IMPACTxAsia 2018). The section covers basic institutional arrangements for enforcement mechanisms; consequences for non-compliance; as well as support to employers in developing inclusive workplaces; access to suitable candidates; and integrated data and monitoring frameworks.

4.1. Governance and institutional responsibilities

Institutional arrangements play an important role in translating legal and policy commitments into employment outcomes. Joined-up systems linking compliance and non-compliance to support services and enforcement mechanisms appear to be key to ensuring desired outcomes.

In Japan and the Republic of Korea, JEED and KEAD function as central operational agencies, combining compliance administration with employment promotion. These integrated models can reduce administrative fragmentation and strengthen linkages between enforcement and support measures (ILO 2019; UNESCAP 2020). These systems are strengthened further by tripartite quota governance mechanisms. These mechanisms build consensus, enhance legitimacy, and ensure that policies are practical, and responsive to labour market realities. In Japan, the tripartite Labour Policy Council, advises on quota adjustments under the Employment Promotion of Persons with Disabilities Act, 1960, (as amended) and the Labour Policy Council Act, 1999. The Republic of Korea similarly operates within a structured tripartite labour governance framework, with disability employment quotas established under the Act on Employment Promotion and Vocational Rehabilitation for Persons with Disabilities, 1999 and shaped through institutions such as the Economic, Social and Labour Council, established under the Act on the Establishment and Operation of the Economic, Social and Labour Council, 2018.

In China, quota oversight is administered through Human Resources and Social Security authorities, with levy collection managed by tax authorities and employment promotion functions supported by the CDPF. Levy revenues are channelled into the Disability Employment Security Fund and used to finance training, wage subsidies and employment services. Although institutional responsibilities are distributed, the linkage between quota compliance, levy payment and dedicated fund allocation creates a structured compliance–financing–service loop (APO 2025).

In Thailand, employment services are directly linked to quota fulfilment through administrative coordination between the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities and the Ministry of Labour’s Public Employment Services.

Singapore, although operating without a quota, relies on a centralized intermediary model through SG Enable which coordinates employer engagement, job matching and retention services, and incentive programmes such as the Open-Door Programme (UNESCAP 2023; Accenture 2018).

Institutional responsibilities in Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines appear more dispersed across ministries and agencies. While public employment services and rehabilitation programmes exist in all countries, they are not always specialized for disability employment, and coordination between, employment services, and social protection systems varies (APO 2025; UNESCAP 2020).

4.2. Monitoring, verification and compliance frameworks

Compliance frameworks vary in their degree of institutionalization and operational detail in the countries examined, reflecting differences in legal design and administrative capacity (Table 4.1). In China, Japan and the Republic of Korea, quota systems are supported by well-established administrative procedures linking reporting, verification, follow-up and financial consequences. In general, public-sector quota obligations are enforced through administrative accountability mechanisms and as such are not separately listed in Table 4.1.

14 “Administrative accountability mechanisms” intended as internal public-sector oversight tools. These might include reporting obligations, compliance audits, performance reviews, public reporting, and disciplinary procedures to ensure that government institutions meet their legal duties. In cases of non-compliance with quotas, administrative sanctions may include corrective directives or managerial sanctions.

In Japan and the Republic of Korea, the data in the reports are integrated into centralized systems in JEED and KEAD and are routinely used to calculate levies, allocate levy-funded subsidies and services, and inform periodic adjustments to quota parameters and accompanying measures, creating desirable feedback loops between reporting, enforcement, and service provision (ILO 2019; Kreko & Telegdy 2025).

China operates a similarly comprehensive administrative reporting model which also engages tax authorities through a unified national digital platform developed with the involvement of the CDPF. Employers submit annual disability employment reports to designated local quota administration authorities, typically under the Human Resources and Social Security system, with involvement of the CDPF in verification and disability certification. Where a quota shortfall is identified, the levy is calculated by the quota administration authorities and collected by tax authorities for transfer to the Disabled Persons' Employment Security Fund. Reporting is complemented by selective verification at sub-national level, for example the Disabled Persons Federation in Hangzhou, reported applying randomized selection of employers for labour inspection, reinforcing the credibility of self-reported data.

In Thailand, under the Persons with Disabilities Empowerment Act, employer declarations are submitted to the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEP), which verifies compliance and administers the Disability Empowerment Fund. Employers may fulfil their obligations through direct employment (Section 33), contributions to the Fund (Section 34), or approved alternative arrangements such as service contracts or livelihood support for persons with disabilities (Section 35). Revenues from the Fund are used to finance employment promotion measures, including vocational training, entrepreneurship support, assistive devices, and workplace adaptation. This institutional arrangement creates a functional linkage between employer reporting, compliance management, and employment promotion, although data integration, inter-agency coordination, particularly with the Ministry of Labour, and transparency could be further strengthened.

A critical component of effective quota and incentive systems is a clear and reliable disability certification framework. Disability certification refers to the formal recognition of a person's disability by an authorized public authority based on standardized criteria, while verification refers to the administrative process through which employers and government agencies confirm eligibility for quotas, incentives, and employment support using certified disability data. Across the countries reviewed, eligibility for mandatory quota compliance, employment services, and fiscal incentives is based on standardized national disability registration systems, often linked with employment services, social security, and tax administration.

Certification mechanisms vary across countries but are formally regulated. In Japan, disability status for quota purposes is based on official disability certificates (e.g., Physical Disability Certificate, Mental Disability Certificate, Rehabilitation Handbook for persons with intellectual disabilities) issued under national legislation and used for quota calculation and employment support. In the Republic of Korea, persons with disabilities are registered under the Act on Welfare of Persons with Disabilities and classified according to standardized criteria; this registration underpins quota eligibility and KEAD-administered employment services. In China, disability certification is issued through local Disabled Persons' Federations based on national standards and is required for quota reporting and levy calculation. In Thailand, disability identification cards issued under the Persons with Disabilities Empowerment Act are used to verify eligibility for quota compliance and Disability Fund mechanisms. Comparable national disability ID or registration systems exist in Malaysia and the Philippines, administered through social welfare authorities and used to determine eligibility for employment-related benefits and incentives. These integrated systems support accurate reporting, reduce administrative burden and misuse, and enable data-driven policymaking.

In Indonesia, the compliance framework for disability remains less institutionalized. Although the employment quota is mandated by law, the mechanism for enforcement is not yet fully developed and a clear escalation pathway has not been established. Companies are required to submit their workforce data through the Ministry of Manpower's Mandatory Company Manpower Reporting (WLKP) system, which includes data on workers with disabilities. This system provides a formal annual reporting channel; however, the follow-up processes for these submissions, including with respect to compliance with the disability employment quota, remains unclear. Importantly, reporting is initiated by companies themselves as the Ministry does not conduct proactive outreach to collect such data directly from workplaces.¹⁵ Similarly, while Indonesia's public sector operates within a broader administrative accountability framework that allows for corrective and disciplinary measures in cases of non-compliance with government policies, there are no quota-specific administrative sanctions for failure to meet disability employment targets. Indonesia's disability identification and registration systems, primarily managed by the Ministry of Social Affairs through social welfare databases and Disability Card, which is being gradually rolled out, are not yet fully standardized or interoperable

¹⁵ Under Law No. 7 of 1981 on Mandatory Company Manpower Reporting, employers are required to submit workforce reports at least annually and whenever there are material changes in company data. The WLKP system functions as a general labour administration reporting tool rather than a quota-specific disability employment reporting mechanism.

with labour market, civil service, and tax administration systems. This fragmentation limits the effectiveness of quota monitoring, enforcement, and incentive delivery. Employers advised that at present, disability certification for the purposes of the quota was through a medical certificate provided by a local doctor.

