

# Ongoing Key Comparison BIPM.QM-K1, Ozone at ambient level, comparison with CHMI (Sept. 2025) *Final Report*

Joële Viallon<sup>1\*</sup>, Philippe Moussay<sup>1</sup>, Faraz Idrees<sup>1</sup>, Robert Wielgosz<sup>1</sup>, Miroslav Klösel<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> BIPM (Bureau International des Poids et Mesures), Pavillon de Breteuil, F-92312 Sèvres, France

<sup>2</sup> CHMI (Czech Hydrometeorological Institute), Na Šabatce 17, 143 06 Praha 4, Czech Republic

## Abstract

As part of the ongoing key comparison BIPM.QM-K1, a comparison has been performed between the ozone standard of the European Commission maintained by the Czech Hydrometeorological Institute (CHMI) and the common reference standard of the key comparison, maintained by the Bureau International des Poids et Mesures (BIPM). The instruments have been compared over a nominal ozone amount fraction range of 0 nmol mol<sup>-1</sup> to 500 nmol mol<sup>-1</sup>.

## Contents:

1. FIELD .....	2
2. SUBJECT .....	2
3. PARTICIPANTS .....	2
4. ORGANIZING BODY .....	2
5. RATIONALE .....	2
6. TERMS AND DEFINITIONS .....	2
7. MEASUREMENTS SCHEDULE .....	2
8. MEASUREMENT PROTOCOL .....	2
9. REPORTING MEASUREMENT RESULTS .....	4
10. POST COMPARISON CALCULATION .....	4
11. DEVIATIONS FROM THE COMPARISON PROTOCOL .....	4
12. MEASUREMENT STANDARDS .....	4
13. MEASUREMENT RESULTS AND UNCERTAINTIES .....	8
14. ANALYSIS OF THE MEASUREMENT RESULTS BY GENERALISED LEAST-SQUARE REGRESSION .....	8
15. DEGREES OF EQUIVALENCE .....	8
16. HISTORY OF COMPARISONS BETWEEN BIPM SRP27, SRP28 AND CHMI SRP17 .....	10
17. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS COMPARISONS INCLUDED IN BIPM.QM-K1 .....	11
18. CONCLUSION .....	11
19. REFERENCES .....	11
<b>APPENDIX 1 - FORM BIPM.QM-K1-R1-CHMI-2025 .....</b>	<b>12</b>

---

\* Author for correspondence. E-mail [jviallon@bipm.org](mailto:jviallon@bipm.org), Tel: +33 1 45 07 62 70, Fax: +33 1 45 07 20 21.

## 1. Field

Amount of substance.

## 2. Subject

Comparison of reference measurement standards for ozone at ambient level.

## 3. Participants

BIPM.QM-K1 is an ongoing key comparison, which is structured as an ongoing series of bilateral comparisons. The results of the comparison with the Czech Hydrometeorological Institute (CHMI) are reported here.

## 4. Organizing body

BIPM.

## 5. Rationale

The ongoing key comparison BIPM.QM-K1 has been running since January 2007. It follows the pilot study CCQM-P28 that included 23 participants and was performed between July 2003 and February 2005 [1]. It is aimed at evaluating the degree of equivalence of ozone photometers that are maintained as national standards, or as primary standards within international networks for ambient ozone measurements. The reference value is determined using the NIST Standard Reference Photometer (BIPM-SRP27) maintained by the BIPM as a common reference.

## 6. Terms and definitions

- $x_{\text{nom}}$ : nominal ozone amount fraction in dry air furnished by the ozone generator
- $x_{A,i}$ :  $i$ th measurement of the nominal value  $x_{\text{nom}}$  by the photometer A.
- $\bar{x}_A$ : the mean of  $N$  measurements of the nominal value  $x_{\text{nom}}$  measured by the photometer A:  $\bar{x}_A = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{A,i}$
- $s_A$ : standard deviation of  $N$  measurements of the nominal value  $x_{\text{nom}}$  measured by the photometer A:  $s_A^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_{A,i} - \bar{x}_A)^2$
- The result of the linear regression fit performed between two sets of data measured by the photometers A and B during a comparison is written:  $x_A = a_{A,B}x_B + b_{A,B}$ . With this notation, the photometer A is compared versus the photometer B.  $a_{A,B}$  is dimensionless and  $b_{A,B}$  is expressed in units of nmol mol<sup>-1</sup>.

## 7. Measurements schedule

This is the sixth participation of CHMI since 2007. Measurements reported in this report were performed on 17 September 2025 at the BIPM.

