The Twenty-eighth Session of the Intergovernmental Meeting (IG28)
on the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)
24-26 November 2026, Niigata, Japan

EANET/IG28/11

CONSIDERATION OF THE RENAMING OF THE EANET

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On 22 July 2026, the Secretariat for the EANET received by email a *Joint Proposal for Renaming the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)* **(Annex 1)**, co-prepared by Japan, Lao PDR, Mongolia, and Viet Nam, and subsequently shared this proposal with all National Focal Points by email on the same day.

2. On 22 July 2026, Japan requested further clarification from the Secretariat regarding the procedural implications related to the renaming of EANET, including through a Technical Note setting out the necessary procedural steps for its to renaming.

3. During the Working Group Meeting on the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia, held on 4 and 5 August 2026 (WG2026), the *Joint Proposal for Renaming the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)* was presented and discussed under Agenda item 8 ("Other Matters").

4. Japan proposed to organize an Online Meeting with UNEP Law Division to address questions from the Participating Countries regarding the applicable procedure for renaming EANET. The summary of the discussions under Agenda item 8 is available in the Report of WG2026 (EANET/WG2026/5 para 32, iv.).

5. On 26 August 2026, the Secretariat circulated a *Technical Note on the legal and procedural framework for the renaming of EANET* (**Annex 2**), prepared by the UNEP Law Division, together with an invitation to an informal Online Meeting, to National Focal Points by email.

6. The informal *Online Meeting with UNEP Law Division on Renaming the EANET* was held via an online platform on 8 October 2026. Seven Participating Countries joined the meeting. The Summary of the informal meeting is available in **Annex 3**.

7. Subsequently, UNEP Law Division and the Secretariat prepared "*A step-by-step guide on the Modification of the Instrument for Strengthening the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)*" to provide further guidance to Participating Countries on the way forward (**Annex 4**).

II. ACTIONS REQUIRED

8. The IG28 is invited to consider the document Consideration on the Renaming of the EANET (EANET/IG28/11), and may wish to discuss, consider, and decide on the next steps, as appropriate.

Annex 1

Joint Proposal for Renaming the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)

Joint Proposal for Renaming the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)

Submission Date: 22 July, 2026

Summary: Mongolia, Vietnam, Lao PDR, and Japan propose renaming of EANET, and call on all Participating Countries to discuss it at the Working Group (WG) Meeting in 2026 and the 28th Intergovernmental Meeting (IG28).

---

1. BACKGROUND

- The Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET) has served as a vital regional framework for monitoring acid deposition across East Asia for 25 years. Since its establishment, EANET has made significant contributions to understanding and addressing air pollution in the region.
- Over the past two decades, air quality challenges in East Asia have evolved significantly, with increasing attention to PM2.5, ozone, and other atmospheric pollutants. In recognition of these developments, **EANET's scope was expanded in 2021** to cover a broader range of "atmospheric environment related substances", going beyond acid deposition alone. Building on this expanded scope, the Medium-Term Plan 2026–2030, which reflects the broadened scope of activities, was adopted at the 27th Intergovernmental Meeting (IG27) held last year.
- Despite this significant expansion of EANET's activities, **its name has still been unchanged**. The current name — *Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia* — still gives the impression that EANET's work is limited solely to acid deposition monitoring. This misalignment between the name and the actual scope of activities has led to the following concerns:
  - The network's relevance and contributions are underrepresented, potentially diminishing its standing in the international community.
  - Collaboration with other international organizations and institutes may be hindered due to the perception that EANET addresses only a narrow range of issues.
  - Member countries may face difficulties in securing domestic budgets for EANET-related activities, as the name does not adequately reflect the full scope of work being undertaken.
- Renaming EANET to better reflect its current activities would contribute to further development and strengthening of EANET as a regional framework for atmospheric environment monitoring.