In Malaysia and the Philippines, quota obligations only apply to the public sector. In the Philippines, enforcement mechanisms are administrative in nature (APO 2025). In Malaysia, the 1 per cent public sector employment quota was established through Service Circular No. 16 of 2010 and is implemented as an administrative policy. While ministries and agencies are required to report biannually to the Public Service Department and monitor progress internally, the framework does not include sanctions or formal enforcement mechanisms for non-compliance. Compliance therefore relies on administrative oversight, performance management, and institutional commitment. Singapore represents a distinct non-quota approach to increase disability inclusion, relying on voluntary private and public sector employer inclusion efforts supported by extensive incentives and services (ILO 2019; UNESCAP 2023).

► **Table 4.1. Compliance and enforcement mechanisms in disability employment quota systems**

Country	Oversight body (type of institution)	Verification / Inspection mechanism	Enforcement Model	Legal consequences for non-compliance (private sector)	Alternative compliance options
China	Disability affairs authority linked to the CDPF and local tax authorities	Mandatory annual employer reporting, administrative verification at provincial and municipal levels of employer reports; integration with tax and social insurance systems	Levy-based quota system	Mandatory contribution to the Disabled Persons' Employment Security Fund	None
Indonesia	Labour administration (Ministry of Manpower), through WLKP reporting, via local manpower offices; civil service reporting overseen by civil service authorities	Limited quota-specific verification; labour inspection not systematically linked to quota monitoring	None	None	None
Japan	Public employment services under the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, with operational support from JEED	Mandatory annual employer reporting; audit and inspection-linked verification	Levy-subsidy quota system	Employment promotion levy payable to JEED for quota shortfall	None – direct employment required but subsidies and incentives to support compliance

Country	Oversight body (type of institution)	Verification / Inspection mechanism	Enforcement Model	Legal consequences for non-compliance (private sector)	Alternative compliance options
The Republic of Korea	Labour administration (Ministry of Employment and Labour) with operational support from KEAD	Mandatory employer reporting; administrative verification and inspection-linked verification and compliance monitoring	Levy-subsidy quota system	Employment promotion levy payable to KEAD for quota shortfall	None – direct employment required but subsidies and incentives to support compliance
Malaysia	Public service administration (Public Service Department)	Administrative monitoring within public-sector reporting systems; no formal inspection mechanism linked to quotas	None	Not applicable – no mandatory private-sector quota	Not applicable
The Philippines	Civil service administration (Civil Service Commission) and labour administration for programme oversight	Administrative monitoring of public-sector compliance; limited verification mechanisms	Administrative accountability framework (public sector only)	Not applicable – private-sector quota is voluntary and incentive-based	Not applicable
Singapore	No quota-based reporting authority; Tripartite and programme-based governance institutions (Ministry of Manpower and SG Enable) programme monitoring	Programme monitoring and administrative reporting within government-funded schemes	Incentive-based, non-quota model	Not applicable – no mandatory employment quota.	Not applicable
Thailand	Labour and disability administration (Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities)	Mandatory employer reporting; administrative verification of compliance pathways	Levy-based quota system with regulated alternative compliance options	Mandatory contribution to the Fund for Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities for unmet quota obligations	Yes – Section 35 allows alternative compliance (of same value) via contracting / outsourcing to persons with disabilities and their organizations/companies or contributions (support self-employment, training)

4.3. Incentives, services and employer support mechanisms

Employment promotion measures can be used to encourage employer engagement with quota implementation and inclusive employment practices. Across the countries reviewed, these measures are used to remove structural barriers, promote inclusive hiring practices and support job retention. The measures include wage subsidies, accommodation grants, tax provisions, procurement preferences, and advisory services (UNESCAP 2020).

In the levy-grant systems operating in Japan and the Republic of Korea, support measures are directly linked to compliance mechanisms. JEED and KEAD administer employment promotion levies and related subsidy schemes, including workplace accommodation support, and manage compliance data systems (ILO 2019; UNESCAP 2020), directly reinvesting levy revenues in support measures such as wage subsidies, workplace accommodation grants and employment retention programmes (ILO 2019). In addition, they provide employer advisory services, job matching and placement support. Regarding job seekers and employees with disabilities, they provide vocational assessments, skills development, job preparation, placement, and retention support (ILO 2007; ILO 2019; Suberei et al. 2025).

In China, through the Disabled Persons' Employment Security Fund, and Thailand, through the Fund for Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, contributions or levy payments are also used to finance employment services, vocational training and employer incentives, such as wage subsidies or access to training. Preferential procurement policies are another tool commonly used in several of above countries (Box 4.1).

► Box 4.1. Preferential procurement strategies

Preferential procurement strategies can be a low-cost way to promote compliance with quotas. A range of options are used by governments:

- **Set-asides.** Governments reserve a share of contracts for a targeted category of bidders.
- **Bid price preferences.** Reducing the bid price of eligible companies or increasing the bid price of those which do not meet preference criteria by a set percentage.
- **Point schemes.** Giving extra points to bidders who meet or exceed preference criteria.
- **Procurement process assistance.** Reducing barriers to participate in a bid for companies that meet the preference criteria, e.g., waiving the application fee; providing training on procurement exercises and operational competencies, or moving the process online (UNESCAP 2021).

China, Japan, the Republic of Korea and Thailand all use procurement-related mechanisms to support the employment and livelihoods of persons with disabilities, but through different policy designs. Japan and the Republic of Korea have the most formalized systems, with governments required to procure goods and services from disability-inclusive enterprises or facilities employing persons with disabilities, possibly with the objective of creating stable market demand alongside quota-levy systems. Thailand adopts a more flexible approach, where procurement-like arrangements (see Table 4.1) are allowed as an alternative means of complying with employment quotas thus directly linking procurement to quota compliance. In China, by contrast, a more indirect model is used whereby the government supports enterprises that employ a minimum share of persons with disabilities (often referred to as “welfare enterprises”) through incentives and policy guidance, and these enterprises may receive preferential access or encouragement in public procurement, though this is not implemented as a uniform, mandatory procurement quota.

Procurement schemes, if not carefully designed, may result in unintended distortive effects such as favouring specialized workshops or social enterprises exclusively employing persons with disabilities thus perpetuating segregation rather than inclusion or locking persons into low quality jobs. Accompanying measures such as including transition targets allowing to shift workers into the open labour market, or time limits to be employed in sheltered employment, or embedding skills development, not just job placement within the employment condition are possible corrective measures.

