

**Acid Deposition Monitoring Network  
in East Asia ( EANET )**

# **Report of the Inter-laboratory Comparison Project 2013**

**16<sup>th</sup> Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on Wet Deposition**

**9<sup>th</sup> Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on Dry Deposition**

**15<sup>th</sup> Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on Soil**

**14<sup>th</sup> Inter-laboratory Comparison Project**

**on Inland Aquatic Environment**

November 2014  
**Network Center for EANET**



## Contents

1. INTRODUCTION .....	1	
2. 16 <sup>th</sup> INTER-LABORATORY COMPARISON PROJECT		
ON WET DEPOSITION .....	5	
2.1 Introduction .....	5	
2.2 Procedures .....	5	
2.3 Results .....	9	
2.4 Comparison with past surveys .....	32	
2.5 Recommendations for improvement .....	35	
References .....	36	
Appendix 2.1 .....	37	
Appendix 2.2 .....	40	
Appendix 2.3 .....	42	
Appendix 2.4 .....	44	
3. 9 <sup>th</sup> INTER-LABORATORY COMPARISON PROJECT		
ON DRY DEPOSITION .....	47	
3.1 Introduction .....	47	
3.2 Procedures .....	47	
3.3 Results .....	49	
3.4 Comparison with past surveys .....	64	
References .....	65	
4. 15 <sup>th</sup> INTER-LABORATORY COMPARISON PROJECT ON SOIL .....		67
4.1 Introduction .....	67	
4.2 Procedures .....	68	
4.3 Results .....	72	
4.4 Needs for improvement of soil analysis .....	85	
4.5 Recommendations .....	86	
References .....	86	
Appendix 4.1 .....	87	
Appendix 4.2 .....	89	

<b>5. 14<sup>th</sup> INTER-LABORATORY COMPARISON PROJECT</b>	
<b>ON INLAND AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT .....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>5.1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>5.2 Procedures .....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>5.3 Results .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>5.4 Comparison with past surveys .....</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>5.5 Recommendations for improvement .....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Appendix 5.1 .....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>Appendix 5.2 .....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>7. CONTACT INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>119</b>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The Inter-laboratory Comparison Project was conducted among the analytical laboratories in participating countries of the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET), based on the Quality Assurance / Quality Control (QA/QC) Program of EANET.

The objectives of this project are, through the evaluation of analytical results, analytical equipment and its operating condition and other practices,

- (i) to recognize the analytical precision and accuracy of the measurement in each participating laboratory,
- (ii) to give further opportunities to improve the quality of the analysis on wet deposition, dry deposition (filter pack method), soil and inland aquatic monitoring of EANET,
- (iii) to improve reliability of analytical data through the assessment of suitable analytical methods and techniques.


The Inter-laboratory Comparison Project is implemented by the Network Center of EANET (NC) annually for the following items:

- a. wet deposition
- b. dry deposition
- c. soil
- d. inland aquatic environment

This report presented the results of the 16<sup>th</sup> Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on wet deposition, 9<sup>th</sup> Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on dry deposition, 15<sup>th</sup> Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on soil, and 14<sup>th</sup> Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on inland aquatic environment.

The number of participating laboratories from each country by project was shown in Figure 1.1.

Table 1.1 listed the name and code of participating laboratories and data submission status. The check-mark mean the analytical results were submitted by individual laboratories.



**Figure 1.1 Number of participating laboratories in 2013**

\* The values in parentheses show the number of participating laboratories from each country.  
(wet/dry/soil/inland aquatic environment)

**Table 1.1 Participating laboratories and data submission status**

Participating laboratories	Code	Data submission			
		Wet	Dry	Soil	IAE
<b>Cambodia</b> Department of Environment Pollution Control, Ministry of Environment	KH01	✓	✓		✓
<b>China</b> Zhuhan Environmental Monitoring Center Station Xiamen Environmental Monitoring Station Xi'an Environmental Monitoring Center Station Chongqing Institute of Environmental Science	CN01 CN02 CN03 CN04	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓		✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
<b>Indonesia</b> Environmental Management Center (EMC), Environmental Impact Management Agency (BAPEDAL) Climatology, Meteorological and Geophysical Agency (BMKG) Indonesian National Institute of Aeronautic and Space (LAPAN) Indonesian Soil Research Institute (ISRI) Research Center for Water Resources (RCWR), Agency for Research and Development, Ministry of Public Works	ID01 ID02 ID03 ID04 ID05	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
<b>Japan</b> Institute of Environmental Sciences, Hokkaido Research Organization Niigata Prefectural Institute of Public Health and Environmental Sciences Nagano Environmental Conservation Research Institute Gifu Prefectural Research Institute for Health and Environmental Sciences Shimane Prefectural Institute of Public Health and Environmental Science Kochi Prefectural Environmental Research Center Okinawa Prefectural Institute of Health and Environment Asia Center for Air Pollution Research (ACAP) Japan Environmental Sanitation Center (JESC)	JP01 JP02 JP03 JP04 JP05 JP07 JP08 JP09 JP10	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓		
<b>Lao PDR</b> Environment Quality Monitoring Center, Environment Research Institute, Science technology and Environment Agency	LA01				
<b>Malaysia</b> Division of Environmental Health, Department of Chemistry (DOC) Faculty of Applied Science, University Technology Mara (UiTM)	MY01 MY03	✓ ✓	✓ ✓		✓ ✓
<b>Mongolia</b> Central Laboratory of Environment and Metrology	MN01			✓	✓
<b>Myanmar</b> Department of Meteorology and Hydrology (DMH)	MM01	✓	✓		
<b>Philippines</b> Environmental Management Bureau - Central Office (EMB-CO) Environmental Management Bureau - Cordillera Administrative Region (EMB-CAR) University of the Philippines Los Baños (UPLB)	PH01 PH02 PH03	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓		✓ ✓ ✓
<b>Republic of Korea</b> National Institute of Environment Research (NIER)	KR01	✓	✓		
<b>Russia</b> Limnological Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, Siberian Branch (LI/RAS/SB) Primorsky Center for Environmental Monitoring, Roshydromet (PCEM)	RU01 RU02	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
<b>Thailand</b> Pollution Control Department (PCD), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) Environmental Research and Training Centre (ERTC), Department of Research and Environmental Quality Promotion Chemistry Department, Science Faculty, Chiangmai University (CMU) Khon Kaen University (KKU) King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT) Kasetsart University Songklal University	TH01 TH02 TH04 TH05 TH06 TH07 TH08	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
<b>Vietnam</b> Environmental Laboratory - Center for Environmental Research - Vietnam Institute of Meteorology, Hydrology and Environment (IMHEN)- MoNRE Mid- Central Regional Hydro Meteorological Center, National Hydro-Meteorological Service of Vietnam (NHMS), MoNRE Sub-Institute of HydroMeteorology and Environment of South Vietnam (SIHYMETE) Center for Hydro-Meteorological and Environmental Networks, National Hydro-Meteorological Service of Vietnam (NHMS), MoNRE Southern Region Hydro-Meteorological Center, National Hydro-Meteorological Service of Vietnam (NHMS), MoNRE	VN01 VN02 VN03 VN04 VN05	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓

Total number of submitted data : 34 24 12 21



## **2. 16<sup>th</sup> INTER-LABORATORY COMPARISON PROJECT ON WET DEPOSITION**

### **2.1 Introduction**

In the 16<sup>th</sup> Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on wet deposition, artificial rainwater samples containing known amounts of major ions were prepared and distributed to the participating countries of EANET by the Network Center (NC). The measured values of pH, electric conductivity (EC) and concentrations of major ions submitted by the participating countries were compared with the prepared values and were treated statistically.

The NC shipped the artificial rainwater samples to laboratories in charge of chemical analysis in EANET on 1 October 2013. Their analytical results were required to be submitted to the NC by 28 February 2014.

### **2.2 Procedures**

#### **2.2.1 Participating laboratories**

The NC distributed the artificial rainwater samples to 37 laboratories in charge of chemical analysis in 13 countries of EANET. 34 of the participating laboratories submitted their analytical results to the NC. All participating laboratories and their codes and data submission status are listed in Table 1.1 in Chapter 1.