2. PROPOSAL

Based on the background described above, Mongolia, Vietnam, Lao PDR, and Japan propose that the following renaming be discussed at the Working Group (WG) Meeting for deliberation:

Current Name	Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia
Proposed New Name	Atmospheric Environment Monitoring Network in East Asia
Abbreviation	EANET *(to be retained)*

- Given that the abbreviation “EANET” has been widely used and recognized, it should be retained as is.
- What is essential is that the new name **clearly reflects EANET’s current mandate**, which is beyond acid

DRAFT

deposition alone. Therefore, we are open to considering alternative proposals from other Participating Countries, as far as this principle is upheld.

3. PRECEDENTS OF THE PROPOSED TERMINOLOGY

It is worth noting that the terminology "**atmospheric environment related substances**" is already used in the Supplementary Document (Annex) to the EANET Instrument[1]. Furthermore, at SAC25 and IG27 in 2025, the renaming of EANET's flagship publication was approved as follows:

Previous Title	Periodic Report on the State of Acid Deposition in East Asia (PRSAD)
Current Title	Periodic Report on the State of Atmospheric Environment in East Asia (PRSAE)

These precedents show that the shift in terminology from "acid deposition" to "atmospheric environment" has already been recognized and endorsed by EANET stakeholders.

4. CALL FOR ACTION

At the WG Meeting 2026, Mongolia, Vietnam, Lao PDR, and Japan call on all Participating Countries to:

1. **Acknowledge** the need to update EANET's name to reflect its expanded scope of activities;
2. **Discuss** the proposed new name and any alternative proposals from participating countries; and
3. **Agree** on, if appropriate, a revised name (or potential new names) to be submitted to the 28th Intergovernmental Meeting for further deliberation and formal adoption.

DRAFT

[1] https://www.eanet.asia/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Supplementary-Document-Annex-to-EANET-Instrument-adopted-at-IG23-in-2021.pdf

Annex 2

Technical Note on the legal and procedural framework for the renaming of EANET

Technical Note

Legal and procedural framework for the renaming of the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)

1. On 22 July 2026, the Secretariat for the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET) received a written communication by the Governments of Mongolia, Viet Nam, Lao People's Democratic Republic, and Japan proposing to change the Network's denomination from the current one to "Atmospheric Environment Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)". This written communication, entitled *Joint Proposal for Renaming the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)* (the "Joint Proposal") also calls on all Participating Countries to discuss the idea at the 2026 Working Group (WG2026) Meeting, held online on August 4–5, 2026, for potential adoption at the 28th Intergovernmental Meeting (IG28), which will take place in a hybrid format in Niigata, Japan, from 24 to 26 November 2026.

2. This note provides an overview of the applicable legal framework, as well as the process for implementing the Joint Proposal.

I. Background

3. Experts from East Asia met from 1993 to 1998 to discuss acid deposition monitoring issues. Based on the findings of the experts, the First Intergovernmental Meeting to establish the "Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)" was held in March 1998 in Yokohama, Japan.

4. In October 2000, IG2 decided to start EANET activities on a regular basis from January 2001, issuing the *Joint Announcement on the Implementation of EANET and the Tentative Design of [EANET]* (the "Joint Announcement").[1] At the same meeting, the IG also designated the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as the Secretariat for EANET.[2]

5. In November 2001, IG3 adopted the Rules of Procedure for EANET (RoPs).[3] The *EANET Guidelines on the Administrative and Financial Management for the Secretariat, the Network Center, and the EANET Project Fund* (the "Guidelines")[4], as approved by IG23 (November 2021) and revised by the Secretariat in 2024 upon

[1] EANET/IG 2/5/2 rev.
[2] EANET/IG 2/9, Annex II.
[3] EANET/IG 3/12, Annex II.
[4] Available at: https://www.eanet.asia/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Guidelines-on-the-Administrative-and-Financial-Management-for-the-Secretariat-and-the-Network-Center_rev-public-access.pdf

request by IG25 (November 2023),[5] confirmed the application of the RoPs to the EANET meetings in *Part I: Rules of Procedures of the EANET Meetings and Dissemination of Data and Information*. There is a common understanding that the revised Guidelines came into effect on 13 December 2024.[6]