Several countries use tax-based incentives to promote the employment of persons with disabilities. In China, corporate income tax provisions allow enhanced deductions for wages paid to employees with disabilities, effectively permitting employers to deduct double the salary amount under specified conditions (GPA 2017; Li et al. 2025). Thailand provides tax deductions equivalent to twice the annual salary paid to employees with disabilities hired under Section 33 of the Persons with Disabilities Empowerment Act, while contributions made to the Disability Empowerment Fund under Section 34 are also tax deductible, as are wages paid under Section 35 (UNDP 2022). In Malaysia, employers may claim double tax deductions for the employment and training of persons with disabilities and for workplace accessibility modifications (Inland Revenue Board Malaysia 2019). In the Philippines, private employers are entitled to an income tax deduction equivalent to 25 per cent of the total salaries and wages paid to employees with disabilities, as well as deductions for expenses on accessibility related modifications (APO 2025). Singapore operates a wage-offset mechanism, through the Enabling Employment Credit, which provides direct co-funding to reduce wage costs for eligible employers (UNESCAP 2023; SG Enable, n.d.).

Non-financial measures such as public recognition programmes and employer awards, have also been used in several countries, including China, Indonesia, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, to reinforce positive employer behaviour and promote inclusive business practices, although the link to quota attainment is not always explicit. Indonesia, for example, provides for awards to individuals, legal entities, and state institutions and public facility providers “that employ persons with disabilities.”¹⁶

16 Further developed under Presidential Regulation (Perpres) No. 67 of 2020 on Terms and Procedures for Giving Awards in Respect, Protection, and Fulfilment of the Rights for Persons with Disabilities and Manpower Ministerial Regulation (Permenaker) No. 3 of 2021 on Guidelines for Awarding National Awards to Companies and State-Owned Enterprises Employing Workers with Disabilities.

► 5. Gaps, challenges, and policy reform for Indonesia's quota system

Considering the progress made in Indonesia towards disability-inclusive employment and its quota system examined in Sections 3 and 4; this section examines gaps, challenges and possible steps forward to enhance effectiveness of the quota system. The analysis is clustered into four key areas, not necessarily, or always, mutually exclusive: 1) legislative and regulatory coherence; 2) institutions and support system; 3) compliance and monitoring architecture; and 4) the broader inclusion ecosystem.

The options for next steps are selective and strategic rather than exhaustive. They have been identified based on three complementary criteria: i) their potential to directly strengthen the implementation, monitoring, and effectiveness of Indonesia's disability employment quota system; ii) their feasibility within Indonesia's existing legal, institutional, and administrative framework; and iii) evidence of effectiveness drawn from international comparative experience across the countries reviewed. The proposals were refined and validated through the multi-stakeholder consultations held during the first half of 2026, involving representatives from government institutions, employers' and workers' organizations, organizations of persons with disabilities, and civil society. While disability-inclusive employment depends on a broad ecosystem of policies and interventions, the section focuses on those most directly linked to improving quota implementation and employment outcomes. Cross-cutting priorities, including gender equality and intersectional inclusion, are integrated throughout the four pillars.

5.1. Legal and regulatory coherence

Core gaps

Indonesia's quota obligation under Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities is binding and clearly articulated. However, it does not provide a quota-specific enforcement mechanism for numerical non-compliance. Existing provisions relate to discrimination or obstruction of enjoyment of equal rights, and not directly to the quota. Consequently, quota implementation currently relies primarily on awareness-raising, facilitation and voluntary compliance. In addition, operational regulation remains fragmented and incomplete. A consolidated, clear and fully disseminated implementing regulation has yet to be developed specifying calculation methodology, compliance and follow-up procedures. In addition, civil service provisions are not internally consistent and not fully aligned with the CRPD.

In particular:

- The quota calculation methodology (definition of total workforce, reporting period, treatment of different contract types) is not codified in a unified instrument. Consequently, consistent dissemination is faulting.
- A Government Regulation being drafted by the Ministry of Manpower under Article 54 concerning incentives for private sector companies that meet the quota has not yet been adopted.
- Although Article 53 of Law No. 8 of 2016 prescribes a 2 per cent quota for national and local government and state-owned enterprises, Ministerial Regulation No. 36 of 2018 issued by the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform,¹⁷ stipulates that central government institutions must allocate at least 2 per cent and regional governments at least 1 per cent of vacancies to persons with disabilities creating a discrepancy.
- Certain civil service eligibility provisions are not fully consistent with non-discrimination and other principles in the CRPD or ILO Conventions No. 159 and No. 111, in particular:
- Article 65(1) of Law No. 5 of 2014 on State Civil Apparatus maintains a general requirement of physical and mental health, creating ambiguity in its application to disability inclusion.¹⁸
- Administrative guidance has reportedly restricted persons with disabilities to certain categories of positions, reinforcing occupational segregation (Payani, 2022).

¹⁷ Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Regulation No. 36 of 2018 on Criteria for Determining Civil Servant Staffing Needs and the Implementation of Civil Servant Candidate Selection in 2018, Annex, Section F(2) (Persons with Disabilities)

¹⁸ Informants of this study argued that the legal limitation is bypassed by hiring practices.

- Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Regulation No. 27 of 2021 requires applicants with disabilities to submit a video demonstrating daily activities, raising concerns regarding equal treatment of candidates and procedural consistency.

Possible next steps

Legal and regulatory reform would require leadership from the Ministry of Manpower in relation to private sector obligations; and from the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform and the Supervisory Body of State-Owned Enterprises in relation to civil service and public enterprise frameworks. Procurement-related adjustments would require coordination with the National Public Procurement Agency and the Ministry of Finance, with strategic alignment supported by Bappenas. Possible next steps have been identified as follows:

1. **Clarity on quota implementation.** Adoption and full dissemination of a consolidated implementing regulation, as seen in Japan and the Republic of Korea, where detailed implementing regulations specify calculation methods. Here, the regulation would clarify:
 - 1.1. Denominator definition (total workforce, measurement in time, typology of worker to be considered) and calculation procedures;
 - 1.2. Certification and verification requirements for job applicants and employees with disabilities;
 - 1.3. Employer scope and thresholds (applicable size threshold, calculation of the size);
 - 1.4. Treatment of employment duration, status and work location;
 - 1.5. Reporting cycle, across public and private sectors (see also option 7 on the role of ULDs).
2. **Structured incentive framework.** Finalization of the Government Regulation under Article 54 of Law No. 8 of 2016 to establish a structured incentive framework, this could draw on the more structured architectures operating in Japan, the Republic of Korea and China, and would add to the ongoing assistance provided to employers by the public sector on reasonable accommodation and facilitation of employment of persons with disabilities, with consideration for financial and non-financial facilitation measures, including:
 - 2.1. Continued capacity-building for HR managers and line supervisors;
 - 2.2. Extended guidance on reasonable accommodation;
 - 2.3. Workplace sensitization and co-worker training;
 - 2.4. Structured technical advisory services;
 - 2.5. Recognition and award systems;
 - 2.6. Potential procurement-related facilitation mechanisms.
 - 2.7. Financial support tools including tax-deductions¹⁹ and subsidies.
3. **Incentive framework for civil service and state-owned enterprises.** Where the forthcoming Ministry of Manpower regulation does not extend to civil service institutions or state-owned enterprises, complementary incentive frameworks should be developed under the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform and the Supervisory Body of State-Owned Enterprises. Respectively, drawing on administrative performance evaluation mechanisms and recognition systems.
4. **Consistency between civil service regulations, Law No. 8 of 2016 and the CRPD.** Review and harmonization of civil service regulations to ensure consistency with Law No. 8 of 2016 and Indonesia's CRPD obligations.
5. **Institutionalization of compliance pathway.** Moving towards more structured models of escalation, support and financial consequence as applied in China, Japan and the Republic Korea, to develop a compliance pathway starting with notifications of non-compliance to proactive support measures for employers and establishing deadlines, to introduction of a levy system consistent with international practice. Phase in of a levy system could be foreseen in the law, and the threshold for applicable companies subject to financial levies could also be progressively lowered, as seen in Japan and the Republic of Korea. Integration of reporting and incentive eligibility, ensuring that access to incentive mechanisms is linked to verified compliance data.

