

“Real jobs for real pay and the support we need to be successful”

[Inclusion International](#)

Inclusion International is the international network of people with intellectual disabilities and their families. We advocate for the rights of people with intellectual disabilities worldwide.

Our key message:

- In 2018, Inclusion International’s General Assembly demanded “real jobs, in the community, with real pay, and the support we need to be successful.”

Our key issues about employment for people with intellectual disabilities:

- The way that employers decide who to hire for a job is not accessible.
- Employers ask for degrees and certificates which makes it harder for people with intellectual disabilities to get jobs when they have not had access to education.
- People with intellectual disabilities do not have enough support at work (this is called reasonable accommodation) and they are not paid fairly.
- Many people are in segregated workplaces, like sheltered workshops, and governments are not doing enough to help people move to real jobs.
- Many people are pushed into doing self-employment (starting a small business) but they do not get enough support to run their business successfully.
- People might lose their disability benefits from the government if they get a job.
- Government programs sometimes encourage people to hire people with intellectual disabilities for the wrong reasons, and these programs might mean that people are being hired into a workplace without support.

Recommendations - We want the CRPD Committee to advise governments to:

- Provide funding to help people transition from sheltered workshops
- Make sure both employers and agencies that help people get work follow the CRPD
- Make sure that employment policy includes the people with most significant barriers
- Collect more data about people with intellectual disabilities in work
- Consult families and self-advocates about employment issues

1. Introduction

Inclusion International (II) welcomes the initiative of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (hereinafter “the Committee”) to call for submissions for the General Comment 8 on Article 27 (Work and Employment).

Inclusion International is the global network of people with intellectual disabilities and their families. Our global network works to advance the human rights and full inclusion of people with intellectual disabilities and their families around the world. With over 200 organizations in our network across 115 countries throughout five regions, Inclusion International is uniquely positioned to highlight the issues people with intellectual disabilities and their families experience in relation to the right to work.

Inclusion International’s submission is informed by the work and expertise of our member organizations and reflects the voices of people with intellectual disabilities and their families. Members of the Inclusion International network from 28 countries and representatives of 4 regions have contributed to developing this submission. This submission captures the inputs from our members with a particular emphasis on the issues related to the right to work of persons with intellectual disabilities.

Around the world, people with intellectual disabilities have a clear message: “We demand real jobs in the community with real pay and the support we need to be successful”. Article 27 of the UN Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities (CRPD) affirms the right to work for all persons with disabilities in a work environment that is open, inclusive, and accessible. Despite the CRPD’s clear focus on inclusive and accessible environments, the Inclusion International network is concerned that employment policy, programming, and legislative measures do not consistently promote inclusion in workplaces.

For people with intellectual disabilities, education and employment supports at present are not preparing people appropriately for the labour market, and people with intellectual disabilities are being excluded from work opportunities due to these systemic issues. Employment initiatives often succeed in placing people with disabilities in workplaces, but do not consistently ensure that the workplace is accessible, that support and other reasonable accommodations are in place, and that the employee with an intellectual disability is meaningfully included by their colleagues. Hiring a person with an intellectual disability may be an example of having more diversity in a workplace, but it does not automatically make a workplace inclusive - genuinely inclusive workplaces take measures to transform their physical spaces, policy environments, support strategies, and employee culture to ensure inclusion.

This submission is grounded in the premise that for a workplace to be genuinely inclusive of people with intellectual disabilities, the employee must work in an accessible environment with all of the support they need and meaningfully participates in all aspects of work on an equal basis with their colleagues. This vision for employment that is genuinely inclusive applies equally to all people with intellectual disabilities and must include people with more significant barriers to inclusion, who are most likely to be excluded from the labour market.

2. Normative Content

Interpretation of Article 27.1 (a): Discrimination in the workplace, including workplace segregation

People with intellectual disabilities face multiple forms of discrimination while trying to access their right to work, which has resulted in people with intellectual disabilities being significantly

underrepresented in the formal sector work environment. In Scotland, only 6% of people with learning disabilities have a job.¹ In many cases, people with intellectual disabilities are also underemployed, restricted to certain roles. In contrast, people with intellectual disabilities are overrepresented in sheltered workshops, which are workplaces that only employ people with disabilities, often (but not exclusively) at low or no pay. In Ireland, for example, 29% of adults with an intellectual disability are in sheltered centres and only 7.1% in the open labour market.

