

The Right to Accessible Transportation in Indonesia: Evaluating Disability Inclusion in Jakarta's Public Transport System

Ahmad Ilyas* 

Universitas Pancasila, Jakarta, Indonesia
ahmadilyas@students.univpancasila.ac.id

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.65815/kt7xac54>

Submitted: 18-12-2025

Revised: 22-03-2026, 05-04-2026

Accepted: 10-04-2026

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

Accessible transportation is essential for the effective enjoyment of education, employment, healthcare, and participation in public life by persons with disabilities. Jakarta has expanded public transportation infrastructure and introduced accessibility measures, yet physical, informational, and institutional barriers may continue to limit independent mobility. This article examines the implementation of the right to accessible transportation in Jakarta. Using normative juridical and policy analysis, the study evaluates disability rights law, transportation regulation, accessibility standards, and public-service obligations. The article argues that accessibility should be understood as a legally enforceable right rather than merely a service improvement. Compliance should encompass stations, vehicles, pedestrian connections, ticketing systems, digital information, emergency procedures, and staff assistance. The study proposes an accessibility governance framework incorporating universal design, measurable service standards, regular accessibility audits, disability participation, and effective complaint mechanisms. Persons with disabilities should be directly involved in evaluating transportation policies and infrastructure. The article concludes that Jakarta's public transportation system can become a model of rights-based urban mobility if accessibility requirements are integrated into planning, procurement, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms.

[Aksesibilitas transportasi sangat penting untuk menikmati pendidikan, pekerjaan, layanan kesehatan, dan partisipasi dalam kehidupan publik secara efektif bagi penyandang disabilitas. Jakarta telah memperluas infrastruktur transportasi publik dan memperkenalkan langkah-langkah aksesibilitas, namun hambatan fisik, informasional, dan kelembagaan mungkin masih membatasi mobilitas mandiri. Artikel ini mengkaji implementasi hak atas aksesibilitas transportasi di Jakarta. Dengan menggunakan analisis yuridis dan kebijakan normatif, studi ini mengevaluasi hukum hak penyandang disabilitas, regulasi transportasi, standar aksesibilitas, dan kewajiban



pelayanan publik. Artikel ini berpendapat bahwa aksesibilitas harus dipahami sebagai hak yang dapat ditegakkan secara hukum, bukan hanya sekadar peningkatan layanan. Kepatuhan harus mencakup stasiun, kendaraan, koneksi pejalan kaki, sistem tiket, informasi digital, prosedur darurat, dan bantuan staf. Studi ini mengusulkan kerangka kerja tata kelola aksesibilitas yang menggabungkan desain universal, standar layanan yang terukur, audit aksesibilitas berkala, partisipasi penyandang disabilitas, dan mekanisme pengaduan yang efektif. Penyandang disabilitas harus dilibatkan secara langsung dalam mengevaluasi kebijakan dan infrastruktur transportasi. Artikel ini menyimpulkan bahwa sistem transportasi publik Jakarta dapat menjadi model mobilitas perkotaan berbasis hak jika persyaratan aksesibilitas diintegrasikan ke dalam perencanaan, pengadaan, pemantauan, dan mekanisme penegakan hukum.]

Keywords: Disability rights, accessible transportation, Jakarta, public services, human rights

Introduction

Transportation is not merely a mechanism for moving people from one location to another. In contemporary urban societies, mobility determines access to employment, education, healthcare, political institutions, social relationships, recreation, and other opportunities necessary for a dignified life. For persons with disabilities, the relationship between transportation and social participation is particularly significant because inaccessible mobility can transform otherwise available opportunities into practically inaccessible ones. International research consistently demonstrates that persons with disabilities experience different travel patterns from non-disabled populations, including fewer trips, shorter travel distances, greater dependence on public transportation or other assisted modes, and greater exposure to environmental and systemic barriers (Park et al. 2023). Accessible transportation therefore constitutes an important dimension of substantive equality. If a person cannot independently reach a workplace, university, hospital, government office, or community facility because public transport is inaccessible, formal equality before the law does not translate into equality in everyday life.

The Indonesian legal framework increasingly recognizes this principle. The ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities through Law No. 19 of 2011 and the enactment of Law No. 8 of 2016 concerning Persons with Disabilities established a stronger legal foundation for equality, accessibility, reasonable accommodation, and participation. Transportation regulation has also developed through sector-specific standards concerning accessibility for users with special needs. Nevertheless, the existence of legal rules does not automatically

guarantee accessible mobility. Research concerning public transportation in Indonesia has repeatedly identified gaps between regulatory expectations and practical implementation. Earlier research on public transportation accessibility for persons with disabilities in Indonesia found that access remained problematic despite the existence of statutory requirements (Wahyuni, Murti, and Joebagio 2015). More recent research similarly demonstrates that accessibility problems persist across different cities and transportation modes.