¹⁹ The Indonesian Supertax Deduction Incentive for Apprenticeship and Training Programs established by Government Regulation No. 45/2019 and Minister of Finance Regulation No. 128/2019 could be considered, aware of the administrative shortcomings (see Nugraeni, U., & Saptono, P. B. (2023), as example.

5.2. Institutions and support systems

Core gaps

Support to employers, employees and jobseekers by strong intermediary institutions helps bridge the gap between employers and jobseekers with disabilities and improves long term retention outcomes. Advisory services include competency-based job matching; accommodation guidance; and structured retention and follow-up support.

Indonesia has established important operational mechanisms to support achievement of the quota, notably establishing ULDs under local Manpower Offices and the Inclusive Job Centre under BPJS. However, capacity and service delivery vary across districts, and integration with quota governance remains inconsistent. Overall, employment services, vocational systems, and employer advisory functions operate largely in parallel rather than in structured alignment with quota demand and disability inclusion in the labour force.

Possible next steps

Strengthening institutional support systems would primarily involve the Ministry of Manpower and subnational manpower offices responsible for ULDs, working in coordination with provincial and district governments. Effective delivery would also require engagement of public sector employers, the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Industry, Ministry of Social Affairs, and vocational training institutions, alongside employer organizations, trade unions, and organizations of persons with disabilities (OPDs). Potential options for future action include:

6. **Stronger employer advisory and sensitization services.** Strengthening gender sensitive, inclusive employer advisory and sensitization services, including (in the order of priority):
 - 6.1. Dissemination of detailed and correct information on quota compliance and its measurement and reporting, in line with # 1 above. In particular, information about reporting frequency, workforce denominator definitions, certification and verification, and treatment of outsourced personnel is required. This could include a short practical guidance note or digital tutorial linked to the WLKP system, to improve transparency, understanding, and support voluntary compliance.
 - 6.2. Practical guidance on recruitment and performance management of workers with disabilities (linking with regulation under # 2 above).
 - 6.3. Dissemination of good practices from Indonesian enterprises and public sector employers and peer-learning platforms for employers including via revamping of the national business and disability network led by Apindo.
7. **ULDs lead in supporting quota fulfilment.** Clarification and strengthening of the mandate of ULDs in relation to quota fulfilment, possibly within the regulation proposed under option 1, including details on the role of ULDs in provision of employer advisory services, job-matching and structured post-placement support, as well as relation to livelihood and social assistance schemes operating under the Ministry of Social Affairs. ULD strengthening shall include: a) systematic capacity-building programmes for ULD personnel and manpower offices regarding quota systems to provide awareness raising, information sharing, career counselling and referral services; and b) improved linkage between ULD services and the Ministry of Manpower's *Siap Kerja* platform, to bridge qualified jobseekers with disabilities to jobs.
8. **Dedicated role for BPJS Ketenagakerjaan in coordination with Ministry of Manpower.** Defining terms of a systematic collaboration aimed also - and measurably - to fulfil quotas between the Ministry of Manpower as provider of employment services or as monitor and compliance agent and BPJS. Collaboration shall entail enhancing regulatory and operational integration between BPJS return-to-work mechanisms and quota objectives, supporting employers to reintegrate qualified injured workers with disabilities and comply with quota requirements. This can be achieved by working on a few key elements such as: a) improved coverage of the employment injury insurance scheme (JKK); b) expanded provision of assistive devices tailored to individual requirements; and c) enhanced reskilling and upskilling training again tailored to individual and employer requirements.
9. **Tripartite responsibility for quota implementation.** Institutionalize a structured tripartite dialogue mechanism, as seen in Japan's Labour Policy Council and Korea's Economic, Social and Labour Council, to guide and monitor the quota implementation system. This could be convened under the Ministry of Manpower, bringing together relevant ministries, employers' organizations, trade unions and OPDs. Indonesia's Tripartite Cooperation Institution²⁰ would

²⁰ Indonesia's Tripartite Cooperation Institution (Lembaga Kerja Sama Tripartit – LKS Tripartit), established under Law No. 13 of 2003 on Manpower (as amended by Law No. 6 of 2023) and Government Regulation No. 8 of 2005, operates at national, provincial, and district/city levels, providing a ready-made platform to institutionalize structured dialogue on disability employment quotas.

provide a ready-made platform to institutionalize structured dialogue on disability employment quotas. Alternatively, the National Commission on Disabilities (KND) could be considered.

10. **Assess labour demand and skills supply for quota implementation.** Conduct regularly a gender-sensitive national quota and labour market assessment similar to the periodic quota reviews undertaken in Japan and the Republic of Korea, to adjust rates and supporting measures. This is instrumental to strengthen quota fulfilment, regulatory and policy coherence between disability employment measures and education and skills frameworks, explicitly linking vocational training, apprenticeships, and transition-to-work programmes to quota implementation. The assessment could map: a) quota-driven job demand shedding light on the performance of sectors in terms of quota fulfilment and skills and profiles needed; b) available labour supply, profiles of persons with disabilities and overview of educational options available; c) mapping of curricula and education provision gaps to meet labour force demand and job seekers and workers with disabilities.
11. **Embed gender-responsive and inclusive approaches in quota systems.** Quota implementation should explicitly address gender and intersectional barriers, recognizing that women with disabilities face compounded barriers to access and retain employment. Rather than treating gender as a standalone issue, it should be embedded within quota design and delivery. In practical terms, this means ensuring that workplace accommodations, and extension of rights, such as maternity entitlements and facilities, are provided in ways that are accessible and inclusive. Relatedly, the national implementation of ILO Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190) must ensure protection of workers with disabilities and in particular female workers with disabilities.

5.3. Compliance and monitoring architecture

Core gaps

Quota systems depend on reliable disability verification and certification mechanisms, predictable and credible monitoring by agencies with clearly allocated monitoring mandates, integrating reporting, inspection and data consolidation. Data from employer reports inform graduated compliance pathways, and at the policy level, for learning and policy recalibration. Employers lack awareness of the quota, and the administrative steps required to comply with reporting.

Monitoring responsibilities are distributed across multiple institutional actors in Indonesia:

- Private-sector employers report workforce data through local manpower offices, primarily using the WLKP.
- While the WLKP system captures general workforce information, including on disability, it is not yet structured as a quota-specific monitoring instrument, and compliance pathways and escalation procedures remain under-defined.
- Multiple public sector institutions share monitoring responsibility: Civil service workforce data are administered by the National Civil Service Agency under policy direction from the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform; and Supervisory Body of State-Owned Enterprises oversees monitoring by state-owned enterprises.