Although sheltered workshops do not constitute authentic employment and are an example of employment discrimination that disproportionately impacts people with intellectual disabilities, sheltered workshops remain pervasive around the world. Sheltered workshops do not prepare people appropriately for inclusive workplaces, and they reinforce negative stereotypes about the capabilities of people with intellectual disabilities. In many contexts, sheltered workshops continue to exist by framing their activities as “vocational training,” despite the lack of genuine skills training, the lack of certification, and lack of an end date for this “training model.” It is widely recognized that sheltered workshops violate Article 27 of the CRPD, but there have been few large-scale attempts to transition people with intellectual disabilities out of sheltered workshops and into the open labour market. Entrenched incentive structures both for organizations that run sheltered workshops and individuals who are not being supported to access the open labour market continue to keep people with intellectual disabilities in these settings. In many countries, States parties continue to fund sheltered workshops - for people with intellectual disabilities to access their right to work, States parties must redirect funding previously allocated to sheltered workshops instead to the transition of individuals to the open labour market. The transition away from sheltered workshops must be accompanied by resources to ensure that individuals previously in sheltered workshops get the training they need, appropriate support to find formal sector employment, and have access to reasonable accommodation in their new roles. If the closure of sheltered workshops is not accompanied by action to eliminate the barriers to employment that exist, people with intellectual disabilities will continue to be left behind.

For people with intellectual disabilities trying to enter the open labour market, instances of discrimination typically start from the recruitment process, which is rarely accessible. Job descriptions and application forms are not provided in plain language/easy read formats, and employers tend to recruit for positions in spaces that people with intellectual disabilities do not have access to. Support persons are often not accepted as a form of reasonable accommodation during an interview, and if they are, employers make assumptions that the person will not have the capacity to work independently and may penalize the person on this basis. In some cases, employers also include psychometric tests or other discriminatory assessments as part of the recruitment process. People with intellectual disabilities face these barriers at each stage of the recruitment process, which has resulted in few people with intellectual disabilities engaged in the open labour market due to this inaccessibility, denial of reasonable accommodation, and other forms of discrimination.

While employers are responsible for ensuring that their workplaces are free from discrimination, employers currently lack support to understand their role and responsibility for creating inclusive workplaces and appropriately accommodating their employees with intellectual disabilities. For workplaces to be more inclusive of people with intellectual disabilities, States parties must provide more support to employers to ensure that they have the information and tools to create recruitment processes and workplaces that are fully

¹ Inclusion Europe, 2020. Employment of People with Intellectual Disabilities: Before, During, and After the COVID-19 Pandemic. https://www.inclusion-europe.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Covid-report-design-finalised_accessible.pdf

inclusive of all people with disabilities, including those with the most significant barriers to inclusion.

Stereotypes and assumptions that people with intellectual disabilities cannot work also represent a major obstacle to employment. In places where employers or families have never seen a person with intellectual disability in a workplace, stereotypes and negative attitudes are a barrier to a person with an intellectual disability being considered for a job. In consultations with self-advocates in Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria, and Bangladesh run by Inclusion International, self-advocates reported that employers do not want to hire people with intellectual disabilities because they do not believe an employee with an intellectual disability can bring value to their company. Self-advocates reported that these concerns about value from employers are also the reason why employers want to pay people with intellectual disabilities lower wages than their colleagues without intellectual disabilities.

In some contexts, a predetermined set of potential jobs or types of jobs have been identified for people with intellectual disabilities based on stereotypes about the suitability of people with intellectual disabilities to particular roles. This results in people with intellectual disabilities being overrepresented in specific types of workplaces and amplifies stereotypes about their capacity to work in different settings. Most of these designated jobs are low wage, do not include benefits, and are often based in sheltered workshops. Unlike other jobseekers, these stereotypes also limit the amount of support that people with intellectual disabilities receive while on the path to formal sector employment. People with intellectual disabilities are less likely to receive the career supports that would allow them to develop their strengths and skills in alignment with their individual interests, and this lack of support increases the likelihood of people with intellectual disabilities being denied choice or pushed into a particular type of employment.

Legislation often creates further discrimination against people with intellectual disabilities and their right to work, and laws and policy that institutionalize discrimination exist in many countries. Laws that require an assessment to prove that the person with an intellectual disability “has the mental capacity to fit the job” is one such example – laws that require determinations of fitness to work are discriminatory and should be urgently repealed. Other discriminatory laws that may prevent persons with disabilities from accessing employment include guardianship laws and non-recognition of the legal capacity of persons with intellectual disabilities in violation of Article 12 of the CRPD, which prevents job seekers with intellectual disabilities from making decisions about their jobs, signing employment contracts, or opening a bank account to receive their pay.