Jakarta provides an important case for examining this gap because it has one of Indonesia's most extensive and rapidly developing integrated public transportation systems. TransJakarta, MRT Jakarta, commuter rail, and integrated feeder services have introduced ramps, elevators, tactile guidance, priority areas, accessible toilets, dedicated staff assistance, and specialized services. TransJakarta Cares, for example, represents an institutional effort to facilitate mobility for persons with disabilities, while research concerning Jakarta's broader transportation policy identifies the development of accessibility facilities as part of the city's response to disability rights obligations (Irviani and Wijayanto 2020; Sianipar, Astuti, and Turtiantoro 2022). However, the existence of individual accessibility facilities does not necessarily create an accessible transportation system. A wheelchair user may encounter an accessible vehicle but an inaccessible sidewalk, a blind passenger may encounter tactile paving but insufficient audio information, or a person with psychosocial or cognitive disabilities may encounter technically compliant infrastructure without understandable information or adequate assistance.

The central argument of this article is therefore that accessibility must be evaluated through the entire journey chain rather than by counting individual facilities. Research on public transportation and disability emphasizes that barriers can arise before boarding, during transfers, within vehicles, at stations, and after passengers leave the system (Park and Chowdhury 2022). Such barriers can increase travel time, reduce trip frequency, restrict independence, and ultimately diminish participation in society. A rights-based assessment must consequently ask whether the system enables persons with different disabilities to travel safely, independently, affordably, predictably, and with dignity. This article examines that question in the context of Jakarta and argues that disability inclusion requires a shift from facility-based compliance toward system-wide accessibility governance.

This study adopts a normative juridical and policy-analysis approach supported by empirical socio-legal and transportation research. The normative analysis examines Indonesian constitutional principles, disability legislation, public-service obligations, transportation regulations, and Indonesia's obligations under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The analysis focuses particularly on equality, non-discrimination, accessibility, reasonable accommodation, participation, independent living, and effective remedies. International human rights principles are used as interpretive standards for assessing whether domestic transportation governance provides meaningful rather than merely formal equality. The study does not treat accessibility as a purely

engineering concept. Instead, accessibility is examined as a multidimensional legal obligation involving physical infrastructure, information, communication, service organization, affordability, safety, independence, and institutional accountability.

The empirical component draws upon peer-reviewed research published no later than 2025 concerning disability and public transportation in Jakarta and other Indonesian cities, supplemented by international literature on accessible transport, universal design, mobility justice, travel behavior, and disability inclusion. Jakarta-specific studies include research concerning TransJakarta, MRT Jakarta, commuter rail at Manggarai, Dukuh Atas and Manggarai stations, and travel satisfaction among persons with disabilities in metropolitan Indonesia (Yola 2023; Fitri and Lesmawati 2024; Jovansa, Nurcahyanto, and Yuniningsih 2024; Rafi and Yulianti 2025). The analysis uses a descriptive, argumentative, and analytical structure to identify existing developments, evaluate their legal and social implications, and formulate a governance framework capable of converting accessibility commitments into enforceable public-service standards.

Disability Rights and Accessible Transportation as a Human Rights Obligation

The right to accessible transportation derives from the broader principle that persons with disabilities are entitled to participate in society on an equal basis with others. Article 9 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities establishes accessibility as a condition for independent living and full participation, requiring states to identify and eliminate obstacles and barriers to accessibility. Transportation is explicitly connected to this obligation. Indonesia's ratification of the Convention therefore requires public authorities to interpret transportation policy through an equality-based framework rather than treating accessibility as voluntary social assistance. Law No. 8 of 2016 reinforces this orientation by recognizing accessibility and reasonable accommodation as important elements of disability rights. The legal significance is substantial: inaccessible transportation may constitute a structural barrier that prevents persons with disabilities from exercising rights guaranteed in other areas of law. Accessibility is consequently not an isolated transportation issue but a cross-cutting condition for the realization of education, employment, healthcare, political participation, and cultural rights.

The relationship between transportation and substantive equality is supported by extensive empirical evidence. Research examining daily travel behavior finds that persons with disabilities generally make fewer trips and travel shorter distances than people without disabilities, while facing environmental, social, and institutional barriers (Park et al. 2023). This difference should not automatically be interpreted as an individual preference. When transportation infrastructure is inaccessible, reduced mobility may represent an imposed restriction rather than a voluntary choice. Similarly, research on community participation demonstrates that transportation barriers can directly reduce participation in activities outside the

home, with certain disability groups experiencing substantially greater difficulties than others (Bezyak et al. 2020). The human rights implication is therefore clear: transportation accessibility must be assessed according to its effects on actual opportunities rather than simply according to whether an authority has installed a ramp or elevator.