#### **2.2.2 Description of samples**

Two kinds of artificial rainwater samples were distributed to the laboratories. A description of the samples was given in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1 Description of artificial rainwater samples**

Artificial rain-water sample	Quantity of sample	Container	Number of samples	Note
No. 131w	100mL each	Polypropylene bottle 100mL	One bottle each	- Fixed quantity of reagents are dissolved in deionized water - Samples do not include other ions than shown in Table 2.2
No. 132w				

The prepared values of analytical parameters in the artificial rainwater samples were described in Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2 Prepared values/concentrations of analytical parameters\***

	pH -	EC mS m <sup>-1</sup>	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Cl <sup>-</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	K <sup>+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>
No. 131w	4.60	3.19	46.2	36.4	49.4	34.4	7.1	22.0	9.7	48.4
No. 132w	5.10	1.02	14.4	17.3	11.6	9.6	3.1	9.1	4.1	10.6

\* For 100 times diluted samples.

### 2.2.3 Analytical methods and data checking procedures

Before the measurement, the samples have to be diluted 100 times accurately with pure water in each laboratory according to the specified procedure.

All participating laboratories were expected to analyze the diluted samples for the following 10 parameters; pH, EC, concentrations of SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>, NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, Cl<sup>-</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup>, Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>.

The laboratories were required to apply the analytical methods and data checking procedures that were specified in the “Technical Manual for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia -2010” and “Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Program for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia”. Analytical methods specified in the Technical Manual were listed in Table 2.3.

**Table 2.3 Analytical methods specified in the Technical Manual**

Parameter	Analytical method
pH	Glass Electrode Method (preferably with the Electrode of non-leak inner cell)
EC	Conductivity Cell Method
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> Cl <sup>-</sup>	Ion Chromatography (preferably with suppressor) Spectrophotometry
Na <sup>+</sup> K <sup>+</sup> Ca <sup>2+</sup> Mg <sup>2+</sup>	Ion Chromatography Atomic Absorption Spectrometry Atomic Emission Spectrometry
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	Ion Chromatography Spectrophotometry (Indophenol Blue Method)

Checking analytical results was performed using the calculation of ion balance (R<sub>1</sub>) and total electric conductivity agreement (R<sub>2</sub>).

### **Calculation of ion balance ( $R_1$ )**

(1) Total anion equivalent concentration ( $A$  [ $\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}$ ]) was calculated by summing the concentrations of all anions ( $c$  [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]).

$$A [\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}] = \sum n c_{Ai} [\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}] = 2c (\text{SO}_4^{2-}) + c (\text{NO}_3^-) + c (\text{Cl}^-)$$

n,  $c_{Ai}$ : electric charge and concentration [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ] of anion “i”.

(2) Total cation equivalent concentration ( $C$  [ $\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}$ ]) was calculated by summing the concentrations of all cations ( $c$  [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]).

$$C [\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}] = \sum n c_{Ci} [\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}] = 10^{(6-\text{pH})} + c (\text{NH}_4^+) + c (\text{Na}^+) + c (\text{K}^+) + 2c (\text{Ca}^{2+}) + 2c (\text{Mg}^{2+})$$

n,  $c_{Ci}$ : electric charge and concentration [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ] of cation “i”.

(3) Calculation of ion balance ( $R_1$ )

$$R_1 = 100 \times (C-A) / (C+A)$$

(4)  $R_1$  calculated by the above equation was compared with allowable ranges specified in the Technical Manual which were shown in Table 2.4. If  $R_1$  was out of the range, re-measurement, check with standard solutions, and/or inspection of calibration curves were required.

**Table 2.4 Allowable ranges for  $R_1$  in different concentration ranges**

$C+A$ [ $\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}$ ]	$R_1$ [%]
< 50	$\pm 30$
50 – 100	$\pm 15$
> 100	$\pm 8$

## **Comparison between calculated and measured values of electrical conductivity ( $R_2$ )**

(1) Total electrical conductivity ( $\Lambda$  calc) was calculated as follows;

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda \text{ calc } [\text{mS m}^{-1}] = & \{349.7 \times 10^{(6-\text{pH})} + 80.0 \times 2c(\text{SO}_4^{2-}) + 71.4 \times c(\text{NO}_3^-) \\ & + 76.3 \times c(\text{Cl}^-) + 73.5 \times c(\text{NH}_4^+) + 50.1 \times c(\text{Na}^+) + 73.5 \times c(\text{K}^+) \\ & + 59.5 \times 2c(\text{Ca}^{2+}) + 53.0 \times 2c(\text{Mg}^{2+})\} / 10000\end{aligned}$$

c: Molar concentrations [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ] of ions in the parenthesis; each constant value was ionic equivalent conductance at 25 degrees centigrade.

(2) Electrical conductivity comparison ( $R_2$ ) was calculated as follows;

$$R_2 = 100 \times (\Lambda \text{ calc} - \Lambda \text{ meas}) / (\Lambda \text{ calc} + \Lambda \text{ meas})$$

$\Lambda$  meas: measured conductivity

(3)  $R_2$  calculated by the above equation was compared with allowable ranges specified in the Technical Manual which were shown in Table 2.5. If  $R_2$  was out of the range, re-measurement, check with standard solutions, and/or inspection of calibration curves were required.

**Table 2.5 Allowable ranges for  $R_2$  in different ranges of EC**

$\Lambda$ meas [ $\text{mS m}^{-1}$ ]	$R_2$ [%]
< 0.5	$\pm 20$
0.5 – 3	$\pm 13$
> 3	$\pm 9$

## 2.3 Results

The NC received the analytical results from 34 laboratories in the participating countries of EANET. The original data submitted by the laboratories were shown in Appendix 2.2.

Basic statistics of submitted data summarized in Table 2.6 were calculated for each parameter of the artificial rainwater samples such as: average (Va), minimum (Min.), maximum (Max.), standard deviation (S.D.), and number of data (N). The outliers which are apart from the average greater than a factor of 3 of S.D. were not included for the statistics calculation. As shown in Table 2.6, Va agreed with prepared value (Vp) fairly well. The range of  $\Delta V/Vp$  was between -3.3% to 3.1% for the sample No. 131w, and -2.8% to 10.0% for the sample No. 132w.

**Table 2.6 Summary of analytical results of the artificial rainwater samples  
(Reported data after removing outliers)**

Sample No. 131w

Constituents	Prepared (Vp)	Average (Va)	$\Delta V/Vp$ % <sup>*1</sup>	S.D.	N	Min.	Max
pH	4.60	4.65	1.1	0.08	32	4.52	4.88
EC [mS m <sup>-1</sup> ]	3.19	3.09	-3.3	0.12	34	2.76	3.42
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	46.2	46.3	0.3	1.91	33	41.9	50.0
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	36.4	36.3	-0.2	1.40	31	32.0	39.2
Cl <sup>-</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	49.4	48.8	-1.2	1.70	31	44.8	54.5
Na <sup>+</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	34.4	33.8	-1.8	1.50	32	31.2	37.4
K <sup>+</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	7.1	7.1	0.4	0.61	33	5.8	8.4
Ca <sup>2+</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	22.0	22.7	3.1	1.89	32	20.2	27.3
Mg <sup>2+</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	9.7	9.6	-1.1	1.09	32	6.3	12.4
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	48.4	49.2	1.6	3.83	32	39.3	61.0

Sample No. 132w

Constituents	Prepared (Vp)	Average (Va)	$\Delta V/Vp$ % <sup>*1</sup>	S.D.	N	Min.	Max
pH	5.10	5.15	1.0	0.11	33	4.95	5.52
EC [mS m <sup>-1</sup> ]	1.02	1.02	0.1	0.06	34	0.89	1.19
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	14.4	14.3	-0.7	0.67	32	13.1	15.7
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	17.3	17.1	-1.0	0.74	32	15.0	18.5
Cl <sup>-</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	11.6	11.7	1.1	1.00	31	9.9	14.6
Na <sup>+</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	9.6	9.8	1.7	1.58	33	5.2	13.0
K <sup>+</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	3.1	3.0	-2.8	0.43	33	2.0	3.9
Ca <sup>2+</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	9.1	10.0	10.0	1.59	32	8.1	15.1
Mg <sup>2+</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	4.1	4.3	4.5	0.61	32	2.5	5.7
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> [ $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ]	10.6	10.8	1.6	1.53	32	4.6	12.9

Note: \*1,  $(\text{Va}-\text{Vp})/\text{Vp} \times 100$

The Data Quality Objective for accuracy (hereafter referred to as DQO) was specified in the QA/QC program of the EANET for every parameter to be within  $\pm 15\%$  of deviation from V<sub>p</sub>. In this report, analytical data of the artificial rainwater samples were compared with V<sub>p</sub>, and the data exceed DQO were marked with flags. Flag “E” was put to the data exceed DQO within a factor of 2 ( $\pm 15\%$  to  $\pm 30\%$ ), and flag “X” was put to the data exceed DQO more than a factor of 2 (over  $\pm 30\%$ ).