## 8. Measurement protocol

The comparison protocol is summarised in this section. The complete version can be downloaded from the BIPM website ([BIPM.QM-K1 protocol](#)).

This comparison was performed following protocol A, corresponding to a comparison between the CHMI standard SRP17 and the common reference standard BIPM-SRP27 maintained at the BIPM. A comparison between two (or more) ozone photometers consists of producing ozone-

air mixtures at different amount fractions over the required range and measuring these with the photometers.

### 8.1. Ozone generation

The same source of purified air is used for all the ozone photometers being compared. Starting from compressed ambient air, the purification system consisted of a first refrigeration dryer, a catalytic converter to burn residual oil, a second refrigeration dryer, a particulate filter to remove particles larger than 0.1  $\mu\text{m}$ , an active coal filter, and a final zero air generator (AADCO 737R-12), which ensured that the amount fraction of ozone, hydrocarbons, and nitrogen oxides remaining in the air was below detectable limits. This final system also ensured a constant amount fraction of oxygen in air, which is important to generate constant ozone amount fractions in the ozone generator. The relative humidity of the reference air was monitored and the amount fraction of water in air was typically found to be less than 3  $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$ .

Ozone in air mixtures were produced from the purified air inside the ozone generator (EnviroNics) equipped with a UV lamp to enable the photolysis of oxygen at a wavelength of 185 nm. To obtain a range of ozone amount fractions, the UV lamp intensity was tuned at appropriate levels. These actions were all controlled by the SRP operating software.

A common dual external Pyrex manifold was used to furnish the necessary flows of reference air and ozone-air mixtures to the ozone photometers. The two columns of this manifold were vented to atmospheric pressure. The same length of Teflon tubing was used to deliver both gas flows to all photometers under comparison, ensuring that they all received homogenized samples and reference air.

### 8.2. Comparison procedure

Prior to the comparison, all the instruments were switched on and allowed to stabilise for at least 8 hours. The pressure and temperature measurement systems of the instruments were checked at this time. If any adjustments were required, these were noted.

For this comparison, adjustment of the pressure probe of BIPM-SRP27 was necessary, based on the local standard. The temperature probe of the CHMI standard SRP17 was calibrated at the CHMI meteorological calibration laboratory two weeks before the key comparison. At the BIPM, the probe was adjusted using a STOLAB calibrator at temperatures of 0 °C and 100 °C. The correction found during calibration at the CHMI laboratory was taken into account during adjustment. The pressure gauge was adjusted using CHMI calibrated Pace 1001 device and checked against the BIPM pressure gauge. The SRP pressure zero was set internally using the SRP electronic module. The SRP Dark Count Scaler values were set according to the procedure in the SRP manual.

One comparison run includes ten different amount fractions of ozone distributed to cover the range, together with the measurement of reference air at the beginning and end of each run. The nominal amount fractions were measured in a sequence imposed by the protocol (0, 220, 80, 420, 120, 320, 30, 370, 170, 500, 270, and 0)  $\text{nmol mol}^{-1}$ . Each of these points is an average of ten single measurements.

For each nominal value of the ozone amount fraction  $x_{\text{nom}}$  furnished by the ozone generator, the standard deviation  $s_{\text{SRP27}}$  on the set of 10 consecutive measurements  $x_{\text{SRP27},i}$  recorded by BIPM-SRP27 was calculated. The measurement results were considered as valid if  $s_{\text{SRP27}}$  was less than 1  $\text{nmol mol}^{-1}$ , which ensures that the photometers were measuring a stable ozone concentration. If not, another series of 10 consecutive measurements was performed.

### 8.3. Comparison repeatability

The comparison procedure was repeated continuously to evaluate its repeatability. The participant and the BIPM commonly decided when both instruments were stable enough to start recording a set of measurement results to be considered as the official comparison results.

### 8.4. SRP27 stability check

A second ozone reference standard, BIPM-SRP28, was included in the comparison to verify its agreement with BIPM-SRP27 and thus follow its stability over the period of the ongoing key comparison.

## 9. Reporting measurement results

The participant and the BIPM staff reported the measurement results in the result form BIPM.QM-K1-R1 provided by the BIPM and available on the BIPM website. It includes details on the comparison conditions, measurement results and associated uncertainties, as well as the standard deviation for each series of 10 ozone amount fractions measured by the participant's standard and the common reference standard. The completed form BIPM.QM-K1-R1-CHMI-2025 is given in appendix 1.

