ESF Evaluation of the Malaysian National Planetary Health Action Plan (NPHAP)

Name: Malaysian National Planetary Health Action Plan (NPHAP)

Originating entity: Planetary Health Alliance and associated governmental and institutional contributors

Primary focus: A national systems-based framework for integrating human health, environmental sustainability, biodiversity protection, food systems, climate resilience, education, governance, and public wellbeing within a unified planetary health architecture. The report seeks to operationalise the interdependence between ecological integrity and human wellbeing through policy, institutional reform, and cross-sector coordination.

ESF Evaluation Score: 17/20

Introductory Context

The National Planetary Health Action Plan (NPHAP) represents one of the most ambitious contemporary attempts to integrate ecological sustainability, public health, governance, and societal wellbeing into a coherent national systems framework. Rooted in the emerging field of planetary health, the report recognises that human flourishing cannot be separated from the health of ecological systems and that environmental degradation increasingly constitutes a direct threat to long-term societal stability and wellbeing.

The framework demonstrates strong systems awareness through its integration of:

- biodiversity,
- climate change,
- food systems,
- environmental governance,
- education,
- economic resilience,
- public health,
- and civic participation.

Importantly, the report moves beyond narrow environmental policy by recognising that ecological crises are simultaneously:

- cultural,
- behavioural,
- institutional,

- economic,
- and developmental challenges.

This aligns strongly with the central ESF proposition that flourishing emerges through the interaction of:

- human capacities and potential,
- cultural values and identity,
- regenerative economic systems,
- and ecological integrity.

However, while the NPHAP framework demonstrates substantial systems integration, it remains primarily oriented around:

- sustainability,
- mitigation,
- and institutional coordination

rather than a fully developed ecosystemic model of flourishing rooted in:

- worldview transformation,
- relational development,
- meaning,
- spirituality,
- and developmental psychology.

From an ESF perspective, the report therefore represents:
a highly integrated planetary wellbeing framework with emerging regenerative potential, but not yet a fully mature ecosystemic flourishing architecture.

---

1. Natural Environment Integration

Score: 5 / 5

This is the strongest area of alignment with the ESF Framework.

The NPHAP report places ecological integrity at the centre of societal wellbeing and demonstrates a highly developed understanding of planetary interdependence. The framework includes extensive attention to:

- biodiversity protection,
- ecosystem services,
- climate adaptation,
- pollution reduction,
- sustainable agriculture,
- fisheries,
- water systems,
- air quality,
- and ecological resilience.

The report explicitly recognises that:

- ecological degradation directly undermines human health,
- environmental collapse threatens long-term societal stability,
- and climate instability affects future generations disproportionately.

The framework includes sophisticated ecological indicators relating to:

- species protection,
- habitat integrity,
- wetland and forest loss,
- pollution exposure,
- sustainable nitrogen management,
- marine ecosystems,
- and planetary boundary risks.

Importantly, the report moves beyond traditional environmental management by positioning ecological systems as foundational infrastructures for life and wellbeing.

This aligns closely with the ESF understanding that:

“human flourishing and ecological flourishing are inseparable developmental processes.”

The report also demonstrates growing awareness of systems interdependence between:

- ecology,
- health,
- economics,
- governance,
- and education.

ESF judgement: Exceptionally strong alignment. The report demonstrates a deeply integrated ecological worldview consistent with ecosystemic approaches to flourishing.

---

2. Circular and Regenerative Economics Integration

Score: 4 / 5

The report demonstrates strong alignment in this domain.

The NPHAP framework recognises that current economic systems frequently externalise ecological and health costs while rewarding extractive and unsustainable practices. The report therefore incorporates substantial attention to:

- sustainable agriculture,
- green entrepreneurship,
- climate-health financing,
- circular resource management,
- waste reduction,

- environmental accountability,
- and resilience-oriented planning.

Particularly important is its recognition that:

- economic planning,
- environmental stewardship,
- and human wellbeing

must be integrated rather than treated separately.

The report also acknowledges the importance of:

- cross-sector collaboration,
- local resilience,
- sustainable livelihoods,
- and long-term ecological stewardship.