A set of data for each sample was evaluated by the data checking procedures described in section 2.2.3. The flag “I” and the flag “C” were put to the data sets with poor ion balance and poor conductivity agreement, respectively.

The results were evaluated by the following three aspects:

- i) Comparison of concentration dependence on level of their concentration
  - sample No. 131w and No. 132w,
- ii) Comparison of individual parameters,
- iii) Comparison of circumstances of chemical analysis in each participating laboratory.

Evaluation of analytical data on both the sample No. 131w and No. 132w was presented in “2.3.1 Evaluation of laboratories’ performance (by sample)”, evaluation of analytical data for each constituent was presented in “2.3.2 Evaluation of laboratories’ performance (by analytical parameter)”, and evaluation of analytical data by the circumstances of chemical analysis such as analytical method used, experience of personnel in charge, and other analytical condition were presented in “2.3.4 Information on laboratories”.

### 2.3.1 Evaluation of laboratories' performance (by sample)

#### 1) Sample No. 131w


The number and percentage of flagged data for the sample No. 131w were shown in Table 2.7. 21 analytical data out of 330 exceeded DQO within a factor of 2 and were flagged by "E". 4 analytical data out of 330 exceeded DQO more than a factor of 2 and were flagged by "X". Data flagged by "E" and "X" shared 7.6 percent of all the submitted data for sample No. 131w. The data normalized by prepared value in each parameter were shown in Figure 2.1.

**Table 2.7 Number of flagged data for the Sample No. 131w**

Characterization of data	pH	EC	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$	$\text{NO}_3^-$	$\text{Cl}^-$	$\text{Na}^+$	$\text{K}^+$	$\text{Ca}^{2+}$	$\text{Mg}^{2+}$	$\text{NH}_4^+$	Total
Data within DQO	34	34	33	31	31	32	28	26	27	29	305
Data with flag E * <sup>1</sup>	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	6	4	3	21
Data with flag X * <sup>2</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4
Flagged data [%]	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	3.1	3.0	15.2	21.2	18.2	12.1	7.6

( Total data = 330 )

Note: \*1, Data exceeded DQO within a factor of 2; \*2, Data exceeded DQO more than a factor of 2



**Figure 2.1 Distribution of the data normalized by prepared value in each parameter for sample No. 131w**

The parameter which had the most flags was  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ . The analytical data submitted by the participating laboratories were shown in Table 2.8 with flags.

**Table 2.8 Analytical results of sample No. 131w**

Lab. ID <sup>*1</sup>	pH	EC mS m <sup>-1</sup>	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Cl <sup>-</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	K <sup>+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	R <sub>I</sub> %	R <sub>2</sub> %
KH01	4.58	2.76	45.8	36.9	46.8	34.2	6.6	22.5	6.3 X	26.7 X	-7.3	4.6
CN01	4.88	2.96	45.3	36.1	48.2	34.6	7.3	21.3	9.5	49.9	-2.4	-3.5
CN02	4.60	3.24	46.9	37.6	49.0	34.8	7.4	21.0	9.6	50.6	-0.4	-0.3
CN03	4.67	3.05	50.0	37.1	50.0	31.7	6.9	20.2	8.7	47.8	-6.1	0.6
CN04	4.66	3.16	45.5	36.0	48.8	34.1	7.2	21.0	8.8	48.6	-1.3	-1.8
ID01	4.54	2.99	44.8	35.1	47.5	32.8	7.1	20.5	10.2	53.2	3.1	4.9
ID02	4.68	2.83	48.6	38.5	50.2	32.6	6.5	22.1	10.3	47.3	-3.9	4.5
ID03	4.69	2.93	44.5	37.4	46.9	34.5	7.3	21.7	9.9	47.4	-0.1	1.0
JP01	4.57	3.20	47.0	37.9	51.0	35.0	7.3	23.0	9.8	51.5	0.9	2.1
JP03	4.70	3.08	45.9	35.7	49.7	34.0	6.8	23.1	9.3	48.3	-1.0	-1.1
JP04	4.64	3.08	45.4	36.1	48.4	32.6	6.9	21.2	9.0	48.7	-1.1	-0.1
JP05	4.65	3.10	45.8	35.0	48.8	31.7	7.1	20.9	9.7	48.9	-1.2	-0.7
JP07	4.52	3.05	46.8	37.1	49.8	33.8	5.8 E	22.1	9.9	47.4	0.2	5.1
JP08	4.68	3.00	45.4	36.0	49.2	33.5	7.0	21.7	9.4	47.5	-1.4	0.3
JP09	4.68	3.02	49.7	39.2	50.0	34.9	7.1	22.1	10.0	50.8	-2.9	2.2
JP10	4.69	3.07	45.3	34.9	48.2	32.7	6.6	21.0	9.4	47.1	-1.8	-1.8
MY01	4.64	3.19	43.4	35.9	48.2	34.3	7.0	22.4	9.2	48.4	1.4	-2.0
MM01	4.81	3.42	44.4	30.9 E	48.5	34.0	6.5	23.8	9.7	54.1	2.6	-9.2 C
PH01	4.57	3.14	41.9	32.0	46.4	33.6	6.8	20.2	9.6	39.3 E	1.2	-1.6
PH02	4.64	3.08	46.9	34.9	47.0	35.2	7.5	25.7 E	10.9	51.5	4.0	1.8
KR01	4.61	3.07	42.6	35.3	35.3 E	31.2	6.7	24.1	0.8 X	57.6 E	4.3	-1.4
RU01	4.60	3.24	48.5	38.0	54.5	35.9	7.4	22.7	9.9	49.3	-1.8	1.1
RU02	4.57	3.20	47.9	37.3	49.9	33.9	7.9	22.0	10.7	49.3	0.1	1.8
TH01	4.65	3.16	47.4	35.7	48.2	34.4	6.5	21.7	9.4	51.4	-0.5	-0.6
TH02	4.66	3.23	47.9	36.7	49.2	33.3	6.9	27.3 E	10.0	46.2	0.3	-1.1
TH04	4.68	3.07	47.1	37.6	50.7	39.9 E	8.2 E	31.2 X	12.4 E	42.7	4.3	2.3
TH05	5.10	3.16	47.8	36.1	47.7	31.3	6.1	25.5 E	11.2 E	61.0 E	0.1	-7.2
TH06	4.66	3.06	46.2	37.3	44.8	32.1	7.6	22.3	10.4	47.5	0.0	-0.1
TH08	4.25	3.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	9.0 I <sup>*2</sup>	17.3 C <sup>*2</sup>	
VN01	4.66	3.09	49.5	36.3	47.5	35.4	7.1	25.8 E	10.2	48.0	0.4	1.4
VN02	4.70	3.15	45.6	36.4	49.4	37.4	7.0	21.7	9.7	45.0	-1.4	-2.5
VN03	4.64	3.05	44.2	---	---	32.9	8.4 E	23.1	8.7	48.7	---	---
VN04	4.82	3.01	46.9	33.9	48.8	37.0	8.3 E	25.7 E	7.5 E	51.4	0.5	-1.8
VN05	4.53	3.08	48.2	35.7	49.7	32.0	8.4 E	26.5 E	7.7 E	47.9	1.2	5.1
Vp	4.60	3.19	46.2	36.4	49.4	34.4	7.1	22.0	9.7	48.4	0.1	0.1
N of data	34	34	33	32	32	33	33	33	33	33		
Within DQO	34	34	33	31	31	32	28	26	27	29		
Flag E	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	6	4	3		
Flag X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1		

Note: "E", Value exceeded the DQO (Accuracy, ±15); "X", Value exceeded the DQO (Accuracy, ±15) more than a factor of 2;

"I", Poor ion balance (R<sub>I</sub>); "C", Poor conductivity agreement (R<sub>2</sub>); "—", Not measured; "Vp", Prepared values of parameters;

\*1: The abbreviated name and code are given in Chapter 1

\*2: R<sub>I</sub> and R<sub>2</sub> for TH08 were calculated with results of ion concentration from TH06.