Possible next steps

Clarifying and strengthening compliance and monitoring mechanisms would require coordinated action by the Ministry of Manpower, including its labour inspectorate, and local manpower offices responsible for workforce reporting, together with the National Civil Service Agency and the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform for civil service personnel systems. Oversight of state-owned enterprises would require engagement of the Supervisory Body of State-Owned Enterprises and relevant regional authorities. Potential next steps include:

12. **Define monitoring roles for quota compliance for both private and public sector.** Formal clarification of reporting and monitoring responsibilities as seen in the clearly delineated monitoring mandates between labour ministries and specialized agencies in China, Japan, the Republic of Korea and Thailand. Here the roles cut across private sector, civil service institutions, and national and regional state-owned enterprises. Consistency with legislative reforms under option 1 is essential. In the private sector, monitoring should be based on mandatory employer self-reporting through the WLKP system, complemented by verification and enforcement through the Ministry of Manpower's labour inspectorate. In the public sector, the monitoring mandate for disability quota compliance within the civil service and public enterprises should be clarified and formalized through appropriate regulatory instruments. This should specify which institution is responsible for verifying compliance, consolidating workforce data, and initiating follow-up where quotas are not met.

For what concerns the private sector, the mandate for monitoring compliance rests with the Ministry of Manpower through its labour inspectorate. For state-owned enterprises, the responsibility lies with the Supervisory Body of State-Owned Enterprises. Any future regulatory framework should therefore explicitly integrate these respective monitoring mandates and clearly delineate the institutional authority over private sector and state-owned enterprises. Concerning the public sector, the monitoring mandate for compliance with disability quotas could be integrated within the responsibilities of the National Civil Service Agency.

13. **Further integrate quota compliance into labour inspection mandates**, to strengthen labour inspectorate engagement with disability employment obligations, consistent with practices in Japan, the Republic of Korea and Thailand, where employer reporting is subject to administrative verification and inspection-linked review mechanisms. Here, quota compliance could be included within existing inspection mandates, in line with option 1. Operational tools, checklists and related training could be a starting point.
14. **WLKP reporting and disability-disaggregated data**. Integration and strengthening of disability quota-related reporting within the WLKP system, including standardized disability-disaggregated data fields, and clarification on verification requirements, in line with # 1 above. This should include interoperability with relevant administrative systems, notably the ones managed by the Ministry of Social Affairs, BPJS Ketenagakerjaan, Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform.
15. **Formal compliance and remediation framework**. Development of a structured compliance pathway (regulated sub # 5 above) specifying a) administrative guidance; b) corrective notification, compliance plans and defined remediation timelines; c) escalation mechanisms; d) integration of reporting and incentive eligibility, ensuring that access to incentive mechanisms is linked to verified compliance data.

5.4. Broader inclusion ecosystem

Core gap

Quotas do not operate in isolation, and while they may contribute to entry into the labour force, they do not guarantee meaningful inclusion or career progression. Here, the wider ecosystem plays a role in breaking down barriers to labour force participation of persons with disabilities and their meaningful inclusion in the workplace. Accessibility and inclusion in education, as well as comprehensive lifecycle social protection impact the skills pipeline, ensuring persons with disabilities can acquire skills demanded by the labour force and have financial resources to cover the extra costs of living with a disability.

Social awareness and sensitivity build employer engagement in inclusive employment. While accessible and inclusive work environments and public spaces, including reasonable accommodation, mean persons with disabilities can access and participate in employment on an equal basis with others. Importantly, ecosystem-benefitting interventions might also help companies that fall under the quota threshold, like SMEs, either directly or via spillover effects. For instance, they could benefit from incentives and support systems or from better qualified human resources.

Addressing disability-inclusion also requires a gender responsive approach, and awareness of intersectional barriers, recognizing that women with disabilities face additional barriers to accessing education, employment opportunities, and safe and healthy workplace environments, while other marginalized groups face additional barriers. Ensuring availability of labour force data, as well as quota compliance data, disaggregated by gender, type of disability, sector, and employment status, supports analysis of employment quality, retention, and intersectional outcomes.

In Indonesia, the objective of disability-inclusive employment embedded in the quota system is supported by a comprehensive legal and institutional framework, including provisions under Law No. 8 of 2016, inclusive education policies, ULDs, and the Return-to-Work programme administered by BPJS. However, opportunities remain to further strengthen coordination and operational linkages between education and training systems, employment services, social protection, and workplace accessibility and accommodation. Enhancing these connections would support smoother school-to-work and return-to-work transitions and improve the overall effectiveness and sustainability of quota implementation.

Possible next steps

Ecosystem reforms require cross-ministerial coordination extending beyond labour governance, engaging actors involved in educational and vocational training, infrastructure or social protection among others. Possible leading entities include BPJS, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Industry, the Ministry of Social

Affairs, or the Ministries of Public Works and Transportation, while strategic alignment within national development planning frameworks should be supported by Bappenas. In addition, provincial and district governments play a central role in accessibility, education delivery, and local service provision. Employer organizations, trade unions, and OPDs are essential partners in aligning skills development, accessibility, and inclusive workplace practices. The National Commission on Disabilities, in its advisory and monitoring capacity, could build on its convening role to promote cross-sector coherence and CRPD alignment. Options for possible next steps include:

16. **Public awareness on inclusive and gender-responsive employment.** Strengthen public sensitization, on inclusive and gender-responsive employment of persons with disabilities potentially drawing on awareness raising and employer engagement campaigns undertaken in Japan and Singapore. Enhance employer and public awareness on working with persons with disabilities, with attention to the specific barriers faced by women with disabilities, including practical guidance on recruitment and job performance, evidence on productivity and business benefits, and examples of good practices from the private sector (including reasonable accommodation and return on investment).
17. **Accessibility and reasonable accommodation in employment.** Strengthen provision and enforcement of accessibility and reasonable accommodation in a gender-responsive manner, through government support to employers, and stronger enforcement of existing legal provisions. Here, it would be possible to draw on the experiences of Japan, the Republic of Korea and Singapore, where structured employer advisory services and public funding mechanisms support workplace accommodation and accessibility adjustments.

► 6. Conclusions and options for next steps

Indonesia has established a clear legal commitment to promoting employment of persons with disabilities including through statutory quota obligations and a rights-based framework. The legal architecture supporting the quota reflects an important shift towards recognition of employment as a right rather than a welfare measure, and it aligns formally with Indonesia's obligations under the CRPD as well as relevant ILO standards, including the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) and the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983 (No. 159).

Effective quota systems combine legal certainty, institutional capacity, credible monitoring and follow-up actions, including employer, employee and job seeker support, and are situated within a broader ecosystem of inclusivity and accessibility. Sustained engagement of employers' organizations, trade unions, and OPDs is essential to ensure quota systems progressively evolve to promote greater inclusivity in the workplace and realization of the rights of persons with disabilities.

The analysis in Sections 3 and 4 indicates that the principal constraints on effectiveness can be addressed by working on four mutually reinforcing areas: strengthening legislative and regulatory coherence; reinforcing institutional and service capacity; consolidating monitoring and compliance architecture; and embedding quota implementation within the broader social and public service ecosystem, with gender equality and women's empowerment a cross-cutting issue.

The options for next steps presented in Section 5 are summarized below and provide a concrete list of implementable actions which can be initiated to strengthen Indonesia's quota system and realize its rights-based foundation.