The concept of accessibility must also extend beyond physical infrastructure. A narrow understanding of accessibility often focuses on ramps, elevators, low-floor buses, tactile paving, accessible toilets, and wheelchair spaces. These elements are essential, but they represent only one dimension of accessibility. Persons with visual, hearing, cognitive, intellectual, psychosocial, or multiple disabilities may encounter barriers that cannot be solved by architectural modifications alone. Research examining universal design in transportation emphasizes that organizational, social, informational, and experiential conditions can be as important as physical design (Nielsen 2023). Similarly, systematic research on the complete public transportation journey demonstrates that barriers can occur at every stage, from reaching the station to obtaining information, boarding, transferring, and completing the final connection (Park and Chowdhury 2022). Jakarta's accessibility policy should therefore define the accessible journey as the legal object of protection rather than the individual accessible facility.

This broader approach is also consistent with the principle of independent mobility. Accessibility is not fully achieved when a passenger can travel only with constant assistance from another person. Assistance may be necessary and should remain available, but a rights-compatible system should maximize the ability of persons with disabilities to travel independently whenever possible. Research on accessible transportation demonstrates that accessible design can increase perceived safety, improve service quality, encourage public transport use, and enhance access to essential urban resources (Sze and Christensen 2017). A system that requires passengers to depend on discretionary assistance at multiple stages of a journey may remain institutionally fragile because access becomes contingent on staff availability. Independence should therefore be incorporated into service standards and evaluated alongside safety, affordability, reliability, and convenience.

Accessibility Gaps in Jakarta's Public Transportation System

Jakarta has made significant progress in incorporating accessibility into public transportation, but evidence indicates that implementation remains uneven. Research concerning Bus Rapid Transit services in Jakarta found that accessibility for passengers with disabilities remained inadequate in several aspects, including facilities, vehicles, and staff services (Yola 2023). Research concerning commuter rail at Manggarai similarly found that three dimensions of accessibility—ease, usefulness, and independence—were not yet optimal, although safety was comparatively stronger (Jovansa, Nurcahyanto, and Yuniningsih 2024). These

findings demonstrate that infrastructure modernization does not automatically produce inclusive mobility. Accessibility is a service-quality question as much as an architectural question. The passenger must be able to navigate the system, understand available information, enter and leave vehicles safely, transfer between services, and complete the journey without disproportionate dependence on others.

Research on Dukuh Atas and Manggarai further illustrates the distinction between having accessibility facilities and achieving inclusive transportation. The existence of elevators, ramps, tactile paving, priority spaces, and other accommodations may create an appearance of compliance, but their availability does not establish whether persons with disabilities can use the entire transportation system independently. Recent research on inclusive citizenship in Jakarta emphasizes that the inclusion of persons with disabilities cannot be established merely through the provision of facilities; persons with disabilities should participate in planning and evaluation processes to determine whether services are genuinely usable (Rafi and Yulianti 2025). This argument is important because technical compliance may overlook practical problems such as unclear signage, inaccessible pedestrian approaches, inconsistent staff assistance, poorly coordinated transfers, or facilities that are technically present but difficult to use.

Travel satisfaction provides another indicator of the quality of accessibility. A transportation system may technically satisfy minimum infrastructure standards while still producing unsatisfactory experiences for users with disabilities. Research focusing specifically on persons with disabilities in metropolitan Indonesia found that travel satisfaction in Jakarta is an important dimension for evaluating whether transportation services adequately respond to their mobility needs (Fitri and Lesmawati 2024). This perspective changes the evaluation from “Does the facility exist?” to “Does the passenger experience the system as usable, safe, predictable, and dignified?” Such a shift is consistent with human rights because rights should be evaluated according to their practical enjoyment. If passengers remain uncertain about whether elevators will function, whether staff will understand their needs, whether information will be accessible, or whether transfers can be completed independently, formal accessibility may not translate into substantive inclusion.

The problem also extends beyond the core transportation facilities to the surrounding urban environment. An accessible train station or bus stop cannot function as an inclusive service if the pedestrian route connecting the passenger's home to the station contains obstacles, unsafe crossings, inaccessible sidewalks, steep curbs, or poorly designed tactile paths. International research demonstrates that sidewalk conditions can significantly influence disparities in public transport accessibility for wheelchair users (Huang et al. 2023). The same principle is relevant to Jakarta, where transportation accessibility must be evaluated as a network rather than as isolated infrastructure. A person using a wheelchair may successfully enter an MRT station but still face barriers when moving from the neighborhood to the station entrance. Similarly, a blind passenger may access a station but encounter discontinuous tactile guidance on the surrounding pedestrian network. Urban

accessibility therefore requires coordination between transportation agencies, public-works authorities, spatial planners, and local governments.

Information accessibility represents another critical gap. Public transportation increasingly depends on digital applications, electronic ticketing, real-time information, route-planning systems, and mobile communication. These innovations can improve convenience, but they can also create new forms of exclusion if digital interfaces are not compatible with screen readers, do not provide sufficient visual contrast, lack captions, or assume that every passenger can use a smartphone. Research on travel behavior demonstrates that information barriers form an important component of the transportation disadvantages experienced by persons with disabilities (Park and Chowdhury 2022). Studies of transit satisfaction also indicate that information available at bus stops can significantly influence the experiences of riders with disabilities (Verbich and El-Geneidy 2016). Accessibility governance in Jakarta should therefore cover digital accessibility as an integral component of transportation rights rather than treating it as a separate information-technology concern.