## 2) Sample No. 132w

The number and percentage of flagged data for the sample No. 132w were shown in Table 2.9. 31 analytical data out of 330 exceeded the DQO within a factor of 2 and were flagged by "E". 17 analytical data out of 330 exceeded the DQO more than a factor of 2 and were flagged by "X". Data marked with flags shared up to 14.5 percent of all the submitted data for sample No. 132w.


The normalized data by prepared value in each parameter were shown in Figure 2.2.

**Table 2.9 Number of flagged data for the sample No. 132w**

Characterization of data	pH	EC	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$	$\text{NO}_3^-$	$\text{Cl}^-$	$\text{Na}^+$	$\text{K}^+$	$\text{Ca}^{2+}$	$\text{Mg}^{2+}$	$\text{NH}_4^+$	Total
Data within DQO	34	33	32	32	28	24	26	24	23	26	282
Data with flag E <sup>*1</sup>	0	1	0	0	3	5	5	5	7	5	31
Data with flag X <sup>*2</sup>	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	4	3	2	17
Flagged data [%]	0.0	2.9	3.0	0.0	12.5	27.3	21.2	27.3	30.3	21.2	14.5

( Total data = 330 )

Note: \*1, Data exceeded DQO within a factor of 2; \*2, Data exceeded DQO more than a factor of 2



**Figure 2.2 Distribution of the data normalized by prepared value for each parameter for sample No. 132w**

Analytical data of cations had a tendency to be marked with flags in comparison with anions. The analytical data submitted by the participating laboratories were shown in Table 2.10 with flags.

**Table 2.10 Analytical results of sample No. 132w**

Lab. ID <sup>*1</sup>	pH	EC mS/m	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Cl <sup>-</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	K <sup>+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> μmol L <sup>-1</sup>	R <sub>I</sub> %	R <sub>2</sub> %
KH01	5.11	0.89	14.7	17.6	11.1	9.2	2.2 E	10.0	2.5 X	4.6 X	-8.7 I	3.7
CN01	5.25	1.04	13.3	17.6	11.3	10.7	3.1	8.9	4.2	10.0	0.1	-6.0
CN02	5.25	0.96	14.1	17.4	10.7	10.8	3.2	8.8	4.4	10.0	-0.2	-1.6
CN03	5.12	0.99	15.6	17.4	11.7	8.3	3.3	8.5	3.9	10.0	-5.5	1.0
CN04	5.35	0.92	14.2	17.5	11.8	12.8 X	3.8 E	9.5	4.5	9.9	1.1	0.2
ID01	5.26	0.96	14.3	17.3	10.9	7.7 E	3.2	9.6	5.3 E	12.1	1.3	-0.6
ID02	5.07	0.92	15.6	18.5	12.0	8.5	3.2	9.7	4.8 E	11.4	-0.9	8.3
ID03	5.20	1.05	14.0	18.2	11.5	10.4	3.4	11.3 E	5.2 E	11.4	5.6	-1.8
JP01	5.03	1.08	14.2	17.7	11.4	9.8	3.0	9.4	4.1	10.6	1.9	-0.4
JP03	5.16	1.02	14.4	17.4	11.3	9.1	2.8	10.4	4.2	10.1	0.5	-1.4
JP04	5.10	1.03	14.3	17.1	11.3	8.5	2.8	8.6	3.7	10.5	-2.4	-1.6
JP05	5.13	1.01	14.1	17.1	11.6	7.8 E	2.9	8.1	4.1	10.2	-3.8	-2.0
JP07	5.00	1.04	14.4	17.5	11.3	8.6	2.0 X	8.9	4.7	11.3	1.3	2.2
JP08	5.07	1.04	14.1	17.1	11.5	9.0	3.1	9.0	4.0	9.5	-0.6	-1.0
JP09	5.22	0.99	15.5	18.5	13.7 E	9.8	3.1	9.2	4.2	11.5	-5.0	0.8
JP10	5.12	1.05	13.9	16.4	11.0	8.9	2.8	8.7	3.9	10.9	0.2	-3.5
MY01	5.11	1.06	13.9	16.9	12.4	9.7	3.3	9.2	3.7	11.6	0.9	-2.1
MM01	5.23	1.19 E	13.7	15.0	11.2	9.7	2.9	10.4	4.7	12.8 E	6.9	-10.9
PH01	4.95	1.02	13.6	16.4	11.2	8.6	2.7	8.6	4.0	9.2	1.9	3.2
PH02	5.12	1.03	14.1	16.5	10.7	9.8	3.2	11.7 E	5.0 E	11.9	8.6 I	0.6
KR01	5.05	1.05	13.1	16.3	16.3 X	11.9 E	3.5	13.9 X	0.0 X	11.9	4.2	2.3
RU01	4.98	1.13	15.0	17.8	12.9	9.6	2.8	10.2	4.2	1.5 X	-6.6	-2.4
RU02	5.20	1.03	24.9 X	16.0	9.9	13.0 X	2.6 E	11.0 E	4.9 E	12.2 E	-6.9	6.2
TH01	5.19	0.96	15.5	16.5	11.0	9.3	2.8	8.7	3.8	11.8	-2.8	0.7
TH02	5.13	1.10	14.4	16.9	10.8	9.4	3.0	15.8 X	5.1 E	9.8	11.7 I	-1.1
TH04	5.58	0.99	14.6	18.1	12.8	11.6 E	3.4	15.1 X	5.7 X	12.1	8.5 I	-1.3
TH05	5.52	1.06	14.0	16.6	11.5	5.2 X	2.1 X	10.6 E	4.2	12.9 E	-3.0	-11.4
TH06	5.05	1.07	14.3	17.4	13.1	9.5	3.1	9.2	4.3	10.6	0.0	-0.1
TH08	5.01	0.99	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.7 <sup>*2</sup>	5.2 <sup>*2</sup>
VN01	5.20	1.03	15.7	16.2	11.9	10.6	3.1	10.4	4.3	11.2	0.9	-1.2
VN02	5.20	1.00	14.2	17.5	11.9	12.7 X	2.4 E	8.6	4.0	8.6 E	-2.3	-2.4
VN03	5.23	1.08	13.3	---	---	9.5	3.9 E	12.9 X	4.1	12.5 E	---	---
VN04	5.23	0.98	13.7	16.8	14.6 E	11.3 E	3.5	9.7	3.2 E	10.7	-1.4	-0.7
VN05	5.11	0.97	14.0	16.7	13.7 E	10.9	3.2	11.5 E	4.2	10.9	4.7	4.4
Vp	5.10	1.02	14.4	17.3	11.6	9.6	3.1	9.1	4.1	10.6	0.0	0.0
N of data	34	34	33	32	32	33	33	33	33	33		
Within DQO	34	33	32	32	28	24	26	24	23	26		
Flag E	0	1	0	0	3	5	5	5	7	5		
Flag X	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	4	3	2		

Note: "E", Value exceeded the DQO (Accuracy, ±15); "X", Value exceeded the DQO (Accuracy, ±15) more than a factor of 2;


"I", Poor ion balance (R<sub>I</sub>); "C", Poor conductivity agreement (R<sub>2</sub>); "—", Not measured; "Vp", Prepared values of parameters;

\*1: The abbreviated name and code are given in Chapter 1

\*2: R<sub>I</sub> and R<sub>2</sub> for TH08 were calculated with results of ion concentration from TH06.