6. In November 2010, IG12 adopted the *Instrument for Strengthening the [EANET]* (the "Instrument").[7]

7. At its twenty-third Session, that was held in November 2021, IG23 decided to expand the scope of the Instrument to encompass activities related to air pollution and decided to adopt a Supplementary Document (Annex) to the Instrument, following the process set out in Item 15 of the Instrument.[8]

8. The current proposal to change the name of the network is linked to a desire to better reflect its current activities in light of the broadened scope.[9]

II. Applicable framework

a. Institutional framework

9. Under Item 10 of the Instrument, *"The IG [...] is the decision-making body of the EANET. The tasks of the IG include, among others, the following: [...] (d) establishment of subsidiary bodies as necessary and appropriate; [...] (i) Decision on other matters related to the management of the EANET and implementation of the work programme"*.

10. Therefore, IG represents the main governing body of the EANET, and the only one endowed with the authority to make decisions on institutional matters.

11. In accordance with Item 15.1 of the Instrument, revisions or modifications to the framework would have to be proposed "*in writing by any Participating Country, to be considered and adopted by the IG in consensus*", and that, under Item 15.2, "*Subject to the official written consent by all Participating Countries, the revision or modification adopted by the IG will form part of [the] Instrument*".

12. In addition, pursuant to Item 10 of the Instrument in conjunction with Rule 6.2 of the EANET Rules of Procedure,[10] the IG is also endowed with the power to

[5] EANET/IG25/13, para. 33.
[6] EANET/IG26/12, para 5.
[7] EANET/IG 12/15, Annex II.
[8] EANET/IG 23/17, para 29-33; see also: EANET/WG2021-1/5/3, paragraph 7.
[9] See the Joint Proposal.
[10] See also Rule (5.2) of the Rules of Procedure of the EANET meetings and dissemination of data and information, EANET Guidelines on the administrative and financial management for the Secretariat, the Network Center and the EANET Project Fund.

establish subsidiary bodies. Accordingly, in November 2025, IG27 "*Task[ed] the Secretariat to organize a Working Group Meeting in 2026 to discuss and consider, among other matters, the EANET Project Plans in 2027*".[11]

13. In line with established practice within the Network with respect to the role of the WG routinely created by the IG, "*The WG2026 [...] may wish to discuss, consider, and provide guidance for further action to the 28th Intergovernmental Meeting (IG28) to be held in November 2026, as appropriate*".[12]

14. As such, it can be reasonably concluded that, while the WG can discuss and consider matters and provide guidance to the IG, it is the IG itself that maintains ultimate and exclusive decision-making powers within the institutional framework of EANET.

b. Decision-making process

15. In accordance with Rule (7.2) of the RoPs as outlined in Part I of the Guidelines, decisions of the IG will be made by consensus among the participating countries.

16. Pursuant to Rule (5.4) of the RoPs as outlined in Part I of the Guidelines, the same principle applies to the proceedings of IG's subsidiary bodies.

III. The process to implement the Joint Proposal

17. EANET is a standalone intergovernmental entity, administered by UNEP.

18. On the face of it and based on the existing institutional and legal framework, there is nothing to prevent the Governments of Mongolia, Viet Nam, Lao PDR, and Japan from proposing a revision to the name of the EANET.

19. Procedurally, such a revision would require a decision of the IG, i.e. the Network's highest decision-making body, in accordance with the applicable RoPs.

20. This procedural requirement, however, does not preclude the abovementioned Participating Countries from officially submitting their proposal to the Working Group, for prior discussion and consideration with a view to providing guidance to the IG for further action.

21. The decision by the IG would have to provide for the adoption of the revised name, indicating that the new name shall replace the previous denomination, taking effect on a specified date, and that all references to the previous denomination in EANET documents shall be understood as referring to the Network under its new name. This approach would not require any formal amendment of the existing

[11] EANET/IG27/12, Annex II, para. IV.c.
[12] EANET/WG2026/4/1, para. 5.

legal framework, instruments or documents, nor would it affect their legal validity or continued application.