## 10. Post comparison calculation

All calculations were performed by the BIPM using the form BIPM.QM-K1-R1. It includes the two degrees of equivalence that are reported as comparison results in the Appendix B of the BIPM KCDB (key comparison database). Additionally, the degrees of equivalence at all nominal ozone amount fractions are reported in the same form, as well as the linear relationship between the participant standard and the common reference standard.

## 11. Deviations from the comparison protocol

There was no deviation from the protocol in this comparison.

## 12. Measurement standards

The instruments maintained by the BIPM and by the CHMI are Standard Reference Photometers (SRP) built by the NIST. More details on the instrument's principle and its capabilities can be found in [2]. The following section describes briefly both instruments' measurement principle and their uncertainty budgets.

### 12.1. Measurement equation of a NIST SRP

The measurement of the ozone amount fraction by an SRP is based on the absorption of radiation at 253.65 nm by ozonized air in the gas cells of the instrument. One particularity of the instrument design is the use of two gas cells to overcome the instability of the light source. The measurement equation is derived from the Beer-Lambert and ideal gas laws. The number density ( $C_{O_3}$ ) of ozone is calculated from:

$$C_{O_3} = \frac{-1}{2\sigma L_{opt}} \frac{T}{T_{std}} \frac{P_{std}}{P} \ln(D) \quad (1)$$

where

- $\sigma$  is the absorption cross-section per molecule of ozone at 253.65 nm under standard conditions of temperature and pressure,  $1.1329 \times 10^{-17} \text{ cm}^2$  [3].
- $L_{opt}$  is the mean optical path length of the two cells;
- $T$  is the measured temperature of the cells;

$T_{\text{std}}$  is the standard temperature (273.15 K);  
 $P$  is the measured pressure of the cells;  
 $P_{\text{std}}$  is the standard pressure (101.325 kPa);  
 $D$  is the product of transmittances of two cells, with the transmittance ( $T_r$ ) of one cell defined as

$$T_r = \frac{I_{\text{ozone}}}{I_{\text{air}}} \quad (2)$$

where

$I_{\text{ozone}}$  is the UV radiation intensity measured from the cell when containing ozonized air,  
 and  
 $I_{\text{air}}$  is the UV radiation intensity measured from the cell when containing pure air (also called reference or zero air).

Using the ideal gas law equation (1) can be recast in order to obtain the amount fraction ( $x$ ) of ozone in air:

$$x = \frac{-1}{2\sigma L_{\text{opt}}} \frac{T}{P} \frac{R}{N_A} \ln(D) \quad (3)$$

where

$N_A$  is the Avogadro constant,  $6.022\,140\,76 \times 10^{23}$  molecule/mol  
 $R$  is the gas constant,  $8.314\,462\,618$  J mol<sup>-1</sup> K<sup>-1</sup>

The formulation implemented in the SRP software, although equivalent in terms of the measurement results, differs from the above in the choice of a unit system based on the “atm” (atmosphere) as unit for the pressure, rather than the SI-unit. As explained in detail in [4], the “atm” unit system was used initially to describe the operation of ozone photometers and, though antiquated, remains in use by many practitioners. In this system, the amount fraction of ozone  $x$  is calculated from:

$$x = \frac{-1}{2\alpha_0 L_{\text{opt}}} \frac{T}{T_{\text{std}}} \frac{P_{\text{std}}}{P} \ln(D) \quad (4)$$

where

$\alpha_0$  is the absorption coefficient at standard temperature and pressure (0 °C and 1 atm), expressed in atm<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>, and linked to the absorption cross-section per molecule  $\sigma$  via the Boltzmann constant  $k_B = 1.380\,649 \times 10^{-23}$  J K<sup>-1</sup> with the relation:

$$\alpha_0 = \frac{\sigma}{k_B T_{\text{std}}} \quad (5)$$

## 12.2. Absorption cross-section for ozone

Since January 2025, the absorption coefficient under standard conditions  $\alpha_0$  used within the SRPs maintained by the BIPM is 304.39 atm<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>. This corresponds to the value for the absorption cross section  $\sigma$  named CCQM.O3.2019 proposed by Hodges *et al.* [5] and recommended by the CCQM.

In the comparison of two SRP instruments, the absorption cross-section can be considered to have a conventional value and its uncertainty can be set to zero. However, in the comparison of different methods or when considering the complete uncertainty budget of the method the uncertainty of the absorption cross-section should be taken into account.