### 3) Comparison of high and low concentration sample


The percentage of flagged data for Sample No. 131w and 132w were shown in Figure 2.3. The percentage of the data within the DQO for the sample No. 131w and 132w were 92.4% and 85.5% respectively. The difference between both samples was 6.9%. In this project, the total number of flagged data was 73 (E: 52, X: 21) among the whole set of 660 data.



**Figure 2.3 Percentage of flagged data for sample No. 131w and No. 132w  
(Left: No. 131w, Right: No. 132w)**

### 4) The number of laboratory (by number of flags)

The number of laboratory by number of flags was shown in Figure 2.4. The number of laboratory without flagged data was 12, which corresponds to 35.3% of all the participating laboratories.




**Figure 2.4 Distribution of the number of laboratory (by number of flags)**

### 2.3.2 Evaluation of laboratories' performance (by analytical parameter)


The data normalized by V<sub>p</sub> were shown in Figures 2.5 through 2.24 for each parameter. In scatter diagrams (lower figures), bold line means the prepared values of sample No. 131w and 132w, broken lines and dotted lines showed the values of V<sub>p</sub>±15% and V<sub>p</sub>±30% respectively.

#### 1) pH

All participating laboratories used pH meter with glass electrode method for the measurement of pH. All the obtained data satisfied the DQO of the QA/QC program of EANET.




**Figure 2.5 Deviation from prepared value for pH (normalized by prepared value)**




**Figure 2.6 Scatter diagram for pH**

## 2) EC

All participating laboratories used conductivity cell method for the measurement of EC. The data of sample No.132w from MM01 exceeded the DQO and were marked with flag “E”




**Figure 2.7 Deviation from prepared value for EC (normalized by prepared value)**




**Figure 2.8 Scatter diagram for EC**

### 3) $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$

The data of sample No. 132w from RU02 exceeded the DQO more than a factor of 2 and were marked with flag “X”




**Figure 2.9 Deviation from prepared value for  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  (normalized by prepared value)**




**Figure 2.10 Scatter diagram for  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$**

#### 4) $\text{NO}_3^-$

The data of sample No. 131w from MM01 exceeded the DQO and were marked with flag “E”.



**Figure 2.11 Deviation from prepared value for  $\text{NO}_3^-$  (normalized by prepared value)**



**Figure 2.12 Scatter diagram for  $\text{NO}_3^-$**

## 5) Cl<sup>-</sup>

The data of sample No.131w from KR01 and the data of sample No.132w from 3 laboratories (JP09, VN04 and VN05) exceeded the DQO and were marked with flag “E”. Additionally, the data of sample No.132w from KR01 exceeded the DQO more than a factor of 2 and were marked with flag “X”.




Figure 2.13 Deviation from prepared value for Cl<sup>-</sup> (normalized by prepared value)




Figure 2.14 Scatter diagram for Cl<sup>-</sup>

## 6) $\text{Na}^+$

The data of sample No. 131w from TH04 and the data of sample No. 132w from 5 laboratories (ID01, JP05, KR01, TH04 and VN04) exceeded the DQO and were marked with flag “E”. Additionally, the data of sample No.132w from 4 laboratories (CN04, RU02, TH05 and VN02) exceeded the DQO more than a factor of 2 and were marked with flag “X”.




Figure 2.15 Deviation from prepared value for  $\text{Na}^+$  (normalized by prepared value)






Figure 2.16 Scatter diagram for  $\text{Na}^+$

## 7) K<sup>+</sup>

The data of sample No. 131w from 5 laboratories (JP07, TH04, VN03, VN04 and VN05) and the data of sample No. 132w from 5 laboratories (KH01, CN04, RU02, VN02 and VN03) exceeded the DQO and were marked with flag “E”. Additionally, the data of sample No. 132w from 2 laboratories (JP07 and TH05) exceeded the DQO more than a factor of 2 and were marked with flag “X”.




**Figure 2.17 Deviation from prepared value for K<sup>+</sup> (normalized by prepared value)**




**Figure 2.18 Scatter diagram for K<sup>+</sup>**

## 8) $\text{Ca}^{2+}$

The data of sample No. 131w from 6 laboratories (PH02, TH02, TH05, VN01, VN04 and VN05) and the data of sample No. 132w from 5 laboratories (ID03, PH02, RU02, TH05 and VN05) exceeded the DQO and were marked with flag “E”. Additionally the data of sample No.131w from TH04 and the data of sample No. 132w from 4 laboratories (KR01, TH02, TH04 and VN03) exceeded the DQO more than a factor of 2 and were marked with flag “X”.




**Figure 2.19 Deviation from prepared value for  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  (normalized by prepared value)**




**Figure 2.20 Scatter diagram for  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$**

## 9) Mg<sup>2+</sup>

The data of sample No. 131w from 4 laboratories (TH04, TH05, VN04 and VN05) and the data of sample No. 132w from 7 laboratories (ID01, ID02, ID03, PH02, RU02, TH02 and VN04) exceeded the DQO and marked with flag “E”. Additionally, the data of sample No. 131w from 2 laboratories (KH01 and KR01) and the data of sample No. 132w from 3 laboratories (KH01, KR01 and TH04) exceeded the DQO more than a factor of 2 and were marked with flag “X”.




**Figure 2.21 Deviation from prepared value for Mg<sup>2+</sup> (normalized by prepared value)**




**Figure 2.22 Scatter diagram for Mg<sup>2+</sup>**

## 10) $\text{NH}_4^+$

The data of sample No. 131w from 3 laboratories (PH01, KR01 and TH05) and the data of sample No. 132w from 5 laboratories (MM01, RU02, TH05, VN02 and VN03) exceeded the DQO and were marked with flag “E”. Additionally, the data of sample No. 131w from KH01 and the data of sample No. 132w from 2 laboratories (KH01 and RU01) exceeded the DQO more than a factor of 2 and were marked with flag “X”.



**Figure 2.23 Deviation from prepared value for  $\text{NH}_4^+$  (normalized by prepared value)**



**Figure 2.24 Scatter diagram for  $\text{NH}_4^+$**

## 11) Scatter diagrams


Most of constituents showed positive correlation between the submitted pairs of results of sample No. 131w and 132w. It suggested that systematic deviation could be the reason for the deviation of results in many of laboratories.

### 2.3.3 Sample and analysis evaluation

The concentrations of the analytical parameters in the samples for this survey were fixed on the basis of the reference to monitoring data on wet deposition in EANET. Two samples were not distinguished as high or low concentration samples when they were distributed to participating laboratories. Ions (including pH as H<sup>+</sup>) concentrations of sample No. 131w were higher than those of No. 132w.

The relative standard deviations (R.S.D.) of each parameter for the sample No. 131w and No. 132w were shown in the Figure 2.25. The R.S.D. values for sample No. 132w were higher than those for sample No. 131w for all the constituents. The R.S.D. of Na<sup>+</sup> for sample No. 132w was the highest in this survey.

(Relative standard deviation (%)) = (Standard deviation / Average) x100; Reported data after removing the outliers)



**Figure 2.25 Relative standard deviations (R.S.D.) of each constituent**

### 2.3.4 Information on laboratories

#### 1) Number of analysts and their experience

Number of analysts and years of their experience were shown in Table 2.11 and Table 2.12 respectively. In the Table 2.11, the letters of “A”, “B” and “C” mean individuals of analysts in each laboratory who carried out analyses. In 17 laboratories, same analyst carried out the analyses for all parameters. Clear relationship between the number of analysts and flagged data was not suggested.