► **Table 6.1. Summary of options for next steps and key actors**

No.	Option summary	Primary responsible institution(s)	Other relevant institutions
1. Legal and regulatory coherence			
1.	Adopt consolidated implementing regulation clarifying quota calculation and reporting cycles for public and private sectors.	Ministry of Manpower (private sector); Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (civil service); Supervisory Body/Ministry of SOEs	National Civil Service Agency; Ministry of Law and Human Rights
2.	Finalize Government Regulation under Article 54 of Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities establishing structured incentive framework, including financial and non-financial facilitation measures (e.g., tax deductions, subsidies, advisory support, recognition mechanisms).	Ministry of Manpower	Ministry of Finance; Employer organizations; Trade unions
3.	Develop complementary incentive frameworks for civil service and SOEs where not covered by Ministry of Manpower regulation.	Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform; Ministry of SOEs	National Civil Service Agency
3.	Review and harmonize civil service regulations to align with Law No. 8 of 2016 and CRPD.	Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform	National Civil Service Agency; Ministry of Law and Human Rights

No.	Option summary	Primary responsible institution(s)	Other relevant institutions
5.	Introduce a graduated compliance pathway, moving from notification and support to defined remediation timelines and potential proportionate administrative or levy-based consequences (longer term).	Ministry of Manpower	Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform; Supervisory Body/ Ministry of State-Owned Enterprises; Ministry of Finance
2. Institutions and support systems			
6.	Strengthen employer advisory and sensitization services, including guidance on quota compliance, inclusive recruitment and management practices, and dissemination of good practices and peer learning platforms.	Ministry of Manpower	Provincial/District Governments; Ministry of Social Affairs
7.	ULDs lead in supporting quota fulfilment, including strengthened mandates, capacity-building, and integration with the Siap Kerja platform, with linkages to Ministry of Social Affairs programmes.	Ministry of Manpower	Subnational governments and manpower offices, Ministry of Social Affairs, ULDs
8.	Dedicated role for BPJS in coordination with the Ministry of Manpower to align return-to-work programmes with quota fulfilment.	BPJS Ketenagakerjaan, Ministry of Manpower	Ministry of Social Affairs; Training providers; Employers; Subnational governments
9.	Tripartite responsibility for quota implementation through institutionalized dialogue via LKS Tripartit at national and subnational levels.	Ministry of Manpower	Employer organizations; Trade unions; OPDs; Relevant ministries; Subnational governments
10.	Assess labour demand and skills supply for quota implementation.	Ministry of Manpower	Ministry of Education. Employers; Trade unions; OPDs; KND
11.	Embed gender-responsive and inclusive approaches in quota systems, aligned with C190 and inclusive workplace standards.	Ministry of Manpower	Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection; Ministry of Social Affairs; Employers; Trade unions; OPDs; KND
3. Compliance and monitoring architecture			
12.	Clarify and formalize monitoring mandates for private sector, civil service, and SOEs.	Ministry of Manpower (private sector); Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (civil service); Ministry of SOEs	National Civil Service Agency; Provincial/District manpower offices

No.	Option summary	Primary responsible institution(s)	Other relevant institutions
13.	Further integrate disability quota compliance into labour inspection mandates through tools, checklists, and training.	Ministry of Manpower	Provincial/District manpower offices
14.	Strengthen WLKP reporting with standardized disability-disaggregated data and interoperability with relevant administrative systems.	Ministry of Manpower	Ministry of Social Affairs; BPJS Ketenagakerjaan; Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform; National Civil Service Agency; Ministry of SOEs; Provincial and district governments.
15.	Establish a formal compliance and remediation framework linking reporting, enforcement, and incentive eligibility.	Ministry of Manpower	Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform; National Civil Service Agency; Ministry of SOEs; Provincial and district governments.
4. Broader inclusion ecosystem			
16.	Strengthen public awareness on inclusive and gender-responsive employment of persons with disabilities.	Ministry of Manpower	Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs; Ministry of Social Affairs; Employer organizations; Trade unions; OPDs; KND; Subnational governments
15.	Strengthen provision and enforcement of accessibility and reasonable accommodation in employment.	Ministry of Manpower; Ministry of Public Works and Housing	Ministry of Social Affairs; KND; Subnational governments; Employers; Trade unions; OPDs

► References

- Accenture. 2018. *Companies Leading in Disability Inclusion Have Outperformed Peers*. Available at: <https://newsroom.accenture.com/news/companies-leading-in-disability-inclusion-have-outperformed-peers-accenture-research-finds.htm>
- APO (Asian Productivity Organization). 2025. *Enhancing Disability-Inclusive Employment Policies in Asia: Challenges, Good Practices, and Policy Recommendations*. Available at: https://www.apo-tokyo.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Enhancing-Disability-Inclusive-Employment-Policies-in-Asia_PUB.pdf
- Ayuningtyas, D., Rachmawati, R., Larasanti, A., Margaretha, C., Sahfira, U.H., and Ayuni, Q. 2022. "The law on persons with disabilities: How far have we gone? Case study in Indonesia". *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 25(1). Available at: <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/the-law-on-persons-with-disabilities-how-far-have-we-gone-case-study-in-indonesia-13877.html>
- Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. 2022. *Concluding observations on the initial report of Indonesia*. CRPD/C/IDN/CO/1. Available at: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3990365>
- Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. 2016. *General Comment No. 8 on the right to work and employment (Article 27)*. CRPD/C/GC/8.
- CRPD Committee. 2018. *Concluding Observations in Relation to the Initial Report of the Philippines*. CRPD/C/PHL/CO/1. Available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/concluding-observations/crpdcp1co1-concluding-observations-relation-initial-report>
- CRPD Committee. 2022. *Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Singapore*. CRPD/C/SGP/CO/1. Available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/concluding-observations/crpdcs1co1-concluding-observations-initial-report-singapore>
- Duryea, S., Martinez, C., and Smith, R. 2024. *Disability Employment Quotas: Effects of Laws and Nudges*. IDB Working Paper. Available at: <https://publications.iadb.org/en/disability-employment-quotas-effects-laws-and-nudges>
- European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2018. *Evidence of the Link Between Inclusive Education and Social Inclusion: A Review of the Literature*. (S. Symeonidou, ed.). Odense, Denmark. Available at https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/Evidence%20E2%80%93%20A%20Review%20of%20the%20Literature_0.pdf
- GBDN (Global Business and Disability Network). 2023. *Businesses Leading the Way on Disability Inclusion: A Compilation of Good Corporate Practices*. ILO. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/disability-and-work/WCMS_907148/lang--en/index.htm
- GPA. 2017. *Hiring Disabled Workers in China: Incentives and Challenges*. Globalization Partners Asia. Available at: <https://gpa.net/blogs/latest-news/hiring-disabled-workers-in-china-incentives-and-challenges>
- Hao, Y., and Li, P. 2020. "Employment Legal Framework for Persons with Disabilities in China: Effectiveness and Reasons". *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(14). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17144976>
- Humanity & Inclusion (HI). 2021. *For a More Integrated Recruitment of People with Disabilities: Global Framework, Issues and Practices*. Available at: https://www.hi.org/sn_uploads/document/2021_HI_Study-recruitment-people-with-disabilities_EN.pdf
- Humanity & Inclusion (HI). 2017. *Employment Policies for Persons with Disabilities: Comparative Study in Thirteen Countries*. Available at: https://www.hi.org/sn_uploads/Employment-and-Disability_13-Countries-Synthesis_EN.pdf
- Howells, I. 2026. *Technical Report on Fair Recruitment of Migrant Workers with Disabilities*. Geneva: ILO. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54394/BUNS0985>
- ILO (International Labour Organization). 2025. *Advancing Disability Inclusion: How the ILO is Promoting Equal Opportunities and Participation for Persons with Disabilities through Development Cooperation Projects (2019–2024)*. I-eval Insights from Evidence, No. 3. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/2025-06/Insight%20paper_June%202025_web-.pdf
- ILO. 2019. *Promoting Employment Opportunities for People with Disabilities: Quota Schemes*. Vols. 1 <https://www.ilo.org/publications/promoting-employment-opportunities-people-disabilities-quota-schemes-vol-1-1> and Vols. 2 <https://www.ilo.org/publications/promoting-employment-opportunities-people-disabilities-quota-schemes-vol-2-1>