### 12.3. Condition of the BIPM SRPs

SRP27 and SRP28 were built in 2002. Compared to the original design described in [2], both instruments have been modified to deal with two biases revealed by the study conducted by the BIPM and the NIST in 2006 [6]. In 2009, an “SRP upgrade kit” was installed in the instruments [7]. In 2021, their electronic modules were upgraded. Negligible impact on their measurement results was demonstrated [8].

### 12.4. Uncertainty budget of the common reference BIPM-SRP27

The uncertainty budget for the ozone amount fraction in dry air ( $x$ ) measured by the instruments BIPM-SRP27 and BIPM-SRP28 in the nominal range 0 nmol mol<sup>-1</sup> to 500 nmol mol<sup>-1</sup> is given in Table 1. The component associated with the ozone absorption cross-section is indicated for information, noting that it is not included when comparing two ozone instruments standards.

**Table 1: Uncertainty budget for the SRPs maintained by the BIPM**

Component ( $y$ )	Uncertainty $u(y)$				Sensitivity coefficient $c_i = \frac{\partial x}{\partial y}$	contribution to $u(x)$ $ c_i  \cdot u(y)$ nmol mol <sup>-1</sup>
	Source	Distribution	Standard Uncertainty	Combined standard uncertainty $u(y)$		
<b>Optical Path</b> $L_{\text{opt}}$	Measurement scale	Rectangular	0.0006 cm	0.52 cm	$-\frac{x}{L_{\text{opt}}}$	$2.89 \times 10^{-3}x$
	Repeatability	Normal	0.01 cm			
	Correction factor	Rectangular	0.52 cm			
<b>Pressure <math>P</math></b>	Pressure gauge	Rectangular	0.029 kPa	0.034 kPa	$-\frac{x}{P}$	$3.37 \times 10^{-4}x$
	Difference between cells	Rectangular	0.017 kPa			
<b>Temperature <math>T</math></b>	Temperature probe	Rectangular	0.03 K	0.07 K	$\frac{x}{T}$	$2.29 \times 10^{-4}x$
	Temperature gradient	Rectangular	0.058 K			
<b>Ratio of intensities <math>D</math></b>	Scaler resolution	Rectangular	$8 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-5}$	$\frac{x}{D \ln(D)}$	0.28
	Repeatability	Triangular	$1.1 \times 10^{-5}$			
<b>Absorption Cross section per molecule <math>\sigma</math></b>	CCQM.O3.2019		$0.35 \times 10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2$		$-\frac{x}{\alpha}$	$3.1 \times 10^{-3}x$

Following this budget, as explained in the protocol of the comparison, the standard uncertainty associated with the ozone amount fraction measurement with the BIPM SRPs can be expressed as a numerical equation (numerical values expressed as nmol mol<sup>-1</sup>):

$$u(x) = \sqrt{(0.28)^2 + (2.92 \cdot 10^{-3}x)^2} \quad (6)$$

### 12.5. Covariance terms for the common reference BIPM-SRP27

As explained in section 14, correlations in between the results of two measurements performed at two different ozone amount fractions with BIPM-SRP27 were taken into account in the software OzoneE. More details on the covariance expression can be found in the protocol. The following expression was applied:

$$u(x_i, x_j) = x_i \cdot x_j \cdot u_b^2 \quad (7)$$

where:

$$u_b^2 = \frac{u^2(T)}{T^2} + \frac{u^2(P)}{P^2} + \frac{u^2(L_{opt})}{L_{opt}^2} \quad (8)$$

The value of  $u_b$  is given by the expression of the measurement uncertainty:  $u_b = 2.92 \times 10^{-3}$ .

## 12.6. Condition of the CHMI SRP17

The hardware of CHMI SRP17 has not been modified since the last comparison [9]. Since 10 January 2025, the instrument has been controlled electronically with the software O3Conductor version 2021-07A. Since 14 January 2025, the ozone absorption cross-section coefficient used by CHMI has been CCQM.O3.2019.

## 12.7. Uncertainty budget of the CHMI SRP17

The uncertainty budget for the ozone mole fraction in dry air  $x$  measured by the CHMI standard SRP17 in the nominal range 0 nmol/mol to 500 nmol/mol is given in Table 2.

Following this budget, as explained in the protocol of the comparison, the standard uncertainty associated with the ozone mole fraction measurement with the CHMI SRP17 can be expressed as a numerical equation (numerical values expressed as nmol/mol):

$$u(x) = \sqrt{(0.28)^2 + (2.92 \cdot 10^{-3} x)^2} \quad (9)$$

No covariance term for the CHMI standard SRP17 was included in the calculations.