**Table 2.11 Number of analysts**

Lab. ID	Total	pH	EC	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	Cl <sup>-</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup>	K <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>
KH01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
CN01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
CN02	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
CN03	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
CN04	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
ID01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
ID02	4	A	B	C	C	C	D	D	D	D	C
ID03	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
JP01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
JP03	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
JP04	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
JP05	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
JP07	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
JP08	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
JP09	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
JP10	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
MY01	3	A	A	B	B	B	C	C	C	C	C
MM01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
PH01	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
PH02	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
KR01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
RU01	3	A	A	B	B	B	C	C	C	C	A
RU02	3	A	A	B	B	B	C	C	C	C	B
TH01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
TH02	3	A	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	C	C
TH04	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
TH05	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
TH06	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
TH08	1	A	A	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*
VN01	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
VN02	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
VN03	3	A	A	B	---	---	C	C	C	C	B
VN04	3	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
VN05	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B

Note: Light mesh, Analytic data of sample No. 131w or No. 132w was marked with flag "E" or "X";

Dark mesh, Analytic data of both samples were marked with flag "E" or "X";

---, Not measured

\*: For TH08, ions were analyzed by TH06.

Total of 136 data out of 330 were analyzed by the analysts whose experience was less than 5 years. The number corresponds to 41.2% of all the submitted data. Clear relationship between the years of experience and flagged data was not suggested.

**Table 2.12 Years of experience**

Lab. ID	pH	EC	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	Cl <sup>-</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup>	K <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>
KH01	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
CN01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
CN02	15	15	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
CN03	15	15	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
CN04	5	5	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
ID01	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
ID02	7	7	13	13	13	6	6	6	6	13
ID03	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
JP01	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
JP03	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
JP04	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
JP05	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
JP07	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
JP08	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
JP09	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
JP10	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
MY01	1	1	3	3	3	7	7	7	7	7
MM01	8	8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
PH01	3	3	6	6	6	16	16	16	16	6
PH02	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
KR01	10	15	15	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
RU01	0.5	0.5	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	0.5
RU02	10	10	35	35	35	23	23	23	23	35
TH01	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
TH02	16	10	10	10	10	16	16	16	16	16
TH04	10	10	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
TH05	12	12	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
TH06	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
TH08	3	3	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*
VN01	1	1	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
VN02	4	4	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
VN03	6	6	7	---	---	1	1	1	1	7
VN04	11	11	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
VN05	4	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

Note: Light mesh, Analytic data of sample No. 131w or No. 132w was marked with flag "E" or "X";

Dark mesh, Analytic data of both samples were marked with flag "E" or "X";

"---", Not measured

\*: For TH08, ions were analyzed by TH06.

## 2) Analytical instruments

As shown in Figure 2.26, most of the participating laboratories used the specified methods described in the “Technical Manual for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia -2010”. 2 laboratories (RU01 and RU02) did not use the specified methods for the analyses of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (Spectrophotometry without Indophenol). Laboratory of RU02 did not use the specified methods for the analyses of Cl<sup>-</sup> (Titrimetry). The specified methods were shown in Table 2.3.

Analytical methods used for the measurement in the participating laboratories were shown in Table 2.13. Clear relationship between analytical methods and flagged data was not suggested.




Figure 2.26 Percentage of laboratories that use the specified methods

**Table 2.13 Analytical method used for the measurement in the participating laboratories**

Lab. ID	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	Cl <sup>-</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup>	K <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>
KH01	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
CN01	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
CN02	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
CN03	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
CN04	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
ID01	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
ID02	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
ID03	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
JP01	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
JP03	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
JP04	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
JP05	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
JP07	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
JP08	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
JP09	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
JP10	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
MY01	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
MM01	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
PH01	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
PH02	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
KR01	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
RU01	IC	IC	IC	AES	AES	AAS	AAS	SP-other
RU02	SP	SP	TI	AES	AES	AAS	AAS	SP-other
TH01	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
TH02	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
TH04	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
TH05	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
TH06	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
TH08	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*	---*
VN01	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
VN02	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
VN03	SP	---	---	AAS	AAS	AAS	AAS	SP-IP
VN04	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC
VN05	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC	IC

Note: "—" Not measured

\*: For TH08, ions were analyzed by TH06.

IC: Ion Chromatography

AAS: Atomic Absorption Spectrometry

AES: Atomic Emission Spectrometry

SP: Spectrophotometry


SP-IP: Spectrophotometry (Indophenol)

TI: Titrimetry

SP-other: Spectrophotometry (Other than Indophenol)


### 3) Date of analysis

Figure 2.27 shows the distribution of “Start date” and “Finish date” of analysis in the participating laboratories. In total, 60% of all the submitted data was determined within the year of 2013, and 5% was finished after the deadline of data submission in this project.



**Figure 2.27 Distribution of start date and finish date of analysis**

Figure 2.28 shows how many days were needed to determine the analytical data in the participating laboratories. Most analytical data were obtained within less than 3 days.




**Figure 2.28 Distribution of days used for analysis**

Clear relationship between date of analysis and flagged data was not suggested, however, it was encouraged to analyze samples as soon as possible if the samples were distributed.

## 2.4 Comparison with past surveys


Since the beginning of EANET, inter-laboratory comparison on wet deposition reached the 16<sup>th</sup> survey. The results showing the percentages of flagged data and percentage of data that satisfied the DQO were shown in Figure 2.29. Hereafter, sample No. 131w and sample No. 132w were treated as high and low concentration samples respectively.

The percentages of data within DQO for the sample No. 131w and No. 132w were 92.4% and 85.5% respectively. They were higher than the percentages of previous survey.



**Figure 2.29 Comparison of results from the inter-laboratory comparison projects**

Figure 2.30 showed the trend of the prepared values and the percentage of flagged data. The percentages of flagged data were relatively high in cations than anions through the series of surveys. Compared to previous survey, prepared value of  $K^+$  was slightly increased, and then the percentages of flagged data of  $K^+$  were decreased from 35.3% to 15.2% and from 52.9% to 21.3% on high concentration sample and low concentration sample respectively. Conversely prepared value of  $Na^+$  was decreased, the percentage of flagged data of  $Na^+$  was increased from 8.8% to 27.3% on low concentration sample. It was also suggested that lower ion concentration might be a reason for higher percentages of flagged data.



**Figure 2.30 Comparison for each parameter in inter-laboratory comparison (ILC) project**





Figure 2.30 Comparison for each parameter in ILC project (continued)

As shown in the figure 2.31, the total number of data in this survey was 660.



**Figure 2.31 The number of participating laboratories and data in the inter-laboratory comparison projects on wet deposition**

## 2.5 Recommendations for improvement

The fundamental matters for QA/QC on measurements and analyses of samples are described on the page 22 through 29 of the "Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Program for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia".

Additionally, the NC showed the following matters for the improvement of data accuracy.

### 2.5.1 Measurement and Analysis

► "Technical Manual for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia -2010" defined EANET DQO values for Detection limits and Determination limits. But both limits exceed the DQO in some laboratories. Both limits depend on the standard deviation from five times analysis of the standard solution which has concentration levels near determination limit of the analytical method. The standard deviation can be improved by method such as use of more purified water. Then Detection limits and Determination limits would be improved.

### 2.5.2 Data control

► After determining all the analytical parameters, data check by calculating  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  values is important. Especially,  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  have to meet allowable ranges according to the "Technical Manual for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia -2010". If the values exceed their allowable ranges, the data set is doubtful and reanalysis shall be carried out after rechecking analytical instruments and analytical procedures.

► Participating laboratories are encouraged to check precision of results in prior to submission.

It should be noted that precision is greatly affected by concentration. To grasp the state of precision, drawing correlation curve between concentration and precision is effective.

► After ILC was done, artificial samples can be used as Standard Reference Material as described in "Technical Manual for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia -2010". The concentration of artificial samples will be stable until next ILC when they are preserved in the refrigerator. Each laboratory should measure Standard Reference Materials in the analytical sample stream.

## References

- EANET (2000). *Guidelines for Acid Deposition Monitoring in East Asia*. Acid Deposition and Oxidant Research Center, Niigata, Japan, 25p.
- EANET (2000). *Technical Manual for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia*. Acid Deposition and Oxidant Research Center, Niigata, Japan, 68p.
- EANET (2000), *Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Program for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia*, Acid Deposition and Oxidant Research Center, Niigata, Japan, 29p.
- EANET (2010). *Technical Manual for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia -2010*. Asia Center for Air Pollution Research, Niigata, Japan, 113p.