Universal Design, Participation, and the Right to Independent Mobility

Universal design provides a valuable conceptual foundation for disability-inclusive transportation because it seeks to create environments usable by the widest possible range of people without requiring separate or exceptional solutions. In transportation, this can involve low-floor vehicles, level boarding, tactile guidance, audible announcements, visual information, accessible ticketing, sufficient circulation space, and intuitive wayfinding. However, universal design should not be interpreted as a purely technical concept. Research on psychosocial disability demonstrates that universal design must also account for crowding, uncertainty, staff behavior, social interaction, information, fatigue, and organizational conditions (Nielsen 2023). This is especially important in large metropolitan systems such as Jakarta, where passengers encounter complex transfers, high passenger volumes, noise, time pressure, and multiple information channels. A technically accessible system may therefore remain psychologically or organizationally inaccessible for some users.

The diversity of disability experiences also means that accessibility cannot be standardized around a single model of the “disabled passenger.” Wheelchair users may prioritize level boarding and sufficient circulation space, blind passengers may depend on tactile and audio information, deaf passengers may require visual announcements, and passengers with cognitive or psychosocial disabilities may need predictable information, clear signage, reduced sensory overload, or staff assistance. Systematic research confirms that different disability groups experience different travel barriers and that conventional transport planning often fails to account for this diversity (Park et al. 2023). Consequently, Jakarta should adopt a

flexible accessibility standard that establishes universal minimum requirements while also requiring disability-specific assessments. This approach would avoid both extremes: designing separately for every disability in a fragmented manner or assuming that one generic accessibility package will meet every user's needs.

Meaningful participation is essential to this process. Persons with disabilities possess experiential knowledge that cannot be fully replaced by technical consultants or administrative assessments. They can identify problems that may remain invisible during conventional infrastructure inspections, including difficult-to-use elevators, poorly positioned signs, inaccessible ticket machines, inadequate boarding gaps, or staff practices that create dependence. Research on inclusive transportation design shows that involving persons with disabilities directly in design and co-creation can improve the quality of transportation experiences (Cerdan Chiscano 2020). Similarly, Jakarta-focused research argues that disability inclusion requires participation in planning rather than merely the provision of facilities after infrastructure has been designed (Rafi and Yulianti 2025). Participation should therefore occur before procurement, during construction, during testing, and throughout service evaluation.

Participation should also be institutional rather than occasional. A single consultation meeting cannot substitute for continuous disability representation in transportation governance. Jakarta's transport authorities should establish formal accessibility advisory mechanisms involving organizations representing different disability groups. Such mechanisms could review station designs, vehicle procurement, digital applications, emergency procedures, signage, and proposed service changes. Persons with disabilities should also be included in accessibility audits and service-performance evaluations. This would transform participation from a procedural formality into a mechanism of accountability. The approach is consistent with the principle of "nothing about us without us," under which disability policy is developed with meaningful involvement of those directly affected. It also improves administrative legitimacy because accessibility decisions become more responsive to actual user experiences.

The right to independent mobility further requires that staff assistance be available without making assistance the default condition for access. Research on the whole journey chain shows that dependence on assistance can become a significant barrier when staff are unavailable or when procedures are inconsistent (Park and Chowdhury 2022). Jakarta should therefore develop service standards requiring predictable assistance while simultaneously designing infrastructure and operational procedures that maximize independence. Staff should receive disability-specific training, including communication with deaf passengers, guidance for blind passengers, wheelchair handling, respectful interaction, emergency evacuation, and support for passengers with cognitive or psychosocial disabilities. Accessibility training should be incorporated into recruitment, certification, periodic evaluation, and performance management. In this model,

accessibility becomes an organizational competency rather than an optional courtesy.

From Facility-Based Compliance to Accessibility Governance

A central weakness in accessibility policy is the tendency to measure compliance by counting facilities rather than evaluating outcomes. Governments may report the number of accessible stations, elevators, buses, tactile paths, or priority seats without determining whether passengers can complete journeys independently. This approach risks creating what may be described as “fragmented accessibility,” where individual elements meet technical requirements but the system remains inaccessible as a whole. Research on mobility-device users demonstrates that barriers can arise from vehicle design, boarding procedures, ramps, station layouts, and operational practices (Unsworth et al. 2021). Jakarta should consequently develop a journey-based accessibility audit that evaluates the passenger experience from origin to destination. The audit should examine pedestrian access, station entry, ticketing, information, security, boarding, travel inside vehicles, transfers, emergency procedures, and final connections.