These themes align strongly with ESF's emphasis on:

- regenerative economies,
- community resilience,
- reciprocity,
- and wellbeing-oriented systems design.

However, while the framework clearly moves beyond conventional GDP-centric economics, it remains more:

- sustainability-oriented
  than:
- fully regenerative.

There is still limited explicit attention to:

- community wealth building,
- alternative ownership structures,
- bioregional economics,
- reciprocity economies,
- post-growth thinking,
- and deeper structural redesign of financial systems.

The framework primarily seeks to reform existing economic systems toward sustainability rather than articulate a fundamentally transformed regenerative economic paradigm.

ESF judgement: Strongly integrated. The report demonstrates substantial movement toward regenerative thinking, though still largely operating within existing institutional-economic assumptions.

---

3. Cultural Values and Identity Integration

Score: 4 / 5

The report demonstrates relatively strong alignment in this area compared with many conventional sustainability frameworks.

Importantly, the NPHAP recognises that planetary health requires:

- cultural transformation,
- behavioural change,
- public engagement,
- educational reform,
- and values-driven leadership.

The framework includes attention to:

- leadership development,
- civic participation,
- local community engagement,
- cultural relevance,
- education reform,
- and whole-of-society mobilisation.

Its proposal to:

“embed planetary health in education”

reflects recognition that ecological flourishing depends upon shifts in:

- worldview,
- values,
- identity,
- and public consciousness.

This aligns significantly with the ESF proposition that:

- worldviews shape institutions,
- cultural narratives shape behaviour,
- and flourishing depends upon relational coherence across society.

The report also demonstrates emerging recognition of:

- interdependence,
- collective responsibility,
- and future generations.

However, there remain important limitations.

The framework gives relatively limited explicit attention to:

- spirituality,
- sacred relationship with nature,

- Indigenous cosmologies,
- contemplative traditions,
- intergenerational meaning systems,
- and existential dimensions of flourishing.

Culture is still approached primarily through:

- behavioural adaptation,
- leadership,
- and public awareness

rather than through deeper exploration of:

- identity,
- belonging,
- meaning,
- relational consciousness,
- and civilisational narratives.

ESF judgement: Strongly integrated relative to most policy frameworks, though less developed regarding spirituality, worldview plurality, and deeper meaning-centred dimensions of flourishing.

---

4. Human Capacities and Potential Integration

Score: 4 / 5

The report demonstrates strong alignment in this domain.

The framework recognises that human wellbeing depends not only upon healthcare systems but also upon:

- education,
- emotional resilience,
- environmental quality,
- social participation,
- leadership,
- agency,
- and public engagement.

The report demonstrates substantial systems awareness regarding the relationship between:

- human health,
- ecological conditions,
- developmental environments,
- and social resilience.

Its educational recommendations are particularly significant from an ESF perspective. The framework explicitly advocates:

- curriculum redesign,
- leadership development,
- systems thinking,
- and planetary health education.

This aligns strongly with the ESF emphasis on:

- ecological literacy,
- relational awareness,
- regenerative learning,
- and developmental flourishing.

The report also demonstrates alignment with several of the ESF seven motivational levels, particularly:

- security,
- relationship,
- engagement,
- contribution,
- and aspects of growth.

However, the framework remains less developed in relation to:

- inner development,
- emotional maturation,
- trauma-informed systems,
- spiritual wellbeing,
- creativity,
- contemplative development,
- and existential flourishing.

The framework largely approaches human development through:

- public health,
- leadership,
- education,
- and behavioural systems

rather than through a comprehensive developmental model of flourishing across the lifespan.

ESF judgement: Strongly integrated. The framework demonstrates broad understanding of human wellbeing within systems contexts, though deeper developmental and inner dimensions remain underdeveloped.

Overall ESF Score

ESF domain	Score
Natural Environment	5

ESF domain	Score
Circular and Regenerative Economics	4
Cultural Values and Identity	4
Human Capacities and Potential	4
Total	**17 / 20**

According to the ESF evaluation scale, a total score of 17 / 20 places the framework in the category of:

Highly Integrated

Overall Assessment

The National Planetary Health Action Plan represents one of the strongest contemporary examples of integrated systems thinking within the global wellbeing and sustainability field.