22. However, given the nature of the proposal which is linked to the expansion of the scope of EANET, Participating Countries are advised to formally amend the Instrument in accordance with Item 15(1) of the Instrument (written proposal to be adopted by consensus) and Item 15(2) of the Instrument (official written consent by all Participating Countries).

23. As was the case with regard to the decision to expand the scope of the Instrument in 2021, any decision by the IG regarding the change of name will therefore be subject to the "official written consent by all Participating Countries" (see Item 15(2) of the Instrument). However, the applicable procedure does not require the amended Instrument to be signed again.

14 August 2026

Annex 3

Summary of the Online Meeting with UNEP Law Division on Renaming the EANET
held on 8 October 2026.

Online meeting with UNEP Law Division on the Renaming of the EANET
Thursday 8 October 13:00-14:00 (Bangkok time) – via Webex

Participants:

EANET Participating Countries including representatives from China, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Thailand.

UNEP Law division
Gerhard Kreutzer, Federico Rossi

UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific – Secretariat for the EANET
Yujeong Kim, Sirinart Suanyam, Aurélia Lemoine

Asia Center for Air Pollution Research (ACAP) – Network Center for the EANET
Toru Hayashi, Meihua Zhu, Kumiko Nakamura, Miho Tamura.

Meeting Notes:

The meeting began with addressing the questions that had been received in advance.

Question 1: Several countries are concerned that domestic procedures will be required in their respective countries following the revision of the Instrument. Are there any cases known to UNEP where such domestic procedures were streamlined in the past?

Gerhard Kreutzer recalled that the entire EANET legal framework is based upon the Instrument for Strengthening the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET) (the "Instrument") adopted at the 12th Intergovernmental Meeting (IG12) in 2010. The Instrument serves as EANET's constitution, outlining its objectives, its scope of activities and the institutional framework. The Instrument contains elements of a treaty without being one. However, Participating Countries can expect that all parties will act according to the rules of the Instrument.

How amendments to the Instrument are implemented domestically must be determined in accordance with domestic law. The Secretariat is not in a position to advise states on the domestic procedure to be followed, for that purpose.

A country asked whether the renaming process could be compared to the expansion of scope and follow a similar procedure.

Gerhard explained that at IG23 a decision had been made to expand the scope of the Instrument through the adoption of a supplementary document. The proposed name change is connected to that expansion and, equally, requires an amendment of the Instrument.

The procedure for amendments is set out in Item 15 of the Instrument which entails the following steps:

1) A decision by consensus of the Intergovernmental Meeting.
2) Official written consent from all Participating Countries.

Only after both steps have been completed can the amendment take effect. Both need to be completed; this is a necessary condition.

Question 2: A country sought clarification regarding Item 15.2 and asked whether "official written consent" meant that an official document would be required, or whether any written expression of consent, including email correspondence, would be sufficient.

Gerhard Kreutzer clarified that a written communication by email can satisfy the requirement for “written form”. However, support expressed verbally during an IG meeting is not sufficient. The written communication does not need to follow any specific format. The second requirement is that the communication be “official”. In the absence of more detailed guidance in the Instrument, an official communication should come from the institution authorized to represent the country in the EANET context. An official letter on institutional letterhead, including the date and a short statement of consent, which is then scanned and sent electronically, would be suitable. If an email is used, it must be possible to establish that the sender has the authority to communicate on behalf of the competent organization.

A country asked whether the Instrument itself would need to be edited to reflect the new name, including in the preface and other sections. Second, the country noted that the Instrument had originally been signed at the level of the Prime Minister. In their country, the Instrument is treated domestically in a manner similar to an intergovernmental agreement. The country therefore asked who would need to provide agreement to the amendment and whether approval at the IG level alone would be sufficient or whether written consent would also be required.