- ILO. 2015. *Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014–17: A Twin-Track Approach of Mainstreaming and Disability-Specific Actions*. Available at: https://webapps.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/2015/115B09_60_engl.pdf
- ILO. 2014. *Achieving Equal Employment Opportunities for People with Disabilities through Legislation: Guidelines*. Available at: <https://www.ilo.org/publications/achieving-equal-employment-opportunities-people-disabilities-through>
- ILO. 2007. *EmployAbility: A Resource Guide on Disability for Employers in Asia and the Pacific*. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/@asia/@ro-bangkok/documents/publication/wcms_bk_pb_98_en.pdf
- IOE (International Organisation of Employers). 2024. *Japan: Amendments to the Act for Eliminating Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities entered into force*. Available at: <https://industrialrelationsnews.ioe-emp.org/industrial-relations-and-labour-law-may-2024/news/article/japan-amendments-to-the-act-for-eliminating-discrimination-against-persons-with-disabilities-entered-into-force>
- IMPACTxAsia. 2018. *Increasing Employment of People with Disabilities in Asia: Beyond Employment Legislation and Quotas*. IMPACTxAsia Blog Series (29 November 2018). Available at: <https://communitybusiness.org/latest-news-publications/increasing-employment-people-disabilities-asia-beyond-employment>
- Inland Revenue Board of Malaysia. 2019. *Public Ruling No. 3/2019: Business Expenses in Respect of Disabled Persons*. Putrajaya: Inland Revenue Board Malaysia. Available at: http://lampiran1.hasil.gov.my/pdf/pdfam/PR_03_2019.pdf
- JEED. n.d. *Levy and Grant System for Employing Persons with Disabilities*. Available at: https://www.jeed.go.jp/english/disability/levy_and_grant_system.html (accessed 12 April 2026)
- Jurado-Caraballo, A., and Quintana-Garcia, C. 2025. "Disability inclusion in workplaces, firm performance, and reputation". *European Management Journal*, 43(5), October 2025. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0263237324000951>
- KEAD (Korean Employment Agency for Persons with Disabilities). n.d. *Employment Incentives/Levy*. Available at: <https://www.kead.or.kr/en/dsempictlvy/cntntsPage.do?menuId=MENU1388> (accessed 12 April 2026)
- Kreko, J., and Telegdy, A. 2025. "The Effects of a Disability Employment Quota when Compliance is Cheaper than Defiance". *Economica*, 92(366). Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ecca.12568>
- Li, M., Wong, Y., & Yue, Y. 2025. "From welfare enterprises to broad tax incentives: Effects of employment policy changes on disabled in China." *China Economic Review*, Vol. 93, October 2025. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1043951X25001099>
- Manalu, B. S., and Hadi, S. 2025. "Legal Protection for Workers with Disabilities in the Workplace to Ensure Equality and Welfare in Indonesia". *Awang Long Law Review*, 8(1), 152-162. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.56301/awl.v8i1.1855>
- Matsumoto, K. 2025. *Current Situation of Disability Employment: Expanding Scope of Firms Subject to the Quota*. Available at: https://www.rieti.go.jp/en/columns/a01_0801.html
- Nugraeni, U., and Prianto, B.S. 2023. "Analysis of the Implementation of Indonesian Supertax Deduction Incentive for Apprenticeship and Training Programs". *Interdisciplinary Social Studies*, 2(8): 2249–2267. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2025109>
- Payani, Ni Luh Bayu Purwa Eka. 2022. "Indonesia's Disability Policy: An Overview of the Quota System in Civil Servant Recruitment". *Waseda University Journal of the Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies*, No. 43. Available at: <https://share.google/fpMmlbU54haGPYbqc>
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2022. *Disability, Work and Inclusion: Mainstreaming in All Policies and Practices*. Available at: https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2022/10/disability-work-and-inclusion_db6df91a/1eaa5e9c-en.pdf
- OECD. 2010. *Sickness, Disability and Work: Breaking the Barriers: A Synthesis of Findings across OECD Countries*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264088856-en>
- PLAN International. 2013. *Include Us! A Study of Disability among Sponsored Children*. Available at: https://www.right-to-education.org/sites/right-to-education.org/files/resource-attachments/Plan_Include_Us%21_Report_2013_En.pdf
- Resources from Disability:IN. n.d. Available at: <https://disabilityin.org/>
- SG Enable. n.d. *Employ: Enabling Employment Credit & Inclusive Business Programme*. Available at: <https://www.sgenable.sg/your-first-stop/hiring-employment/employers/employ>. Last checked 21/05/2026
- Stoevska, V. 2022. "New ILO Database Highlights Labour Market Challenges of Persons with Disabilities". *ILOSTAT Blog*, 13 June 2022. Available at: <https://ilostat.ilo.org/new-ilo-database-highlights-labour-market-challenges-of-persons-with-disabilities/>

- Suberei, A. et al. 2025. *Advancing Equality: A Comparative Analysis of Employment Rights for Disabled Individuals in Malaysia and Japan*. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 8(12): 3753–3760. Available at: <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/advancing-equality-a-comparative-analysis-of-employment-rights-for-disabled-individuals-in-malaysia-and-japan/>
- Szerman, C. 2022. *The Labor Market Effects of Disability Hiring Quotas*. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4267622
- Theirworld. 2018. *Left Behind: How Children with Disabilities Are Missing Out on Education*. London: Theirworld. Available at: <https://theirworld.org/resources-3/left-behind-from-the-start-how-governments-and-donors-are-failing-children-with-disabilities-in-their-early-years/>
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2022. *Promoting an Inclusive Workplace for Persons with Disabilities in Thailand*. Available at: <https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2023-03/PWD%20inclusion%20study.pdf>
- UNESCAP (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific). 2023. *Catalysts of Change: Disability Inclusion in Business in Asia and the Pacific*. Available at: <https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/d8files/knowledge-products/DAG2023.pdf>
- UNESCAP. 2018. *Inequality of Opportunity in Asia and the Pacific: Decent Work*. Available at: <https://repository.unescap.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/32c7ca55-3252-4dea-8cd6-ec8f991f5137/content>
- UNESCAP. 2020. *Employment of Persons with Disabilities in Asia and the Pacific: Trends, Strategies and Policy Recommendations*. Policy Paper No. 2020/13. Available at: https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/d8files/knowledge-products/Paper_%28Employment_of_Persons_with_Disabilities%29_final.pdf
- UNESCAP. 2021. *Disability at a Glance 2021: The Shaping of Disability-Inclusive Employment in Asia and the Pacific*. Available at: <https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/d8files/knowledge-products/DAG2021-Final.pdf>
- UNESCO. 2026. *Global Education Monitoring Report 2026: Access and Equity, Countdown to 2030*. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000397618>
- UNICEF. 2023. *Discussion Paper: Key Issues for Children with Disabilities in Indonesia*. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/social-policy/publication/key-issues-children-with-disabilities>
- USCBC (US China Business Council). 2017. *Disability Security Changes Could Be Costly*. Available at: <https://www.uschina.org/articles/disability-employment-security-changes-could-be-costly/>