Discrimination and lack of accessibility in other areas of community life also can have a direct impact on the access to employment. Inaccessible community transportation systems are a significant barrier for people with intellectual disabilities, as public transport is often the only option to accessing work. Lack of clear orientation and guidance, non-availability of public transportation, additional costs required by individualized transport, and absence of support and personal assistance using public transportation systems are among the main barriers that persons with intellectual disabilities may face trying to access employment outside of their immediate community.

Interpretation of Article 27 (b): The right to equal remuneration for work of equal value

Unequal pay is another form of discrimination that is common for people with intellectual disabilities. During consultations with self-advocates in Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria, and Bangladesh, self-advocates reported that it is common for people with intellectual disabilities to be paid less than half of the standard wage, and some self-advocates reported only being paid a tenth of the standard wage. Employers use arguments about efficiency, productivity,

or quality of the work to justify these differences in wages. Time flexibility must be considered an accessibility or reasonable accommodation measure and not a justification for lower wages - unfair pay is and should be recognized as a form of discrimination.

Interpretation of Article 27 (d) and (j): Access to inclusive education and inclusive vocational training

The right to work under Article 27 is closely linked to the right to inclusive education outlined in Article 24. For people with intellectual disabilities, the lack of access to inclusive education is a key barrier to employment, as educational barriers impact access to secondary school certificates and other documentation that employers consider to be prerequisites for readiness to be competitive in the labour market. Very few people with intellectual disabilities have access to higher education due to the inaccessibility of higher education systems, which creates an additional barrier to employment. In many countries, degrees, diplomas, and certificates are treated as mandatory requirements for employment, even in jobs that do not require competencies developed through higher education, which creates an additional barrier for people with intellectual disabilities.

Vocational training delivered in segregated settings also does not typically allow people with intellectual disabilities to access official certification that they can use when looking for a job. In many cases, segregated vocational training institutes may be linked to sheltered workshops. Wherever possible people with intellectual disabilities should be supported to access inclusive vocational training opportunities that are responsive to their individual interests and needs and should be supported to access vocational training opportunities that include a clear pathway to employment.

Interpretation of Article 27 (f): Self-employment, microfinance, business development services

People with intellectual disabilities are disproportionately represented among informal sector workers, with entrepreneurship often presented as the only option to people with intellectual disabilities and their families. People with intellectual disabilities have been firm in calling for prioritizing formal sector employment, with self-advocates emphasizing the need for “real jobs in the community with real pay and the support we need to be successful.”²

Self-employment for people with intellectual disabilities is rarely a viable model because it fails to acknowledge the lack of support inherent to entrepreneurship. Due to the denial of legal capacity and barriers to accessing financial institutions, people with intellectual disabilities are often unable to access start-up capital for self-employment, and the lack of a structured workplace makes access to on-the-job support unlikely. In these cases, families of people with intellectual disabilities tend to play a support role when their family member is engaging in entrepreneurship due to the lack of external support. Self-advocates who have engaged in self-employment have also reported frequent discrimination, theft, and difficulty getting customers due to the stigma against people with intellectual disabilities in their communities.³

Pressure on people with intellectual disabilities to participate in self-employment as an alternative to the open labour market is often tied to contexts that place a strong emphasis on vocational training and other supply-side interventions for people with disabilities. Often these vocational training programs focus on training people with intellectual disabilities in the

² Inclusion International, 2018. Calls to Action. <https://inclusion-international.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/CallsToAction-GA.pdf>

³ Inclusion International, 2019. Consultations on Inclusive Employment with Self-Advocates in Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria, and Bangladesh. Publication forthcoming.

production of handicrafts or other skills that have no clear basis in the needs of the local labour market, instead presenting self-employment as the ultimate employment goal. Continuing to emphasize entrepreneurship as the only realistic model for people with intellectual disabilities perpetuates the inaccurate idea that people with intellectual disabilities cannot be included in formal sector workplaces.

People with intellectual disabilities should be empowered to engage in self-employment if they choose too, which requires ensuring access to support in starting and running their business, but self-employment cannot be treated as the default option for people with intellectual disabilities. Wherever possible, aligned with the wishes of self-advocates, the priority should be on creating access points for formal sector jobs in the community.