Gerhard Kreutzer explained that EANET is an intergovernmental forum, and representatives act on behalf of their governments rather than their ministries. He outlined two possible scenarios. If the individual providing written consent already possesses the necessary authority, no additional steps are needed. If not, a delegation of authority or formal credentials would be required. He suggested checking who signed the Instrument in 2012 on behalf of the Participating Country, to determine the appropriate level of authority required for approving the amendment in accordance with domestic law and procedure.

A country explained that the original signatory of the Instrument was no longer in office but had received special authorization from the Prime Minister. A similar arrangement had been used for

the Annex. The country therefore anticipated that a similar procedure might be required for the name change. The country also asked whether it would be necessary to sign changes to the Instrument itself or simply a consent letter.

Gerhard Kreutzer responded that the country would likely need to obtain authority from the appropriate level of government. What is required is evidence that the individual signing the official written consent is authorized to do so on behalf of the government.

A country then asked again whether the Instrument itself would need to be edited.

Gerhard Kreutzer responded that there would be no need to sign a new Instrument.

A country clarified that the expectation would therefore be to sign a consent letter rather than amend and re-sign the Instrument itself.

Gerhard Kreutzer confirmed that an authorized representative could provide the necessary consent by means of a consent letter.

A country noted that it would need an official document from EANET outlining the proposed name change. Such a document would provide a solid basis for requesting credentials and beginning domestic procedures. The country suggested that it would be useful to have a preliminary decision from the IG. At IG28, the country expected to receive initial information and a basis for discussion.

Gerhard Kreutzer reiterated that Item 15 establishes a two-step process. First, the IG must decide by consensus to modify the Instrument. Only after this decision has been taken can Participating Countries initiate their domestic procedures and obtain the necessary credentials. He compared this process to treaty law, where states first agree internationally and then return home to complete ratification. However, in the EANET context, the process is considerably lighter. He also emphasized that the requirement is for consent from all Participating Countries. If even one Participating Country does not provide consent, the amendment cannot enter into force.

A country raised a further concern regarding budgetary support arrangements. The country's budget for EANET is administered through a different ministry, and the country asked how a name change would affect existing legal and administrative arrangements. The country observed that although the abbreviation "EANET" would remain the same, the words behind the abbreviation would change. The country indicated that legal advice would likely be needed at the national level to assess the implications. It also noted that it could not yet indicate clear support for the proposal at the upcoming IG meeting.

Gerhard Kreutzer clarified that the name change cannot occur automatically. It would require an amendment to the Instrument under the procedure set out in Item 15. However, the Instrument itself would not need to be signed again. The existing Instrument and signatures would remain valid. The amendment would only change the title of the Instrument.

A country pointed out that in Item 1 of the Instrument, EANET is defined with reference to acid deposition. Since the proposed new name would refer more broadly to the atmospheric environment, the country questioned why the definition itself would not also be amended, rather than changing only the name.

Gerhard Kreutzer explained that the scope of the Instrument had already been expanded through the adoption of the Annex in 2021. The Instrument today consists of both the original document and the Annex. As a result, the original scope has already been broadened. The current proposal for a name change seems to be linked to the earlier expansion of scope. He suggested that the proponents of the Joint Proposal would be in the best position to explain the rationale for the proposed new name.

Regarding the letter of consent, he noted that the country's consent letter from 2022 serves as an example where multiple elements (including delegation of authority and written consent) were addressed within a single document.

Yujeong Kim offered to continue discussions bilaterally with the country in order to provide further support.

A country emphasized that it would be helpful to receive information on the overall purpose and benefits of the proposed name change before the IG28 meeting, as this would support preparations for the consent process and requests for credentials.

Yujeong Kim thanked the UNEP Law Division for its expert support and noted that the Secretariat would circulate a meeting summary after the meeting. The Secretariat also offered to provide further support to Participating Countries following the meeting if needed.