Its major strengths include:

- exceptionally strong ecological systems integration,
- sophisticated environmental-health interdependence,
- multidimensional policy coherence,
- educational integration,
- long-term resilience thinking,
- and increasing recognition of cultural and behavioural dimensions of transformation.

The report moves significantly beyond:

- siloed environmental policy,
- conventional healthcare models,
- and narrow economic metrics.

Instead, it advances a systems-based understanding of flourishing in which:

- ecological integrity,
- human wellbeing,
- governance,
- economy,
- education,
- and culture

must evolve together.

From an ESF perspective, this places the framework among the most advanced current international approaches to integrated wellbeing governance.

However, important gaps remain.

The framework is still primarily framed through:

- sustainability,
- mitigation,
- resilience,
- and systems management

rather than a fuller ecosystemic understanding of flourishing rooted in:

- relational consciousness,
- spiritual ecology,
- developmental psychology,
- intergenerational meaning,
- and cultural transformation.

The report also remains relatively institutional in orientation and gives less attention to:

- lived experience,
- emotional depth,
- inner capacities,
- relational healing,
- and existential dimensions of flourishing.

As such, the NPHAP framework represents:
a highly integrated planetary wellbeing architecture that is approaching ecosystemic flourishing, but has not yet fully entered a genuinely regenerative civilisational paradigm.

Recommendations for Stronger ESF Alignment

To deepen alignment with the ESF Framework, several areas could be further developed.

First, the framework would benefit from a stronger integration of:

- worldview formation,
- meaning-making,
- and relational consciousness.

This could include greater attention to:

- Indigenous knowledge systems,
- ecological spirituality,
- contemplative traditions,
- intergenerational wisdom,
- and sacred relationship with nature.

Second, the framework could incorporate a more explicit developmental architecture based upon:

- emotional development,
- agency,
- belonging,
- contribution,

- creativity,
- and lifelong psychosocial flourishing.

This would strengthen alignment with the ESF seven-level flourishing model:

- Security,
- Relationship,
- Independence,
- Engagement,
- Fulfilment,
- Contribution,
- and Growth.

Third, the framework could move more fully toward regenerative systems thinking by incorporating:

- community wealth building,
- circular regional economies,
- stewardship governance,
- reciprocity-based systems,
- and bioregional resilience models.

Finally, the framework would benefit from recognising that flourishing is not solely a matter of:

- environmental protection,
- institutional coordination,
- or policy reform,

but also of:

- cultural imagination,
- relational repair,
- developmental maturity,
- and the cultivation of meaning-rich societies.

Concluding Assessment

The National Planetary Health Action Plan represents one of the clearest emerging bridges between:

- planetary health,
- ecological systems thinking,
- wellbeing governance,
- and regenerative societal transformation.

Its strongest contribution lies in recognising that:

- human health,
- ecological integrity,
- and long-term societal flourishing

are inseparable.

From an ESF perspective, the framework demonstrates unusually high levels of:

- systems integration,
- ecological coherence,
- policy relevance,
- and multidimensional thinking.

However, it remains somewhat less developed regarding:

- worldview,
- spirituality,
- developmental flourishing,
- and the deeper relational dimensions of human transformation.

A concise ESF judgement would therefore be:

The NPHAP framework represents one of the strongest current planetary wellbeing architectures, integrating ecological and human systems with substantial sophistication, while still evolving toward a fuller ecosystemic understanding of flourishing.

ESF Assessment

The National Planetary Health Action Plan demonstrates highly integrated systems thinking and substantial alignment with ecosystemic flourishing principles, particularly in ecological and public wellbeing domains, while still retaining opportunities for deeper cultural, developmental, and regenerative integration.

Endnotes

Ellyatt, W. (2025). *Eco-Systemic Flourishing: Expanding the Meta-Framework for 21st-Century Education*. *Challenges*, 16(2), 21. MDPI: Basel, Switzerland.

Flourish Project. (2025). *Alignment of Philosophical, Psychological, Indigenous, Integral, and Unitive Approaches with Eco-Systemic Flourishing (ESF)*. Flourish Project C.I.C.: Cheltenham, UK.