**Table 2 : SRP17 uncertainty budget**

Component (y)	Uncertainty $u(y)$				Sensitivity coefficient $c_i = \frac{\partial x}{\partial y}$	contribution to $u(x)$ $ c_i  \cdot u(y)$ nmol/mol
	Source	Distribution	Standard Uncertainty	Combined standard uncertainty $u(y)$		
<b>Optical Path</b> $L_{opt}$	Measurement Scale	Rectangular	0.005 cm	0.52 cm	$-\frac{x}{L_{opt}}$	$2.89 \times 10^{-3} x$
	Variability	Rectangular	0.004 cm			
	Divergence	Rectangular	0.52 cm			
<b>Pressure <math>P</math></b>	Pressure gauge	Rectangular	0.029 kPa	0.034 kPa	$-\frac{x}{P}$	$3.37 \times 10^{-4} x$
	Difference between cells	Rectangular	0.017 kPa			
<b>Temperature <math>T</math></b>	Temperature probe	Rectangular	0.03 K	0.07 K	$\frac{x}{T}$	$2.29 \times 10^{-4} x$
	Temperature gradient	Rectangular	0.058 K			
<b>Ratio of intensities <math>D</math></b>	Scaler resolution	Rectangular	$8 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-5}$	$\frac{x}{D \ln(D)}$	0.28
	Repeatability	Triangular	$1.1 \times 10^{-5}$			
<b>Absorption Cross section <math>\alpha</math></b>	CCQM.O3.2019		$0.35 \times 10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2$		$-\frac{x}{\alpha}$	$3.1 \times 10^{-3} x$

### 13. Measurement results and uncertainties

Details of the measurement results, the measurement uncertainties and the standard deviations at each nominal ozone amount fraction can be found in the form BIPM.QM-K1-R1-CHMI-2025 given in appendix 1.

### 14. Analysis of the measurement results by generalised least-square regression

The relationship between the national and reference standards was first evaluated with a generalised least-square regression fit, using the software OzonE. This software, which is documented in a publication [10], is an extension of the previously used software B\_Least recommended by ISO 6143:2025 [11]. It includes the possibility to take into account correlations between measurements performed with the same instrument at different ozone amount fractions.

In a direct comparison, a linear relationship between the ozone amount fractions measured by the instrument  $i$  and SRP27 is obtained:

$$x_i = a_0 + a_1 x_{\text{SRP27}} \quad (10)$$

The associated uncertainties on the slope  $u(a_1)$  and the intercept  $u(a_0)$  are given by OzonE, as well as the covariance between them and the usual statistical parameters to validate the fitting function.

#### 14.1. Least-square regression results

The relationship between SRP17 and SRP27 is:

$$x_{\text{SRP17}} = 0.10 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1} + 1.0019 x_{\text{SRP27}} \quad (11)$$

The standard uncertainties on the parameters of the regression are  $u(a_1) = 0.0033$  for the slope and  $u(a_0) = 0.22 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1}$  for the intercept. The covariance between the two parameters is  $\text{cov}(a_0, a_1) = -2.09 \times 10^{-4}$ .

The least-squares regression results confirm that a linear fit is appropriate, with a sum of the squared deviations (SSD) of 0.44 and a goodness of fit (GoF) equals to 0.24.

To assess the agreement of the standards using equations 11 and 12, the difference between the calculated slope value and unity, and the intercept value and zero, together with their measurement uncertainties need to be considered. In this comparison, the value of the intercept is consistent with an intercept of zero, considering the uncertainty in the value of this parameter; i.e.  $|a_0| < 2u(a_0)$ , and the value of the slope is consistent with a slope of 1; i.e.  $|1 - a_1| < 2u(a_1)$ .

### 15. Degrees of equivalence

Degrees of equivalence are calculated at two nominal ozone amount fractions among the twelve measured in each comparison, in the nominal range  $0 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1}$  to  $500 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1}$ :  $80 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1}$  and  $420 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1}$ . These values correspond to points number 3 and 4 recorded in each comparison. As an ozone generator has limited reproducibility, the ozone amount fractions measured by the ozone standards can differ from the nominal values. However, as stated in the protocol, the value measured by the common reference SRP27 was expected to be within  $\pm 15 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1}$  of the nominal value. Hence, it is meaningful to compare the degree of equivalence calculated for all the participants at the same nominal value.