Interpretation of Article 27 (i): The obligation to provide reasonable accommodation in the workplace and the denial of reasonable accommodation as a form of disability-discrimination, including in recruitment processes

Accessibility in the work environment and provision of reasonable accommodation are prerequisites for employment of people with intellectual disabilities. Denial of reasonable accommodation is discrimination and should not be subject to progressive realization. Accessibility must be thought of from the earliest stages when designing the job and preparing the workplace, and reasonable accommodation should be provided according to the person's needs.

Reasonable accommodation measures for people with intellectual disabilities include provision of individualized and ongoing support and flexibility of working times, among others. It is also important to note the way employees communicate, the policy environment within the business, and other broader aspects of inclusive work culture should also be considered elements of accessibility and reasonable accommodation, to ensure that people with intellectual disabilities are accessing genuinely inclusive workplaces.

Reasonable accommodation should be provided by the employer whether it is the government (for public employment) or the company (for the private sector). While it is the employer's responsibility to provide reasonable accommodation, States parties must also ensure that individual services that a person with an intellectual disability is accessing to support their transition to work are publicly funded. A lack of support for people with intellectual disabilities in other areas of life will also impact the way that reasonable accommodation is delivered in the workplace. For example, a lack of consistent funding for personal assistance has resulted in conflating the role of a job coach, who is meant to aid in the transition to a new workplace, with the role of a personal assistant, which has resulted in people requiring job coach services in the long term to fill the gap that should be covered by other services.

States parties must also ensure that the necessary accountability measures are in place, including in the private sector, to monitor access to reasonable accommodation.

3. States parties' obligations

Immediate obligations

Among the immediate obligations for States parties is action to improve the data on the employment rates of persons with disabilities in the open labour market, in line with Article 31 of the CRPD. There exist major gaps in the availability of good quality data on the inclusion of people with intellectual disabilities in the labour market, as the data that is available is not disaggregated. Where legislative measures are put in place to increase access to employment, data disaggregation is particularly important to ensure that people

with intellectual disabilities and other marginalized groups are also benefiting equally from schemes and legislative measures. Quality and publicly available data about the degree of inclusion of people with intellectual disabilities in the labour market is essential to ensure that policymakers have the necessary baseline data to introduce targets for tracking policy and programming impact on inclusion in employment.

A limitation of current data collection on employment rates of persons with intellectual disabilities is the exclusion of people with disabilities who face more significant barriers, which includes people with complex and multiple disabilities. In many cases, people with disabilities who have more significant barriers to inclusion are living in institutional settings or may be attending day programmes (including sheltered workshops) in their community as an alternative to working in the open labour market. States parties must recognize that people with more significant barriers also enjoy the right to work under Article 27, ensure that people living in institutions or attending day programmes are counted among people with disabilities in and out of the labour market, and that action is taken to support people to transition from segregated settings to work opportunities in the open labour market.

States parties must consider where accountability for the employment of people with disabilities lies within their departmental structure. Responsibility for policy and programming for the inclusion of people with disabilities in the labour market should be housed within the government's equivalent to the Ministry of Labour to ensure that policy for employment of people with disabilities aligns with the jurisdiction's mainstream employment policies. Housing government accountability for the employment of people with disabilities within the Ministry of Welfare, Ministry of Social Services, or other similar departments frames employment of people with disabilities within a welfare framework or charity model and is likely to result in the jurisdiction's employment policy failing to be disability inclusive. When disability-specific programming is also housed outside of the Ministry of Labour, this may also prevent people with disabilities from accessing mainstream employment programming.

While direct accountability for implementation of the CRPD is limited to States parties, it is essential to recognize the other stakeholders involved in the employment of persons with disabilities for States parties to create legislative and policy environments that ensure these stakeholders will also act in compliance with the CRPD, as part of their immediate obligations under Article 27.

Both mainstream and specialist employment agencies play a significant role in connecting people with disabilities to the labour market, but few jurisdictions regulate employment agencies to ensure that the models are inclusive, scalable, and CRPD-compliant. Employment agencies can be an effective partner for employing people with disabilities, and particularly for people with intellectual disabilities and other marginalized groups for whom stigma from employers can be a major barrier to employment. In these cases, agencies play a key role by building relationships with employers and creating connections with people with intellectual disabilities, which creates a direct path to employment facilitated by a source that is trusted by employers. For people with intellectual disabilities in particular, many employment agencies instead use a model which emphasizes vocational training over connections, which does not create a direct path to employment and rarely results in real jobs for people with intellectual disabilities. States parties must ensure that where employment agencies exist, they are using holistic service delivery models that create direct paths to employment, that they initiate job placements based on the will and preferences of the individual, that they limit job placements to inclusive workplaces, and that they ensure the availability of reasonable accommodation and other accessibility measures within their partnered workplaces.