Flourish Project. (2025). *ESF Community Evaluation Guide*. Flourish Project C.I.C.: Cheltenham, UK.

Flourish Project. (2025). *ESF Framework Integrated Wellbeing Evaluation Form*. Flourish Project C.I.C.: Cheltenham, UK.

Flourish Project. (2025). *Introducing the ESF Framework Step One - The Ecology of Wellbeing*. Flourish Project C.I.C.: Cheltenham, UK.

National Planetary Health Action Plan (NPHAP). (2026). *Full Report*. Planetary Health Alliance and associated contributors.

Name: Measuring Sustainable and Inclusive Wellbeing: A Multidimensional Dashboard Approach

Originating entity: European Commission Joint Research Centre

Primary focus: A multidimensional EU dashboard designed to move beyond GDP by integrating economic, social, environmental, inclusiveness, and institutional indicators into a sustainable and inclusive wellbeing framework for present and future generations.

ESF Evaluation Score: 14/20

Introductory Context

The European Indicators 2025 framework, developed by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre, emerges from a growing recognition that traditional economic measures such as GDP are insufficient for capturing the full complexity of human wellbeing. Building on decades of international work on "beyond GDP" metrics, the framework brings together a comprehensive dashboard of indicators designed to assess sustainable and inclusive wellbeing across European societies. It integrates social, economic, environmental, and institutional dimensions, with a particular emphasis on long-term resilience, intergenerational fairness, and policy relevance.

As such, it represents one of the most advanced large-scale efforts to operationalise multidimensional wellbeing measurement at a regional and supranational level

---

1. Natural Environment Integration

Score: 5 / 5

This is one of the strongest areas of alignment. The SIWB framework explicitly includes **Nature and planetary boundaries** as one of its six core components, and defines it in unified environmental terms that include biodiversity, land, soil, forests, air, water, climate mitigation and adaptation, sustainable resource use, and green economy and policies . The summary dashboard includes indicators such as the farmland bird index, Natura 2000 protected areas, ecological status of water, water exploitation, renewable energy share, net greenhouse gas emissions, circular material use, and consumption footprint per capita.

This aligns closely with the ESF requirement that a wellbeing model should recognise ecological health as foundational, incorporate biodiversity and environmental sustainability, and support stewardship and regeneration . The report also explicitly frames policy in terms of respecting **planetary boundaries** and protecting the wellbeing of both present and future generations .
ESF judgement: Very strong alignment. The framework clearly understands that ecological conditions are not peripheral but constitutive of wellbeing.

2. Circular and Regenerative Economics Integration

Score: 4 / 5

The SIWB framework goes well beyond conventional growth economics. It explicitly arose from dissatisfaction with GDP as the dominant measure of progress and seeks to complement GDP through a broader architecture of wellbeing, sustainability, and inclusion . It includes indicators relevant to regenerative and resilience-oriented economics, such as net fixed capital formation, total fixed assets, green economy and finance, circular material use, resource productivity, environmental taxes, material import dependency, and various resilience and transition indicators.

This gives it substantial overlap with the ESF economic domain, which values sustainable economic practices, resilience, circularity, and equitable distribution . However, the SIWB framework still remains more a **sustainability-adjusted dashboard of the existing economy** than a fully regenerative economic philosophy. It measures circularity and environmental pressure, but it does not yet articulate a deeper normative shift toward local livelihood regeneration, community wealth building, reciprocity, or regenerative design as first principles in the way ESF does.

ESF judgement: Strong but not complete. It is post-GDP, but not yet fully regenerative in worldview or intent.

3. Cultural Values and Identity Integration

Score: 2 / 5

This is a clear area of weakness from an ESF perspective. The SIWB framework includes some partial proxies for this domain - trust in institutions, feeling discriminated against, active citizenship, social interactions, inequality measures, and aspects of governance and inclusion. It also recognises that wellbeing has social and institutional dimensions and that fairness, voice, and accountability matter. However, ESF defines this domain much more deeply. It includes cultural identity, diversity, heritage, intergenerational belonging, social cohesion, ethics, spirituality, and the shared narratives that shape meaning and behaviour.