Annex 4

A step-by-step guide on the Modification of the Instrument for Strengthening the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)

Modification of the Instrument for Strengthening the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)

A step-by-step guide

This document provides a step-by-step guide on the procedure for revising or modifying the *Instrument for Strengthening the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET)* (the "Instrument") for use of Participating Countries.

A. Legal framework

In accordance with Item 15(1) of the Instrument for Strengthening the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia ("the Instrument") "[a]ny revisions or modifications to any part of th[e] Instrument may be proposed in writing by any Participating Country to be considered and adopted by the [Intergovernmental Meeting] IG in consensus". Pursuant to Item 15(2) of the Instrument "[s]ubject to the official written consent by all Participating Countries, the revision or modification adopted by the IG will form part of this Instrument".

Pursuant to Item 10(1)(d) of the Instrument, the tasks of the IG include, amongst others, the [...] establishment of subsidiary bodies as necessary and appropriate.

At its twenty-third Session, that was held in November 2021, IG23 decided to expand the scope of the instrument to encompass activities related to air pollution and decided to adopt a Supplementary Document (Annex) to the Instrument, following the process set out in Item 15 of the Instrument (EANET/IG 23/17, para 29-33; see also: EANET/WG2021-1/5/3, paragraph 7).

B. Step-by-step guide

I. Proposal phase

1. **One or more Participating Countries may propose revisions or modifications** to any part of the Instrument (Item 15(1) of the Instrument). Such proposals may relate to the operative provisions ("Items"), as well as to the title or preamble.

2. Any proposal for revisions or modifications must be submitted **in writing** (Item 15(1) of the Instrument). The requirement that a proposal be made "in writing" does not prescribe any specific format. It may reasonably be understood as encompassing communications transmitted either in paper form or electronically.

3. While the Instrument does not establish specific timelines for the submission of proposals, it would be advisable to submit the proposal to the EANET Secretariat **sufficiently in advance of the IG meeting**, to allow for its circulation to all Participating Countries and to provide them with adequate time for consideration ahead of such meeting.

II. Consultation phase

4. Following the submission of a written proposal, Participating Countries **engage in consultations.**

5. Discussions may take place **through bilateral or multilateral exchanges**, including during formal sessions of the IG or of Subsidiary Bodies, established in accordance with Item 10(1)(d) of the Instrument in conjunction with Rule 6.2 of the Rules of Procedure, or through informal consultations.

III. Decision phase

6. Regardless of the specific modalities adopted for the consultation process, **any decision** on revisions or modifications of the Instrument must be **adopted by consensus** (Item 15(1) of the Instrument).

7. Where a proposal concerns a change to the name of EANET, the decision should further provide that references to the former designation in the Network's documents shall be understood as referring to the Network under its new designation.

IV. Expression of consent phase

8. Once adopted by the IG, **a decision** concerning revisions or modifications of the Instrument **remains subject to the receipt by the Secretariat of the "official written consent" of all Participating Countries** before the revision or modification of the Instrument may enter into force (Item 15(1) of the Instrument).

9. About the **requirement that consent be "written"**, the Instrument does not prescribe any specific form or modality for its communication. The considerations set out in paragraph 2 above would apply equally in this context. An official letter issued on institutional letterhead, bearing the date and a valid signature, would generally satisfy this requirement. Such letter may be transmitted electronically, by way of a scanned copy. Consent can also be communicated by means of simple text in an electronic mail.

10. Regardless of the chosen option, the Secretariat should be able to verify both the identity of the sender and the sender's authority to express consent on behalf of its government. In this regard, the **requirement that consent be "official"** may be understood to mean that the communication should originate from, or be transmitted through, the official channels of the government authority responsible for representing the Participating Country within the EANET framework, **in accordance with its domestic legal and administrative arrangements.**

11. **Only once the Secretariat has received the official written consent of all Participating Countries, the revisions or modifications may enter into force**.

12. The Secretariat may issue an amended version of the Instrument, incorporating the approved changes. In the absence of any provision in the Instrument to the contrary, **the amended version of the Instrument would not need to be signed again by the Participating Countries**.

22 October 2026