4. Relationship with other provisions of the CRPD

Article 27 is closely linked with Article 28, as social protection systems can be a major barrier for employment of people with intellectual disabilities. Social protection programs are built without consideration of disability related costs and are rarely designed using a human rights-based approach in their categorization of beneficiaries. Disability benefits (including allowances or pensions) are typically linked to the individual's income, and in many countries people with intellectual disabilities risk losing their pension or other benefits if they engage in formal sector work. The maximum income for loss of benefits is often based on a predetermined threshold that is put in place for the whole population, but the additional costs related to disability are not considered which forces people with intellectual disabilities to choose between working and losing their disability benefit and having to pay out of pocket for their additional disability-related costs (including support, transport, etc). Not working in order to secure the disability benefit is the most common choice, especially in situations where this allowance is the primary household income.

Article 27 also has clear links with Article 32 on international cooperation, as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and development organizations are another key stakeholder for the employment of people with disabilities through their program delivery. Often this NGO-led disability employment programming is funded directly by States parties through Official Development Assistance (ODA) channels. A recent analysis of ODA funding by Inclusion International identified that among projects that included people with intellectual disabilities, 38% of employment and livelihoods projects in 2018 used methodologies that violated Article 27⁴, promoting segregation and other human rights violations. In line with States parties commitment to disability-inclusive international cooperation under Article 32, States parties have an obligation to ensure that the humanitarian and development aid programming they fund uses CRPD-compliant models, including ensuring that all employment and livelihoods programmes are based on inclusion in the open labour market and are compliant with Article 27.

5. Implementation at the National Level

States parties have applied a variety of legislative measures to implement Article 27 at the national level, with varying degrees of success. In many cases, the introduction of legislative measures for people with disabilities results in an increase in employment for only people with disabilities who require the fewest accommodations, resulting in marginalized groups being left further behind.

Quotas

The introduction of quota systems as a legislative measure is one such example. People with intellectual disabilities, who are among the most marginalized within the disability community, rarely benefit from cross-disability quota systems, which generally only create a path to employment for people with physical and sensory disabilities. These cross-disability quotas also fail to address intersectionality, and do not benefit young people with intellectual disabilities or women with intellectual disabilities who are also disproportionately excluded from the labour market.⁵ Some jurisdictions have explored quotas specifically for people with intellectual disabilities, including some regions of Spain, where these quotas have proven successful both in creating space in the labour market for some people with intellectual

⁴ Inclusion International, 2020. Excluded from the Excluded: People with Intellectual Disabilities in (and out of) Official Development Assistance. <https://inclusion-international.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Excluded-from-the-Excluded.pdf>

⁵ Inclusion Europe, 2020. Employment of People with Intellectual Disabilities: Before, During, and After the COVID-19 Pandemic. https://www.inclusion-europe.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Covid-report-design-finalised_accessible.pdf

disabilities and for opening dialogues between the government and organizations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) representing people with intellectual disabilities and their families. It is important to note that even in the case of quotas that target people with intellectual disabilities, these measures still do not typically benefit people with intellectual disabilities who face more significant barriers to inclusion.

Quotas also increase the risk of tokenism in hiring, as companies hire individuals based on their disability rather than based on their value as an employee. Employers who aim to create workplaces that are inclusive make a proactive choice to hire people with intellectual disabilities and ensure they are supported in their role, but mandatory quotas eliminate the intentionality in diverse hiring practices. As a result, quotas may also increase the risk of a person with an intellectual disability lacking support in their role, as employers who face mandatory quotas may hire people with intellectual disabilities to fill their quota without seeking knowledge about how to make their recruitment process and their workplace inclusive of that employee. Enforcement of quotas is also relatively rare, and some quota systems permit companies to pay a fine or make a donation in lieu of hiring people with disabilities. In many countries, loose definitions of how quota systems can be applied have also resulted in further segregation of people with intellectual disabilities, as many countries permit hiring individuals to participate in sheltered workshop activities to count towards employment quotas.