► Bibliography of legal references by country

International legal instruments

United Nations

- Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), 2006

International Labour Organization

- Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100)
- Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)
- Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983 (No. 159)
- Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190)

National legal references

China

- Law on the Protection of Persons with Disabilities of 2008
- Regulations on the Employment of Persons with Disabilities of 2007

Indonesia

Primary legislation

- Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities
- Law No. 13 of 2003 on Manpower, as amended by Law No. 6 of 2023
- Law No. 5 of 2014 on State Civil Apparatus
- Law No. 1 of 2025 on the Third Amendment to Law No. 19 of 2003 on State-Owned Enterprises

Government regulations

- Government Regulation (PP) No. 52 of 2019 on Social Welfare for Persons with Disabilities
- Government Regulation (PP) No. 70 of 2019 on the Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation of the Respect, Protection, and Fulfilment of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
- Government Regulation (PP) No. 60 of 2020 on Disability Service Units in the Labour Sector

Presidential regulations

- Presidential Regulation (Perpres) No. 67 of 2020 on the Requirements and Procedures for Conferring Awards in the Respect, Protection, and Fulfilment of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
- Presidential Regulation (Perpres) No. 68 of 2020 on the National Commission on Disabilities

Ministerial regulations

- Minister of Manpower Regulation (Permenaker) No. 21 of 2020 on Disability Service Units
- Ministerial Regulation of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (PermenPANRB) No. 27 of 2021 on Civil Service Recruitment for Persons with Disabilities
- Ministerial Regulation of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (PermenPANRB) No. 36 of 2018 on Criteria for Determining Civil Servant Staffing Needs and the Implementation of Civil Servant Candidate Selection

Policy instruments

- Regional Regulations (Perda) and related Governor/Mayor Regulations on disability inclusion (various jurisdictions)
- National Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPN)

- National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2025-2029
- National Action Plan for Disability Inclusion (RAN PD)

Japan

- Act on Employment Promotion of Persons with Disabilities of 1960; as amended)
- Act for Eliminating Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities of 2016
- Labour Policy Council Act of 1999

The Republic of Korea

- Act on Employment Promotion and Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities of 1999; as amended
- Act on the Prohibition of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities and Remedy against Infringement of their Rights of 2007
- Act on the Establishment and Operation of the Economic, Social and Labour Council of 2018.

Malaysia

- Persons with Disabilities Act of 2008
- Public Service Circular No. 16 of 2010

The Philippines

- Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities, Republic Act No. 7277 (1992)
- Amendments to the Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities, Republic Act No. 10524 (2013)
- Implementing Rules and Regulations of Republic Act No. 10524.

Singapore

- Enabling Masterplan for Disability Inclusion 2022-2030
- Tripartite Guidelines on Fair Employment Practices

Thailand

- Persons with Disabilities Empowerment Act, B.E. 2550 (2007), as amended.
- Ministerial Regulation B.E. 2554 (2011) issued under the Persons with Disabilities Empowerment Act.

► Annex: List of Interviewees

ID	Type	Organization	Interviewee(s)	Gender	Notes
China					
1	People's organization	China Disabled Persons' Federation (CDPF); Hangzhou Disabled Persons' Federation (DPF)	Li Weijun	F	Director of the Employment Department
2	Social enterprise	Easy Inclusion	Haibin Zhou	M	
Indonesia					
3	Government	Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas)	Nur Hygiawati Rahayu	F	Director of Employment
			Mariska Yasrie	F	Senior Planning Officer, Directorate of Employment
			Muhammad Eka Kusuma	M	Senior Planner, Directorate of Employment
4	Government	Ministry of Manpower (MoM)	Anwar Sanusi	M	Head of Manpower Planning and Development Agency
			Anggun Sintana	F	Director of Job Placement for Vulnerable Groups
6	Employers	Indonesian Employers Association (APINDO)	Myra Hanartani	F	Head of Manpower Committee on Regulations and Institutional Cooperation
7	Government	Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas)	Dwi Rahayuningsih	F	Coordinator, Inclusivity Team
8	Government	National Commission on Disability (Indonesia)	Dante Rigmalia	F	Chairman of the National Commission of Disabilities
			Try Manulang	F	

ID	Type	Organization	Interviewee(s)	Gender	Notes
9	Trade Union	KSBSI	Carlos	M	Chairman of the Central Executive Board of FSB Nikeuba (Federation of Trade Unions in Commerce, Informatics, Finance, Banking and Various Industries)
10	NGO	Sasana Inklusi & Gerakan Advokasi Difabel (SIGAB)	Joni Yulianto	M	Executive Director
Japan					
11	Employers' organization	Japan Business Federation (KEIDANREN)	N/A written unattributed answers		
12	Specialist	Hosei University	Ryuhei Sano	M	
13	Specialist	International Labour Organization (ILO), Geneva	Yuta Momose	M	Technical Officer
Republic of Korea					
14	Employers' organization	Korea Employers Federation (KEF)	Yeonjoo Sohn	F	Senior Specialist
15	Specialist		Yonghyeon Nam	M	Senior Specialist, International Affairs Team
Malaysia					
16	Government	Social Security Organisation (PERKESO)	Md Yazit Bin Hashim	M	Head of Strategy, Employment Services Division
Philippines					
17	OPD	WOW LEAP	Carmen Zubiaga	F	
18	NGO	Project Inclusion	Grant Javier; Kevin Hombrebueno	M	
19	ILO	ILO Philippines	Steph; Cocoy	F	

ID	Type	Organization	Interviewee(s)	Gender	Notes
Singapore					
20	Autonomous (set up by the Ministry of Social and Family Development)	SG Enable	Eelin Ong	F	Lead agency for disability employment support
21	Employers	Singapore Business Disability Network (SBNOD)	Alasdair Ong; Hua-Han Ong; Alister Ong	M	
Thailand					
22	Government	Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS)			Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEP)
23	Employers' organization	Employers' Confederation of Thailand (ECOT)	Kornchai Kaewmahawongse	M	
			Ukrish Kanchanaketu	M	
			Bavornsak Klaharn	M	
24	Government	Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS)		4F	International Cooperation Section, Division of Strategies and Plans, DEP
25	Trade Union	State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation (SERC), Thailand	Manop Kuerat		General Secretary
26	Employers	Thailand Business Disability Network Steps	Max Simpson;	M	
			Namnam Fuwongcharoeon	F	
Global and regional stakeholders					
27	Specialist	Former ILO Officer	Barbara Murray	F	

ILO Country Office for Indonesia and Timor-Leste

Menara Thamrin Level 22,
Jl. M.H Thamrin Kav. 3
Jakarta 10250, Indonesia

Email: jakarta@ilo.org

Phone: +6221 3913112

Fax: +62 21 3983 8959

ISBN: 9789220436431