Accessibility audits should produce measurable indicators that can be incorporated into transportation performance contracts. Indicators could include the percentage of stations with independently usable elevators, the reliability of accessible equipment, the proportion of vehicles providing accessible boarding, the availability of audio and visual information, the accessibility of ticketing systems, staff response times, and the number and resolution rate of disability-related complaints. Importantly, performance should be disaggregated by disability type because an infrastructure element may be effective for one group but inadequate for another. Research on transportation equity emphasizes that different disability groups may experience different levels of mobility and accessibility, while gender and socioeconomic characteristics can further influence mobility outcomes (Uddin, Pan, and Hwang 2023; Legrain et al. 2024). A measurable framework would allow Jakarta to move from general commitments toward enforceable service obligations.

Procurement policy is another critical point of intervention. If accessibility requirements are added only after vehicles, stations, software, or ticketing systems have already been purchased, retrofitting may become costly and incomplete. Accessibility should therefore be embedded in procurement specifications from the beginning. Vehicles should be evaluated for boarding gaps, wheelchair spaces, priority seating, audio and visual announcements, and internal circulation. Stations should be evaluated for elevators, ramps, tactile guidance, accessible toilets, emergency routes, signage, and pedestrian connections. Digital systems should undergo accessibility testing before deployment. Procurement contracts should include enforceable performance clauses and remedies when suppliers fail to meet accessibility requirements. This approach would make universal design part of

ordinary infrastructure governance rather than an additional expense imposed after construction.

Emergency preparedness deserves particular attention because accessibility during normal operations does not guarantee accessibility during disruptions. Persons with disabilities may face disproportionate risks during fires, power outages, flooding, equipment failures, crowding, or emergency evacuations. An elevator failure, for example, can transform an accessible station into an inaccessible environment for wheelchair users. Emergency announcements may also fail if information is delivered through only one communication channel. Accessible emergency planning should therefore include visual, auditory, tactile, and staff-assisted communication, accessible evacuation routes, alternative boarding arrangements, and procedures for equipment failure. Persons with disabilities should participate in emergency simulations because standard drills may not reveal the practical barriers they encounter. This would connect accessibility governance with the broader principle of safety and disaster preparedness.

Complaint mechanisms are equally important because rights without remedies remain difficult to enforce. Persons with disabilities should have accessible, inexpensive, and non-discriminatory channels for reporting barriers. Complaints should be available through multiple formats, including accessible digital platforms, telephone services, text-based communication, and direct reporting to staff. The system should permit complaints concerning physical infrastructure, discriminatory treatment, inaccessible information, equipment failures, and denial of reasonable accommodation. Importantly, complaint data should be publicly analyzed to identify recurring systemic problems rather than treated solely as individual customer-service incidents. A high number of complaints concerning elevators, tactile guidance, staff conduct, or ticketing accessibility may indicate a governance problem requiring structural intervention.

Disability Inclusion, Mobility Justice, and Social Participation

The accessibility of public transportation should ultimately be evaluated through the concept of mobility justice. Mobility justice emphasizes that movement is distributed unequally and that transportation systems can reproduce social inequalities when certain groups experience greater restrictions on movement and access to opportunities. Persons with disabilities are particularly exposed to this form of inequality because inaccessible infrastructure can limit both where they can go and how independently they can travel. Research in Indonesia demonstrates that persons with disabilities are less likely to use conventional public transportation than non-disabled persons, suggesting that existing systems continue to impose meaningful mobility barriers (Ariansyah et al. 2025). This is significant because lower public transport use among persons with disabilities may not simply reflect preference; it may indicate adaptation to an inaccessible system.

The implications extend beyond transportation itself. Restricted mobility can reduce access to employment and consequently affect income and economic independence. It can limit educational opportunities when students cannot reliably reach schools or universities. It can delay medical treatment when healthcare facilities are difficult to reach. It can restrict social participation when spontaneous travel becomes difficult or unpredictable. Research on community participation demonstrates precisely this relationship between transportation barriers and reduced engagement in community activities (Bezyak et al. 2020). Transportation accessibility should therefore be incorporated into broader disability inclusion strategies, including employment, education, healthcare, housing, and social protection policies. Jakarta's transportation system should be assessed not only by transport indicators such as passenger numbers and travel time but also by its contribution to social inclusion.

Gender and socioeconomic status should also be integrated into accessibility governance. Disability is not experienced independently of other social characteristics. Low-income persons with disabilities may have fewer alternatives when public transport is inaccessible because they cannot afford private vehicles or repeated ride-hailing services. Women with disabilities may experience additional safety and dependence concerns. Persons living outside central Jakarta may face longer first- and last-mile journeys and weaker connectivity to accessible transport services. Research on disability and transportation choices indicates that income, location, and environmental conditions influence mobility patterns among persons with disabilities (Uddin, Pan, and Hwang 2023). A rights-based policy should therefore prioritize the communities experiencing the greatest combined mobility disadvantages rather than distributing accessibility investments solely according to passenger volume or commercial importance.