Ultimately, the use of quotas creates a real risk for tokenistic hiring of people with disabilities, and in most cases, only benefits people with disabilities within the fewest barriers to inclusion. Where States parties do introduce quotas, they must be intentionally designed to ensure that people with intellectual disabilities, including those with the most significant barriers to employment, are also benefiting from the systems, and there must be clear buy-in from employers to ensure that people are not being hired tokenistically without the appropriate accommodations in their workplace.

Wage Subsidies and Tax Incentives

The use of wage subsidies is one legislative measure commonly applied to the employment of people with intellectual disabilities, whereby employers receive public funds to cover some or all of the salary costs for an employee with an intellectual disability. While wage subsidies may encourage an employer to hire a person with an intellectual disability they would not otherwise have included in their workplace, the subsidizing of the salary of an employee with an intellectual disability creates a narrative that employees with intellectual disabilities do not have the same value as an employee without a disability, perpetuating a charity model of disability within employment. This may create a self-fulfilling prophecy, whereby the employer begins to see the employee as less capable than their colleagues and develops lower expectations for that employee with a disability due to their subsidized wage. In scenarios where a person begins a role as a subsidized employee, it can be very challenging to adjust employer perceptions about that individual if they have begun their role with a company framed as a less valuable employee. In many cases, jobs that hire people with intellectual disabilities using wage subsidies are inherently unsustainable, with the employee often being let go after the employer loses the subsidy and is expected to pay full price for the employee. A key exception to these caveats are wage subsidies that apply to the general population, such as subsidy programs for summer employment or student employment which are designed for short-term employment - people with intellectual disabilities in these demographics seeking short term jobs should have equal access to these programmes.

Tax incentives, which provide benefits to companies who have hired people with disabilities but are not tied to the employment of one individual, is an alternative model that addresses some of the issues associated with wage subsidy systems. However, as with wage

subsidies, tax incentives may still create a risk for tokenistic hiring, although not being linked to an individual jobseeker decreases this risk. In many scenarios, large companies may build tax breaks and subsidies into their budget planning, understanding these employees with disabilities as “discounted labour,” which continues to risk tokenization.

It is important to note that if job seekers with intellectual disabilities are appropriately supported and if employers are equally supported to create inclusive workplaces, the use of incentives for businesses to hire people with disabilities would be unnecessary. Employment in accessible workplaces where employees have access to reasonable accommodation from the earliest stages of employment is a more sustainable solution. The fact that many people with intellectual disabilities are successfully working in formal sector employment with appropriate support and full wages borne fully by the employer suggests that good practice models are replicable without employer incentives.

Families

The families of people with intellectual disabilities are key stakeholders in their employment, and families must be consulted in the development of policy and legislation on employment measures. The expectations of families have a significant impact on the career prospects of people with intellectual disabilities, but organizations and employment agencies have done little to cultivate high expectations of family members. Due to the lack of support from governments available to both families and individuals with intellectual disabilities for accessing employment, families are often forced to choose between a series of undesirable choices about the future of their family member with an intellectual disability. In many cases, this choice is between their family member participating in a sheltered workshop or a day programme and their family member staying at home all day. Families must be supported to understand the possibilities for employment of people with intellectual disabilities, when formal sector employment tends to be a choice that is rarely presented to them.

Families also face challenging choices when living in contexts that provide disability benefits that are tied to employment. Faced with their family member with an intellectual disability losing their income assistance or other benefits upon entering the open labour market, families may choose to forgo formal sector employment in favour of their family member's financial security in the long term. Social protection systems often create conditions that force families to make choices that limit their family member's opportunity to work - these systems must be reimagined to better support families and empower them to choose inclusion.

Conclusion

People with intellectual disabilities and their families are clear in their urgent call for real jobs for real pay in inclusive environments. States parties must take action to ensure that the legislative and policy environment for the employment of people with disabilities, including people with intellectual disabilities and people with intellectual disabilities who face the most significant barriers, is grounded in the principle of inclusion.

Implementation of Article 27 and working towards the inclusion of people with disabilities in the workplace at the national level must be framed based on an understanding of the need for system level transformation of the labour market. For people with disabilities, and particularly people with disabilities from marginalized communities like people with intellectual disabilities, there is a need to reimagine the way that companies recruit employees, ensuring accessible, and create inclusive work cultures where all employees can meaningfully participate.