### 15.1. Definition of the degrees of equivalence

The degree of equivalence of the participant  $i$ , at a nominal value  $x_{\text{nom}}$  is defined as:

$$D_i = x_i - x_{\text{SRP27}} \quad (12)$$

where  $x_i$  and  $x_{\text{SRP27}}$  are the measurement result of the participant  $i$  and of SRP27 at the nominal value  $x_{\text{nom}}$ .

Its associated standard uncertainty is:

$$u(D_i) = \sqrt{u_i^2 + u_{\text{SRP27}}^2} \quad (13)$$


where  $u_i$  and  $u_{\text{SRP27}}$  are the measurement uncertainties of the participant  $i$  and of SRP27 respectively.

### 15.2. Values of the degrees of equivalence

The degrees of equivalence and their uncertainties calculated in the form BIPM.QM-K1-R1-CHMI-2025 are reported in the table below. Corresponding graphs of equivalence are displayed in Figure 1. The expanded uncertainties are calculated with a coverage factor  $k = 2$ .

**Table 3: Degrees of equivalence of CHMI at the ozone nominal amount fractions  
80 nmol mol<sup>-1</sup> and 420 nmol mol<sup>-1</sup>**

Nominal value	$x_i /$	$u_i /$	$x_{\text{SRP27}} /$	$u_{\text{SRP27}} /$	$D_i /$	$u(D_i) /$	$U(D_i) /$
	(nmol mol <sup>-1</sup> )	(nmol mol <sup>-1</sup> )	(nmol mol <sup>-1</sup> )	(nmol mol <sup>-1</sup> )	(nmol mol <sup>-1</sup> )	(nmol mol <sup>-1</sup> )	(nmol mol <sup>-1</sup> )
<b>80</b>	84.30	0.37	84.01	0.37	0.29	0.53	1.05
<b>420</b>	427.25	1.28	426.52	1.28	0.73	1.81	3.61




**Figure 1: Degrees of equivalence of CHMI at the two nominal ozone amount fractions  $80 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1}$  and  $420 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1}$**

The degrees of equivalence between the CHMI standard and the common reference standard BIPM SRP27 indicate good agreement between the standards. A discussion on the relation between degrees of equivalence and CMC statements can be found in [1].

## 16. History of comparisons between BIPM SRP27, SRP28 and CHMI SRP17

Results of the previous comparison performed with CHMI are displayed in Figure 2 together with the results of this comparison. The slopes  $a_1$  of the linear relation  $x_{SRPn} = a_0 + a_1 x_{SRP27}$  are represented together with their associated uncertainties calculated at the time of each comparison. Figure 2 shows that all standards included in these comparisons stayed in close agreement.



**Figure 2: Results of previous comparisons between SRP27, SRP28 and CHMI-SRP17 realised at the BIPM. Uncertainties are calculated at  $k = 2$ , with the uncertainty budget in use at the time of each comparison.**

## 17. Summary of previous comparisons included in BIPM.QM-K1

The comparison with CHMI is the sixth one since the start of BIPM.QM-K1 in 2007. An updated summary of BIPM.QM-K1 results can be found in the key comparison database: <http://kcdb.bipm.org/appendixB/>.

## 18. Conclusion

For the sixth time since the launch of the ongoing key comparison BIPM.QM-K1, a comparison has been performed between the ozone standard of the European Commission, maintained by CHMI, and the common reference standard of the key comparison, maintained by the BIPM. The instruments have been compared over a nominal ozone amount fraction range of 0 nmol mol<sup>-1</sup> to 500 nmol mol<sup>-1</sup>. Degrees of equivalence of this comparison indicated very good agreement between both standards.

## 19. References

- [1] Viallon J., Moussay P., Esler M., Wielgosz R., Bremser W., Novák J., Vokoun M., Botha A., Janse Van Rensburg M., Zellweger C., et al., 2006, PILOT STUDY: International Comparison CCQM-P28: Ozone at ambient level, *Metrologia*, **43**, *Tech. Suppl.*, 08010, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0026-1394/43/1A/08010>
- [2] Paur R.J., Bass A.M., Norris J.E. and Buckley T.J. NIST 2003 Standard reference photometer for the assay of ozone in calibration atmospheres *Env. Sci. Technol.* **NISTIR 6369**, February 2003, p 25,
- [3] ISO 13964:1998/Amd 1:2024 Air quality — Determination of ozone in ambient air — Ultraviolet photometric method/Amendment 1: Consensus value for the ozone absorption cross-section at room temperature at the mercury-line wavelength (253,65 nm air) (International Organization for Standardization)