The development of specialized services can complement universal design but should not replace it. Jakarta's TransJakarta Cares illustrates the value of specialized transportation assistance for people who may have difficulty using conventional services. Research indicates that the program has contributed to improving accessibility through institutional coordination and dedicated services (Irviani and Wijayanto 2020). Specialized services are important because some passengers require individualized assistance that cannot reasonably be provided through universal infrastructure alone. However, reliance on specialized services can also unintentionally reinforce segregation if mainstream transportation remains inaccessible. The objective should therefore be a dual system in which conventional public transport becomes progressively more accessible while specialized services remain available as reasonable accommodation for passengers with particular needs.

The experience of other Indonesian cities reinforces the importance of this distinction. Research on Trans Metro Bandung identified continuing gaps between regulatory commitments and practical accessibility, while studies concerning Trans Semarang similarly demonstrate the importance of aligning infrastructure, service

provision, and disability rights (Simanjuntak, Rusli, and Susanti 2019; Suwandi et al. 2021). Research concerning Mikrotrans Jakarta also shows that disability organizations play an important advocacy role in expanding access to transportation services (Bonpalda and Ghofur 2024). These findings suggest that inclusive transportation is not achieved by government action alone. It requires continuous interaction among government authorities, transportation operators, infrastructure providers, disability organizations, civil society, and passengers. Accessibility governance should institutionalize this cooperation rather than relying on individual advocacy campaigns.

Jakarta's experience therefore offers a broader lesson for Indonesian urban policy. A large transportation network can become more inclusive when accessibility is incorporated at the beginning of planning and continuously evaluated through user experience. Research on accessible transport systems consistently demonstrates that design improvements can increase safety, perceived accessibility, public transport use, and quality of life (Sze and Christensen 2017). More recent research on Indonesia also emphasizes that accessibility is central to mobility equality and social justice (Ariansyah et al. 2025). Jakarta has the institutional capacity and infrastructure base to move toward this model, but doing so requires a shift from viewing disability access as a special facility toward recognizing it as a core quality of public transportation.

Toward a Rights-Based Accessibility Framework for Jakarta

A rights-based accessibility framework should begin with the principle that accessibility is an enforceable entitlement. Transportation agencies should be legally and administratively required to provide services that are accessible, safe, affordable, predictable, and usable by persons with diverse disabilities. This obligation should be reflected in transportation plans, annual budgets, procurement documents, operator contracts, infrastructure standards, and performance evaluations. Accessibility should not depend on the discretionary priorities of individual managers or the availability of special funding. Its integration into ordinary governance would reduce the risk that disability inclusion is treated as an additional program rather than a fundamental public-service obligation.

The second element should be universal design combined with reasonable accommodation. Universal design should establish the baseline standard for all major infrastructure and services, including stations, vehicles, pedestrian connections, ticketing, information, and digital platforms. Reasonable accommodation should then address individual needs that cannot be fully met through universal design. This combination is important because universal design alone cannot anticipate every disability-related need, while individualized accommodation alone can produce fragmented and dependency-based services. Research on inclusive public transport increasingly supports integrated approaches that combine network-wide accessibility with disability-specific solutions (Moussi

et al. 2025). Jakarta should therefore avoid choosing between universal design and specialized services; it should develop both within a coherent rights-based system.

The third element should be mandatory disability participation. Persons with disabilities should participate in the design, testing, monitoring, and evaluation of transportation infrastructure and services. This participation should include representative organizations but should also seek diversity across disability categories, gender, age, and socioeconomic conditions. Accessibility audits should be conducted with users, not merely for users. New stations and vehicles should undergo user-based accessibility testing before full operation, while existing infrastructure should be periodically reassessed. This would transform lived experience into an institutional source of policy evidence. The approach is supported by research showing that co-design with persons with disabilities can improve the transportation experience and reveal barriers that conventional design processes overlook (Cerdan Chiscano 2020).

The fourth element should be continuous and transparent accountability. Jakarta should publish accessibility performance indicators and periodically report on equipment reliability, service interruptions, complaint resolution, staff training, and user satisfaction. Accessibility audits should be conducted by independent or sufficiently autonomous bodies, with findings made publicly available. Complaints should trigger not only individual remedies but also systemic review when patterns emerge. The objective is to establish a feedback loop in which barriers are identified, corrected, monitored, and prevented from recurring. Such governance would be particularly important because accessibility is not static. Infrastructure deteriorates, technologies change, transportation networks expand, and user needs evolve. Continuous monitoring is therefore more appropriate than one-time compliance certification.

Finally, accessibility should be integrated into broader urban planning. Jakarta cannot achieve inclusive mobility if accessible transportation is disconnected from accessible housing, sidewalks, public buildings, schools, hospitals, workplaces, and public spaces. The transportation network should be planned as part of an integrated accessibility ecosystem. Research on metropolitan accessibility demonstrates that physical connections and network characteristics influence the actual opportunities available to travelers (Shabrina and Nurlaela 2021). Disability inclusion therefore requires cooperation between transportation, spatial planning, public works, housing, social affairs, and digital-government authorities. Such integration would transform accessibility from a sector-specific requirement into a citywide principle of inclusive urban development.