## **Appendix 2.1 Data precision of submitted data**

Data precision is one of the most important factors of data quality. Relative standard deviation (R.S.D.), which is one of the parameter to indicate precision, is defined by the equation below.

$$\text{R.S.D.} = \sigma / V_a \times 100\%$$

$\sigma$ : standard deviation of result       $V_a$ : average of result

In appendix table 2.1.1 and appendix table 2.1.2, data precisions calculated from the submitted results were shown. Sample No. 131 of higher concentration had a tendency to show better R.S.D. than sample No. 132 of lower concentration in each constituent. It was suggested that R.S.D. was greatly affected by sample concentration.

Participating laboratories are encouraged to check the precision of data in prior to submission. Correlation between sample concentration and precision should be also noted, because sample concentration could be the greatest factor to determine precision. Therefore, it is important to grasp the state of data quality during daily analysis. For example, drawing a correlation curve between concentration of standard solutions and R.S.D. of repeat analysis is effective.

**Appendix Table 2.1.1 Data precision (R.S.D.) of sample No. 131w**

Lab. ID	pH as H <sup>+</sup> %	EC %	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> %	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> %	Cl <sup>-</sup> %	Na <sup>+</sup> %	K <sup>+</sup> %	Ca <sup>2+</sup> %	Mg <sup>2+</sup> %	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> %
KH01	1.6	1.0	1.5	2.2	7.8	4.1	8.4	5.0	11.3	6.2
CN01	3.4	0.5	1.1	0.9	0.3	0.4	2.2	1.3	1.1	0.5
CN02	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.1
CN03	6.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.4	1.0	0.3	0.9	0.1
CN04	6.1	1.3	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.8	2.0	1.7	4.2	0.6
ID01	2.0	0.6	0.8	0.7	1.4	8.0	8.3	3.2	1.8	0.8
ID02	8.8	1.3	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.5	3.3	1.2	0.4
ID03	27.7	0.7	0.4	1.1	1.0	0.8	3.5	1.8	1.2	0.3
JP01	1.6	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.3	1.2	1.3	0.5	1.1
JP03	3.1	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.5	1.1
JP04	1.5	0.4	1.3	1.0	2.4	1.3	3.6	5.9	8.6	0.7
JP05	0.7	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	1.2	0.3	0.0	0.2
JP07	9.5	1.7	0.7	0.4	0.8	1.3	2.7	1.3	2.1	2.3
JP08	6.0	1.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.1
JP09	4.8	1.2	1.7	1.9	1.6	0.9	1.8	0.8	1.4	1.3
JP10	4.6	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	1.0	0.4	0.5	1.2
MY01	6.2	0.5	1.2	0.2	0.5	0.5	2.1	3.0	0.9	0.1
MM01	18.1	2.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.4	1.2	0.6	1.1	0.4
PH01	13.8	0.5	3.2	1.0	0.6	2.0	2.4	0.9	3.4	1.5
PH02	1.1	0.5	1.6	2.7	1.8	6.2	5.5	13.2	5.7	0.8
KR01	13.9	0.3	1.8	0.6	0.6	2.2	2.6	15.2	53.4	3.2
RU01	2.8	1.6	0.5	0.3	3.6	0.9	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.0
RU02	5.3	0.9	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.7	0.6	0.7	1.5	0.4
TH01	2.9	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.8	1.5	2.0	0.8
TH02	1.8	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.1	1.4	0.3	0.4	0.2
TH04	8.2	0.5	1.3	0.7	0.8	2.0	3.2	1.6	2.0	0.7
TH05	15.2	0.4	1.6	2.7	1.1	2.3	4.5	3.5	2.8	1.1
TH06	2.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1.0	0.2	0.7	0.2
TH08	2.0	0.3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
VN01	3.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	1.5	0.9	0.6	0.3
VN02	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.6	3.7	0.9	2.2	0.7
VN03	2.5	0.2	1.2	--	--	1.5	0.9	0.4	2.0	1.0
VN04	4.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	1.1	0.4	1.2	2.4	1.2	0.5
VN05	2.6	0.0	5.0	1.4	2.0	1.3	4.9	3.1	3.8	6.0
Number of data	34	34	33	32	32	33	33	33	33	33
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1
25% value	2.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.3
Median	3.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7	1.5	1.3	1.2	0.7
75% value	6.4	0.8	1.3	0.9	1.1	1.3	3.2	3.0	2.2	1.1
Maximum	27.7	2.0	5.0	2.7	7.8	8.0	8.4	15.2	53.4	6.2

Note: R.S.D for "pH as H<sup>+</sup>" was calculated after pH value was converted to H<sup>+</sup> concentration;  
"--", Not measured

**Appendix Table 2.1.2 Data precision (R.S.D.) of sample No. 132w**

Lab. ID	pH as H <sup>+</sup> %	EC %	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> %	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> %	Cl <sup>-</sup> %	Na <sup>+</sup> %	K <sup>+</sup> %	Ca <sup>2+</sup> %	Mg <sup>2+</sup> %	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> %
KH01	6.2	2.6	9.8	6.5	5.2	6.7	21.6	10.1	23.1	12.3
CN01	4.6	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.9	0.9	5.0	1.3	2.9	1.3
CN02	2.3	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
CN03	4.5	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.3	0.8	1.4	0.6
CN04	5.3	1.2	0.4	0.6	0.0	1.6	4.1	1.7	3.0	2.0
ID01	11.7	1.4	1.1	1.6	7.7	12.3	7.8	4.7	1.6	8.5
ID02	7.9	2.6	0.9	0.9	2.0	2.7	2.4	1.8	1.0	0.6
ID03	28.4	1.4	1.4	1.2	3.5	1.9	5.0	3.3	2.8	1.2
JP01	2.6	0.8	0.6	0.9	0.9	1.3	2.0	1.6	2.1	2.2
JP03	1.8	0.7	0.7	1.1	0.8	0.8	1.6	1.0	1.6	1.1
JP04	3.0	0.8	0.9	1.1	3.1	3.3	5.5	7.9	8.1	1.5
JP05	3.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	1.5	1.7	0.6	1.1	0.7
JP07	2.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.1	1.0	0.0	0.6	1.1	0.6
JP08	6.9	1.1	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.6	1.6	0.8	1.3	0.7
JP09	13.8	2.3	2.5	1.7	1.5	0.8	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.7
JP10	3.6	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.4	1.4	1.6	1.1	1.7	0.3
MY01	2.0	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.9	0.0	4.0	5.3	8.0	0.3
MM01	12.4	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	3.3	0.6	2.1	1.8
PH01	12.3	1.4	0.8	0.7	0.4	1.6	3.7	1.2	2.8	3.8
PH02	4.5	3.6	4.0	5.4	5.3	1.4	2.9	6.4	10.6	1.5
KR01	5.7	0.5	1.2	0.5	0.5	0.8	2.2	4.0	--	4.3
RU01	3.7	3.3	0.4	0.4	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.3	37.9
RU02	6.4	2.9	2.3	1.1	2.0	1.2	2.1	1.9	2.5	2.2
TH01	7.0	1.4	1.0	0.4	3.8	0.8	1.6	2.2	1.8	1.3
TH02	1.4	0.0	0.4	0.2	1.2	0.5	1.6	0.8	0.0	0.7
TH04	39.7	1.5	0.5	0.7	1.5	5.4	2.6	1.5	6.3	2.0
TH05	13.1	0.6	1.3	1.7	3.6	5.0	10.6	2.4	1.7	1.3
TH06	1.6	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.7	1.1	0.4	1.8	0.7
TH08	3.1	0.7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
VN01	5.3	1.0	1.4	0.9	1.5	0.9	4.5	3.1	1.0	3.2
VN02	0.0	2.1	1.2	1.9	2.5	1.7	8.7	2.6	4.3	3.0
VN03	3.7	1.9	15.0	--	--	2.3	3.2	1.9	9.6	1.8
VN04	4.5	1.0	0.8	1.2	1.7	0.0	2.7	1.3	3.1	1.2
VN05	5.1	0.0	4.4	4.3	1.8	6.1	3.4	1.8	2.5	3.0
Number of data	34	34	33	32	32	33	33	33	32	33
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
25% value	3.0	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	1.0	1.3	0.7
Median	4.6	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.4	1.3	2.6	1.6	2.0	1.5
75% value	6.9	1.6	1.4	1.3	2.1	2.3	4.1	2.6	3.0	2.2
Maximum	39.7	3.6	15.0	6.5	7.7	12.3	21.6	10.1	23.1	37.9

