

Eidgenössisches Departement des Innern EDI Bundesamt für Meteorologie und Klimatologie MeteoSchweiz







# The revised CO<sub>2</sub> calibration scale at the World Calibration Centre WCC-Empa

#### Christoph Zellweger<sup>1</sup>, Martin Steinbacher<sup>1</sup>, Lukas Emmenegger<sup>1</sup>, and Brigitte Buchmann<sup>2</sup>

(1) Empa, Laboratory for Air Pollution / Environmental Technology, Duebendorf, Switzerland (<u>christoph.zellweger@empa.ch</u>)
 (2) Empa, Department Mobility, Energy and Environment, Dübendorf, Switzerland

### World Calibration Centre WCC-Empa

- Supports global research and policies since 1996
- More than 100 station audits at mainly global GAW stations
- Covers four important greenhouse and reactive gases
- Collaborates with other calibration centres to improve traceability
- Assesses the performance of stations also with parallel measurements
- Audit procedure includes data and metadata review



Audited stations by WCC-Empa since 1996 (red triangles)



Scope (top) and cumulative number (bottom) of WCC-Empa audits

#### @ WCC-Empa we have



christoph.zellweger@empa.ch

eGMAC 2021

#### Zero air system

WCC-Empa zero air system

Oil free compressor (JunAir model 2XOF302-40BQ) with adsorption dryer (dew point < -40°C) Oxidation catalyst (Breitfuss NBS) Aadco Pure Air generator (737-12A) Ascarite and magnesium perchlorate

compared to

😉 Empa

- Pure Nitrogen 99.9999%
- Same CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> content (zero) within uncertainties



Date/Time [YY-MM-DD hh

#### Instrument linearity

- WCC-Empa zero air system was used to dilute a standard gas
- Excellent linearity of the Picarro G2401 was observed for both CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub>
- Residuals were smaller than WMO/GAW compatibility goals
  (0.1 ppm for CO<sub>2</sub>, and 2 ppb for CH<sub>4</sub>)



😉 Empa

✓ Zero air

✓ Linearity

Picarro was calibrated with one standard (CB09915) and CO<sub>2</sub> free air



- Picarro was calibrated with one standard (CB09915) and CO<sub>2</sub> free air
- All other NOAA standards were measured against CB09915
- Agreement within 0.1 µmol mol<sup>-1</sup> except for two standards



🧐 Empa

- Picarro was calibrated with one standard (CB09915) and CO<sub>2</sub> free air
- All other NOAA standards were measured against CB09915
- Agreement within 0.1 µmol mol<sup>-1</sup> except for two standards
- One standard outside the range defining the scale
- One standard is old (2003)



NOAA  $CO_2$  value (µmol mol<sup>-1</sup>) (WMO- $CO_2$ -2007 scale)



Date of intial calibration (YYYY)

- Picarro was calibrated with one standard (CB09915) and CO<sub>2</sub> free air
- Values on the X2019 scale were obtained from the CCL website
- The agreement improved on average for the standards on the X2019 CO<sub>2</sub> scale



😉 Empa

- Picarro was calibrated with one standard (CB09915) and CO<sub>2</sub> free air
- Values on the X2019 scale were obtained from the CCL website
- The agreement improved on average for the standards on the X2019 CO<sub>2</sub> scale
- Improvement also for the "old" and the "high" standard
- Range of the X2019 scale extended to 800 ppm
- Trend over time?



Date of intial calibration (YYYY)

eGMAC 2021

### CO<sub>2</sub> standard drift

- CC707356 filled by NOAA, April 3, 2020
- Analysis at NOAA from April 29 to June 9
- Small downward trend?

#### Filling Code A

Date	Loc	Inst F	Pressure	Value	S.D.	Unc*	Num	Avg	Sdev
 2020-04-29	BLD	PC1	2015	419.31	0.01	0.01 *			
2020-05-12	BLD	PC1	2015	419.29	0.01	0.01 .			
2020-05-27	BLD	PC1	2000	419.28	0.01	0.01 .			
2020-06-09	BLD	PC1	2000	419.27	0.01	0.01 .			
							3	419.28	0.01

- Arrived at WCC-Empa July 2020
- Measurements from August 2020 May 2021 showed further decrease of CO<sub>2</sub>
- Seems to have stabilized after ~1 year after filling
- Drift since NOAA analysis of ~1 ppm explains the bias for this cylinder



Time since fillin



Time since fillin

## CO<sub>2</sub> standard drift

- CO<sub>2</sub> standard gases (in aluminium cylinders, dry, high pressure) are normally stable and not drifting
- However, drift may occur over a certain period after filling due to surface effects, or incomplete mixing
- Quick analysis, preferably within hours after filling, helps to identify drifting cylinders
- Example on the left shows a drifting cylinder filled by WCC-Empa
- This cylinders was measured ~immediately after filling, and then with high frequency during the first weeks
- It took ~1 year to stabilize
- **CO**<sub>2</sub> changed by ~0.25 ppm within one year
- Drift in CO<sub>2</sub> is likely caused by surface effects (because CH<sub>4</sub> is stable)



Time since fillin



Time since fillin

#### CH<sub>4</sub> consistency check X2004A

- Picarro was calibrated with one standard (CB09915) and CH<sub>4</sub> free air
- All other NOAA standards were measured against CB09915
- Agreement within 2 nmol mol<sup>-1</sup> for all NOAA standards
- Amount fraction dependent bias was found



#### CH<sub>4</sub> consistency check X2004A

- Picarro was calibrated with one standard (CB09915) and CH<sub>4</sub> free air
- All other NOAA standards were measured against CB09915
- Agreement within 2 nmol mol<sup>-1</sup> for all NOAA standards
- Amount fraction dependent bias was found
- No dependency on cylinder age



NOAA  $CH_4$  value (nmol mol<sup>-1</sup>) (WMO- $CH_4$ -2004A scale)



Date of intial calibration (YYYY)

🧐 Empa

### Calibration strategy @ WCC-Empa





Most common: set of standards covering ambient range, linear regression

Step changes are possible when exchanging the set of standards

- Alternative: Inclusion of zero air in case of an internally consistent calibration scale, linear instruments, and reliable zero air
- Reduces step changes
- Depends less on the uncertainty of individual standard
- Gives reliable results beyond the range covered by the set of standards

🧐 Empa

#### Conclusions

- NOAA maintains calibration standards with high accuracy over decades
- Recent update of the CO<sub>2</sub> scale improved internal consistency
- Function to convert between X2007 and X2019 scale is useful
- CH<sub>4</sub> scale is also internally consistent within the uncertainties
- Progress in analytical instruments enables detection of small changes or inconsistencies
- Not checked: Internal consistency of CO and N<sub>2</sub>O scales
- Calibration strategies need to be adjusted to take full advantage of the analytical progress

#### Thank you!

#### Acknowledgments

- Financial support of GAW activities by MeteoSwiss
- Staff at various GAW stations and Empa for their support