Conclusion

The right to accessible transportation should be understood as a substantive human rights obligation rather than a discretionary improvement to public services. Jakarta has made significant progress through the expansion of public transportation and

the introduction of accessibility facilities and specialized services, but empirical research continues to identify gaps involving independence, information, continuity, staff assistance, physical connections, and user experience. These gaps demonstrate that accessibility cannot be measured simply by the existence of ramps, elevators, tactile paving, or priority seats. The relevant question is whether persons with different disabilities can complete their journeys safely, independently, affordably, predictably, and with dignity. Because transportation determines access to employment, education, healthcare, public institutions, and social participation, inaccessible mobility can reproduce broader forms of inequality even where formal legal rights are recognized.

Jakarta should consequently move from facility-based compliance toward rights-based accessibility governance. Universal design, reasonable accommodation, disability participation, measurable service standards, accessibility audits, accessible information, staff accountability, emergency preparedness, and effective complaint mechanisms should be incorporated into planning, procurement, operation, monitoring, and enforcement. Persons with disabilities should participate directly in determining whether transportation services are genuinely accessible. Specialized services such as dedicated assistance should complement rather than substitute for accessible mainstream transportation. If these principles are institutionalized, Jakarta has the potential to become a national model for disability-inclusive urban mobility. More importantly, such transformation would affirm that accessible transportation is not simply about improving infrastructure; it is about ensuring that persons with disabilities can exercise their rights, participate in society, and live independently on an equal basis with others.

References

- Arianto, Dwi, and Nurliana Cipta Apsari. 2022. "Gambaran Aksesibilitas, Inklusivitas, dan Hambatan Penyandang Disabilitas dalam Memanfaatkan Transportasi Publik: Studi Literatur di Berbagai Negara." *Focus: Jurnal Pekerjaan Sosial* 5 (2).
- Ariansyah, Kasmad, Caecilia Suprpti Dwi Takariani, Diana Sari, Ahmad Budi Setiawan, Syarif Budhirianto, and Ardison. 2025. "Transportation Accessibility for People with Disabilities: Examining Preferences for Conventional Public Transport and Ride-Hailing Services in Indonesia." *Case Studies on Transport Policy* 20: 101451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cstp.2025.101451>.
- Bezyak, Jill Louise, Scott Sabella, Joy Hammel, Katherine McDonald, Robin Ann Jones, and Dana Barton. 2020. "Community Participation and Public Transportation Barriers Experienced by People with Disabilities." *Disability*

- and Rehabilitation* 42 (23): 3275–3283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2019.1590469>.
- Bonpalda, Ginna Glyceria, and Abdul Ghofur. 2024. “Advocacy of Gerakan Aksesibilitas Umum Nasional for Persons with Disabilities in Using Mikrotrans JakLingko Mode of Transportation.” *Jurnal Ad’ministrare* 11 (1). <https://doi.org/10.71309/administrare.v11i1.2235>.
- Cerdan Chiscano, Monica. 2020. “Improving the Design of Urban Transport Experience with People with Disabilities.” *Research in Transportation Business & Management* 37: 100596. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rtbm.2020.100596>.
- Fitri, Husnul, and Diah Rini Lesmawati. 2024. “Travel Satisfaction of Persons with Disabilities in Metropolitan Indonesia: A Case of Jakarta.” *Indonesian Journal of Disability Studies* 11 (2). <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.ijds.2024.11.2.2>.
- Irviani, Evi, and Hendra Wijayanto. 2020. “Implementasi Layanan Publik Transjakarta Cares dalam Meningkatkan Aksesibilitas Penyandang Disabilitas di Wilayah Provinsi DKI Jakarta.” *The Indonesian Journal of Public Administration* 6 (2).
- Jovansa, Jesia Charel, Herbasuki Nurcahyanto, and Tri Yuniningsih. 2024. “Analisis Aksesibilitas Pelayanan Transportasi Publik Commuter Line bagi Penyandang Disabilitas di Stasiun Manggarai Jakarta Selatan.” *Journal of Management and Public Policy* 13 (3): 252–273. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jppmr.v13i3.44875>.
- Legrain, Alain, et al. 2024. “Exploring Transportation Equity Issues for Persons with Disabilities: The Impact of Gender on Mobility and Accessibility Indicators.” *Journal of Transport & Health* 36: 101801. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2024.101801>.
- Moussi, et al. 2025. “Inclusion Persons with Disabilities to a Public Transport System: An Integrative Decision-Aiding Approach.” *Transportation Research Procedia* 82: 3007–3033. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2024.12.233>.
- Nielsen, Anja Fleten. 2023. “Universal Design for People with Psychosocial Disabilities – The Effect of COVID-19.” *Research in Transportation Economics* 98: 101280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2023.101280>.
- Park, Jun, and Subeh Chowdhury. 2022. “Towards an Enabled Journey: Barriers Encountered by Public Transport Riders with Disabilities for the Whole Journey Chain.” *Transport Reviews* 42 (2): 181–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2021.1955035>.
- Park, Keunhyun, Hossein Nasr Esfahani, Valerie Long Novack, Jeff Sheen, Hooman Hadayeghi, Ziqi Song, and Keith Christensen. 2023. “Impacts of Disability on Daily Travel Behaviour: A Systematic Review.” *Transport Reviews* 43 (2): 178–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2022.2060371>.
- Rafi, Muhamad, and Isneningtyas Yulianti. 2025. “Kewarganegaraan Inklusif Penyandang Disabilitas dalam Aksesibilitas Transportasi Publik: Studi