- [4] Davis R.S., Niederhauser B., Hodges J.T., Viallon J. and Wielgosz R.I. BIPM 2022 Units and values for the ozone absorption cross section at 253.65 nm (air) with appropriate significant digits and rounding for use in documentary standards **Rapport BIPM-2022/02** p 16, <https://doi.org/10.59161/Rapport202202>
- [5] Hodges J.T., Viallon J., Brewer P.J., Drouin B.J., Gorshelev V., Janssen C., Lee S., Possolo A., Smith M.A.H., Walden J., et al., 2019, Recommendation of a consensus value of the ozone absorption cross-section at 253.65 nm based on a literature review, *Metrologia*, **56**, 034001, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1681-7575/ab0bdd>
- [6] Viallon J., Moussay P., Norris J.E., Guenther F.R. and Wielgosz R.I., 2006, A study of systematic biases and measurement uncertainties in ozone mole fraction measurements with the NIST Standard Reference Photometer, *Metrologia*, **43**, 441-450, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0026-1394/43/5/016>
- [7] Viallon J., Moussay P., Idrees F. and Wielgosz R.I. BIPM 2010 Upgrade of the BIPM Standard Reference Photometers for Ozone and the effect on the on-going key comparison BIPM.QM-K1 **Rapport BIPM-2010/07** p 16,
- [8] Viallon J., Moussay P., Idrees F. and Wielgosz R.I. BIPM 2022 Upgrade of the electronics modules of the BIPM Standard Reference Photometers for ozone and the effect on the on-going key comparison BIPM.QM-K1 **Rapport BIPM-2022/01** p 8, <https://doi.org/10.59161/Rapport202201>
- [9] Viallon J., Idrees F., Moussay P., Wielgosz R. and Vokoun M., 2022, Final report, ongoing key comparison BIPM.QM-K1, ozone at ambient level, comparison with CHMI, September 2021, *Metrologia*, **59**, 08008, 10.1088/0026-1394/59/1a/08008
- [10] Bremser W., Viallon J. and Wielgosz R.I., 2007, Influence of correlation on the assessment of measurement result compatibility over a dynamic range, *Metrologia*, **44**, 495-504, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0026-1394/44/6/009>
- [11] ISO 6143:2025 Gas analysis - Comparison methods for determining and checking the composition of calibration gas mixtures (International Organization for Standardization)

## Appendix 1 - Form BIPM.QM-K1-R1-CHMI-2025

See the following pages.

**OZONE COMPARISON RESULT - PROTOCOL A - DIRECT  
COMPARISON**

Participating institute information	
<b>Institute</b>	<b>CHMI</b>
<b>Address</b>	Generala Sisky 942/1 143 06 Praha 4 - Kamyk Czech Republic
<b>Contact</b>	<b>Miroslav Klösel</b>
<b>Email</b>	<a href="mailto:miroslav.kloesel@chmi.cz">miroslav.kloesel@chmi.cz</a>
<b>Telephone</b>	+420244033458/+420602479184

Instruments information		
	Reference Standard	National Standard
<b>Manufacturer</b>	NIST	NIST
<b>Type</b>	SRP	SRP
<b>Serial number</b>	SRP27	SRP17

Content of the report	
page 1	general informations
page 2	comparison results
page 3	measurements results
page 4	comparison description
page 5	uncertainty budgets

### comparison reference standard (RS) - national standard (NS)

Operator	F. Idrees	Location	BIPM/Room CHEM09
Comparison begin date / time	2025-09-17 08:54	Comparison end date / time	2025-09-17 11:08

### Comparison results

Equation

$$x_{NS} = a_{NS,RS} x_{RS} + b_{NS,RS}$$


### Least-square regression parameters

$a_{TS,RS}$	$u(a_{TS,RS})$	$b_{TS,RS}$ (nmol/mol)	$u(b_{TS,RS})$ (nmol/mol)	$u(a,b)$
1.0019	0.0033	0.10	0.22	-2.09E-04

(Least-square regression parameters will be computed by the BIPM using the software OzonE v2.0)

### Degrees of equivalence at 80 nmol/mol and 420 nmol/mol:

Nom value (nmol/mol)	$D_i$ (nmol/mol)	$u(D_i)$ (nmol/mol)	$U(D_i)$ (nmol/mol)
80	0.29	0.53	1.05
420	0.73	1.81	3.61