By contrast, the European framework contains almost no explicit treatment of:

- cultural heritage
- intercultural meaning
- spiritual or ethical formation
- narrative identity
- Indigenous or plural ways of knowing

The SIWB model is socially aware, but not culturally deep. It captures fairness and governance better than it captures worldview, identity, or meaning.

ESF judgement: Limited integration. Some relevant social indicators are present, but the underlying cultural, ethical, and civilisational dimensions of flourishing are largely absent.

4. Human Capacities and Potential Integration

Score: 3 / 5

The SIWB framework performs moderately well here. It includes substantial material on:

- health and healthcare access
- mental health proxies such as suicide

- education and underachievement
- tertiary attainment
- adult participation in learning
- life satisfaction
- volunteering
- digital skills
- social interactions

This means it does recognise that wellbeing depends partly on the development of human capabilities, not just economic outputs. However, ESF's human domain is more expansive and developmentally structured. ESF explicitly includes physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual dimensions of development across the seven levels of **security, relationship, independence, engagement, fulfilment, contribution, and growth**. The European framework does not organise human flourishing in those developmental terms, gives little emphasis to early childhood, and contains almost nothing on meaning, purpose, self-expression, spiritual life, or the inner architecture of flourishing.

So while SIWB captures important surface indicators of health, education, and participation, it does not yet provide a deep developmental model of the human being.

ESF judgement: Moderate integration. Strong on measurable capacities, weak on inner development, human motivation, and the deeper conditions of flourishing.

Overall ESF score

ESF domain	Score
Natural Environment	5
Circular and Regenerative Economics	4
Cultural Values and Identity	2
Human Capacities and Potential	3
Total	**14 / 20**

According to the ESF evaluation scale, a total of **14/20** places the framework in the category of **Moderately Integrated - Good Integration, with minor to significant gaps depending on domain** .

Overall assessment

The European Indicators 2025 framework is a **serious and sophisticated attempt to move beyond GDP** and is unusually strong in its inclusion of environmental sustainability, intergenerational fairness, resilience, and institutional quality . In ESF terms, it is one of the more advanced large-scale wellbeing architectures currently in circulation.

Its principal strengths are:

- strong ecological integration
- substantial post-GDP economic thinking
- clear intergenerational and systemic orientation
- broad multidimensional coverage across present and future wellbeing

Its principal limitations are:

- weak treatment of culture, identity, and worldview
- very limited attention to spiritual and ethical dimensions
- no developmental model of human flourishing
- little explicit engagement with meaning, belonging, purpose, or early years formation
- mostly descriptive and dashboard-based, rather than transformative in normative architecture

In short, from an ESF perspective, the SIWB framework is **systemically broad but anthropologically thin**. It captures the outer conditions of sustainable wellbeing much better than the inner and cultural conditions from which lasting flourishing emerges.

Recommendations for stronger ESF alignment

To move the SIWB framework toward fuller ESF integration, the following additions would be valuable.

First, it would benefit from an explicit **cultural values and identity layer**, including indicators related to cultural participation, heritage, social trust, belonging, ethical literacy, and plural epistemologies. Second, it would be strengthened by a more explicit **human development architecture**, perhaps by incorporating the seven ESF levels - security, relationship, independence, engagement, fulfilment, contribution, and growth - as a supplementary interpretive layer.

Third, it could move from sustainability toward genuine regeneration by including stronger indicators of:

- local and circular economies
- community wealth building
- reciprocity and stewardship
- regenerative value creation rather than reduced harm alone
- what constitutes a ‘Good Life’

Fourth, it would benefit from asking not only **what is being measured**, but **what worldview is being expressed through the measurement system itself**. That question sits at the heart of the ESF evaluation process .

Concluding Assessment

The **European Indicators 2025 / SIWB framework** should be regarded as a **strong partial ally of the ESF approach**. It already shares ESF’s concern with integration, sustainability, fairness, and future generations. But it stops short of ESF’s deeper contribution, which is to show that flourishing is not only ecological and economic, but also cultural, developmental, relational, and meaning-laden .
A concise way to express the judgement would be:

The SIWB framework is a robust multidimensional sustainability dashboard, but not yet a fully ecosystemic flourishing framework.