- Aksesibilitas Stasiun Dukuh Atas dan Manggarai." *Jurnal Masyarakat dan Budaya* 26 (1). <https://doi.org/10.55981.2024.14034>.
- Shabrina, Salsa, and Siti Nurlaela. 2021. "Komparasi Tingkat Aksesibilitas Jaringan Transportasi Publik bagi Pekerja Ulang-Alik di Kawasan Surabaya Metropolitan Area." *TATALOKA* 23 (3): 363–376. <https://doi.org/10.14710/tataloka.23.3.363-376>.
- Sianipar, Jose, Puji Astuti, and Turtiantoro. 2022. "Analisis Kebijakan Pemerintah Daerah dalam Pemenuhan Aksesibilitas Penyandang Disabilitas terhadap Layanan Moda Transportasi di DKI Jakarta." *Journal of Politic and Government Studies* 11 (2).
- Simanjuntak, Jeremia G. G. Parulian, Budiman Rusli, and Elisa Susanti. 2019. "Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities in Trans Metro Bandung Services." *Indonesian Journal of Disability Studies* 6 (2): 149–156. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.ijds.2019.006.02.4>.
- Suwandi, Putri Anggi Permata, Bayu Singgih Saputro, Wilarso Hermanto, and Agung Kristiawan. 2021. "Accessibility of Transportation Facilities for Disabilities: Case Study of Trans Semarang." *International Journal of Sustainable Building, Infrastructure and Environment*.
- Sze, Nang Ngai, and Keith M. Christensen. 2017. "Access to Urban Transportation System for Individuals with Disabilities." *IATSS Research* 41 (2): 66–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iatssr.2017.05.002>.
- Uddin, Md Majbah, Meiyu Pan, and Ho-Ling Hwang. 2023. "Factors Influencing Mode Choice of Adults with Travel-Limiting Disability." *Journal of Transport & Health* 33: 101714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2023.101714>.
- Unsworth, Carolyn, Man Hei So, Julian Chua, Prasad Gudimetla, and Anjum Naweed. 2021. "A Systematic Review of Public Transport Accessibility for People Using Mobility Devices." *Disability and Rehabilitation* 43 (16): 2253–2267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2019.1697382>.
- Verbich, David, and Ahmed M. El-Geneidy. 2016. "The Pursuit of Satisfaction: Variation in Satisfaction with Bus Transit Service among Riders with Encumbrances and Riders with Disabilities Using a Large-Scale Survey from London, UK." *Transport Policy* 47: 64–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2015.12.009>.
- Wahyuni, Endang Sri, Bhisma Murti, and Hermanu Joebagio. 2015. "Public Transport Accessibility for People with Disabilities." *Journal of Health Policy and Management*.
- Wijaya, Amelia Tharuni, and Lestari Nurhajati. 2017. "Implementasi CRPD dalam Aspek Aksesibilitas Transportation Publik di DKI Jakarta." *Bricolage: Jurnal Magister Ilmu Komunikasi*.
- Yola, Lin. 2023. "Analisis Aksesibilitas Bus Rapid Transit bagi Penumpang dengan Disabilitas di DKI Jakarta: Studi Kasus pada Moda Transportasi Publik di DKI

Jakarta." *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Pendidikan Sejarah* 8 (3): 1689–1695.
<https://doi.org/10.24815/jimps.v8i3.25240>.

Zakiyah, Ummi, and Dina Fadiyah. 2020. "Inovasi Pelayanan Transportasi Publik Ramah Penyandang Disabilitas di DKI Jakarta." *Administratio* 11 (1).
<https://doi.org/10.23960/administratio.v11i1.102>.

Legal Sources

Indonesia. 1945. *The Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945*.

Indonesia. 2011. *Law No. 19 of 2011 on the Ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*.

Indonesia. 2016. *Law No. 8 of 2016 concerning Persons with Disabilities*.

Indonesia. 2011. *Regional Regulation of DKI Jakarta No. 10 of 2011 concerning the Protection of Persons with Disabilities*.

United Nations. 2006. *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*.

United Nations. 2015. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.

Acknowledgment

None

Funding Information

None

Conflicting Interest Statement

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement

N/A