Measurement results						
Nominal value	Reference Standard (RS)			National standard (NS)		
	$x_{RS}$ nmol/mol	$s_{RS}$ nmol/mol	$u(x_{RS})$ nmol/mol	$x_{NS}$ nmol/mol	$s_{NS}$ nmol/mol	$u(x_{NS})$ nmol/mol
0	0.04	0.11	0.28	0.19	0.31	0.28
220	214.69	0.15	0.69	215.29	0.19	0.69
80	84.01	0.14	0.37	84.30	0.20	0.37
420	426.52	0.24	1.28	427.25	0.54	1.28
120	120.38	0.16	0.45	120.81	0.29	0.45
320	314.87	0.17	0.96	315.63	0.36	0.96
30	36.69	0.19	0.30	36.87	0.26	0.30
370	370.06	0.08	1.12	370.71	0.27	1.12
170	167.30	0.18	0.56	167.60	0.37	0.56
500	523.76	0.31	1.55	524.71	0.37	1.56
270	263.59	0.14	0.82	264.25	0.18	0.82
0	-0.03	0.15	0.28	-0.02	0.30	0.28

Degrees of Equivalence				
Point Number	Nom value (nmol/mol)	$D_i$ (nmol/mol)	$u(D_i)$ (nmol/mol)	$U(D_i)$ (nmol/mol)
1	0	0.15	0.40	0.79
2	220	0.60	0.97	1.94
3	80	0.29	0.53	1.05
4	420	0.73	1.81	3.61
5	120	0.43	0.64	1.27
6	320	0.76	1.36	2.72
7	30	0.19	0.42	0.85
8	370	0.64	1.58	3.16
9	170	0.30	0.80	1.59
10	500	0.95	2.20	4.40
11	270	0.66	1.16	2.32
12	0	0.00	0.40	0.79

Covariance terms in between two measurement results of each standard

Equation  $u(x_i, x_j) = \alpha \cdot x_i \cdot x_j$

Value of  $\alpha$  for the reference standard 8.50E-06

Value of  $\alpha$  for the national standard 0.00E+00

Comparison conditions	
Ozone generator manufacturer	<a href="#">Environics</a>
Ozone generator type	<a href="#">Model 6100</a>
Ozone generator serial number	<a href="#">3128</a>
Room temperature(min-max) / °C	<a href="#">21.9 - 22.1</a>
Room pressure (min-max) / hpa	<a href="#">1013.2 - 1013.7</a>
Zero air source	<a href="#">compressor + BekoKAT + dryer+ aadco 737-R</a>
Reference air flow rate (L/min)	<a href="#">14</a>
Sample flow rate (L/min)	<a href="#">10</a>
Instruments stabilisation time	<a href="#">&gt; 8 hours</a>
Instruments acquisition time /s (one measurement)	<a href="#">5 s</a>
Instruments averaging time /s	<a href="#">5 s</a>
Total time for ozone conditioning	<a href="#">&gt; 8 hours</a>
Ozone mole fraction during conditioning (nmol/mol)	<a href="#">700 nmol/mol</a>
Comparison repeated continuously (Yes/No)	<a href="#">Yes</a>
If no, ozone mole fraction in between the comparison repeats	***
Total number of comparison repeats realised	<a href="#">13</a>
Data files names and location	<a href="#">G:\Gas\Ozone\BIPM.QM-K1\Participants results\2509 CHMI</a> <a href="#">Cal25091500.xls to Cal25091703.xls</a>

### Instruments checks and adjustments

#### Reference Standard

As written in the procedure BIPM/CHEM-T-05

#### National Standard

The temperature probe was calibrated at the CHMI meteorological calibration laboratory two weeks before the comparison. At the BIPM, the probe was adjusted using a STOLAB calibrator at temperatures of 0 °C and 100 °C. The correction found during calibration at the CHMI laboratory was taken into account during adjustment. The pressure gauge was adjusted using our calibrated Pace 1001 device and checked against the BIPM pressure gauge. The SRP pressure zero was set internally using the SRP electronic module. The SRP Dark Count Scaler values were set according to the procedure in the SRP manual.



---

**Uncertainty budgets (description or reference )**

---

**Reference Standard**

BIPM-SRP27 uncertainty budget is described in the protocol of this comparison: document BIPM.QM-K1 protocol, date 10 Januray 2007, available on BIPM website. It can be summarised by the formula:

$$u(x) = \sqrt{(0.28)^2 + (2,92 \cdot 10^{-3} x)^2}$$

**National Standard**

As described in NIST report of analysis delivered on 1 September 2007.  
The budget can be summarised by the formula:

$$u(x) = \sqrt{(0.28)^2 + (2,92 \cdot 10^{-3} x)^2}$$