Note: R.S.D for "pH as H<sup>+</sup>" was calculated after pH value was converted to H<sup>+</sup> concentration;  
"--", Not measured

## Appendix 2.2 Analytical results submitted by the laboratories

**Appendix Table 2.2.1 Analytical data concerning sample No. 131w**

Lab. ID	pH	EC mS/m	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> μmol/L	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> μmol/L	Cl <sup>-</sup> μmol/L	Na <sup>+</sup> μmol/L	K <sup>+</sup> μmol/L	Ca <sup>2+</sup> μmol/L	Mg <sup>2+</sup> μmol/L	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> μmol/L
KH01	4.58	2.76	45.8	36.9	46.8	34.2	6.6	22.5	6.3	26.7
CN01	4.88	2.96	45.3	36.1	48.2	34.6	7.3	21.3	9.5	49.9
CN02	4.60	3.24	46.9	37.6	49.0	34.8	7.4	21.0	9.6	50.6
CN03	4.67	3.05	50.0	37.1	50.0	31.7	6.9	20.2	8.7	47.8
CN04	4.66	3.16	45.5	36.0	48.8	34.1	7.2	21.0	8.8	48.6
ID01	4.54	2.99	44.8	35.1	47.5	32.8	7.1	20.5	10.2	53.2
ID02	4.68	2.83	48.6	38.5	50.2	32.6	6.5	22.1	10.3	47.3
ID03	4.69	2.93	44.5	37.4	46.9	34.5	7.3	21.7	9.9	47.4
JP01	4.57	3.20	47.0	37.9	51.0	35.0	7.3	23.0	9.8	51.5
JP03	4.70	3.08	45.9	35.7	49.7	34.0	6.8	23.1	9.3	48.3
JP04	4.64	3.08	45.4	36.1	48.4	32.6	6.9	21.2	9.0	48.7
JP05	4.65	3.10	45.8	35.0	48.8	31.7	7.1	20.9	9.7	48.9
JP07	4.52	3.05	46.8	37.1	49.8	33.8	5.8	22.1	9.9	47.4
JP08	4.68	3.00	45.4	36.0	49.2	33.5	7.0	21.7	9.4	47.5
JP09	4.68	3.02	49.7	39.2	50.0	34.9	7.1	22.1	10.0	50.8
JP10	4.69	3.07	45.3	34.9	48.2	32.7	6.6	21.0	9.4	47.1
MY01	4.64	3.19	43.4	35.9	48.2	34.3	7.0	22.4	9.2	48.4
MM01	4.81	3.42	44.4	30.9	48.5	34.0	6.5	23.8	9.7	54.1
PH01	4.57	3.14	41.9	32.0	46.4	33.6	6.8	20.2	9.6	39.3
PH02	4.64	3.08	46.9	34.9	47.0	35.2	7.5	25.7	10.9	51.5
KR01	4.61	3.07	42.6	35.3	35.3	31.2	6.7	24.1	0.8	57.6
RU01	4.60	3.24	48.5	38.0	54.5	35.9	7.4	22.7	9.9	49.3
RU02	4.57	3.20	47.9	37.3	49.9	33.9	7.9	22.0	10.7	49.3
TH01	4.65	3.16	47.4	35.7	48.2	34.4	6.5	21.7	9.4	51.4
TH02	4.66	3.23	47.9	36.7	49.2	33.3	6.9	27.3	10.0	46.2
TH04	4.68	3.07	47.1	37.6	50.7	39.9	8.2	31.2	12.4	42.7
TH05	5.10	3.16	47.8	36.1	47.7	31.3	6.1	25.5	11.2	61.0
TH06	4.66	3.06	46.2	37.3	44.8	32.1	7.6	22.3	10.4	47.5
TH08	4.25	3.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
VN01	4.66	3.09	49.5	36.3	47.5	35.4	7.1	25.8	10.2	48.0
VN02	4.70	3.15	45.6	36.4	49.4	37.4	7.0	21.7	9.7	45.0
VN03	4.64	3.05	44.2	---	---	32.9	8.4	23.1	8.7	48.7
VN04	4.82	3.01	46.9	33.9	48.8	37.0	8.3	25.7	7.5	51.4
VN05	4.53	3.08	48.2	35.7	49.7	32.0	8.4	26.5	7.7	47.9
<b>Prepared value</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>36.4</b>	<b>49.4</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>48.4</b>
Number of data	32	34	33	31	31	32	33	32	32	32
Average	4.65	3.09	46.3	36.3	48.8	33.8	7.1	22.7	9.6	49.2
Minimum	4.52	2.76	41.9	32.0	44.8	31.2	5.8	20.2	6.3	39.3
Maximum	4.88	3.42	50.0	39.2	54.5	37.4	8.4	27.3	12.4	61.0
Standard deviation	0.08	0.12	1.91	1.40	1.70	1.50	0.61	1.89	1.09	3.83

Note: The outliers judged by 3S.D. method were painted with light mesh and were excluded from statistics;  
 "----", Not measured

**Appendix Table 2.2.2 Analytical data concerning sample No. 132w**

Lab. ID	pH	EC mS/m	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> μmol/L	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> μmol/L	Cl <sup>-</sup> μmol/L	Na <sup>+</sup> μmol/L	K <sup>+</sup> μmol/L	Ca <sup>2+</sup> μmol/L	Mg <sup>2+</sup> μmol/L	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> μmol/L
KH01	5.11	0.89	14.7	17.6	11.1	9.2	2.2	10.0	2.5	4.6
CN01	5.25	1.04	13.3	17.6	11.3	10.7	3.1	8.9	4.2	10.0
CN02	5.25	0.96	14.1	17.4	10.7	10.8	3.2	8.8	4.4	10.0
CN03	5.12	0.99	15.6	17.4	11.7	8.3	3.3	8.5	3.9	10.0
CN04	5.35	0.92	14.2	17.5	11.8	12.8	3.8	9.5	4.5	9.9
ID01	5.26	0.96	14.3	17.3	10.9	7.7	3.2	9.6	5.3	12.1
ID02	5.07	0.92	15.6	18.5	12.0	8.5	3.2	9.7	4.8	11.4
ID03	5.20	1.05	14.0	18.2	11.5	10.4	3.4	11.3	5.2	11.4
JP01	5.03	1.08	14.2	17.7	11.4	9.8	3.0	9.4	4.1	10.6
JP03	5.16	1.02	14.4	17.4	11.3	9.1	2.8	10.4	4.2	10.1
JP04	5.10	1.03	14.3	17.1	11.3	8.5	2.8	8.6	3.7	10.5
JP05	5.13	1.01	14.1	17.1	11.6	7.8	2.9	8.1	4.1	10.2
JP07	5.00	1.04	14.4	17.5	11.3	8.6	2.0	8.9	4.7	11.3
JP08	5.07	1.04	14.1	17.1	11.5	9.0	3.1	9.0	4.0	9.5
JP09	5.22	0.99	15.5	18.5	13.7	9.8	3.1	9.2	4.2	11.5
JP10	5.12	1.05	13.9	16.4	11.0	8.9	2.8	8.7	3.9	10.9
MY01	5.11	1.06	13.9	16.9	12.4	9.7	3.3	9.2	3.7	11.6
MM01	5.23	1.19	13.7	15.0	11.2	9.7	2.9	10.4	4.7	12.8
PH01	4.95	1.02	13.6	16.4	11.2	8.6	2.7	8.6	4.0	9.2
PH02	5.12	1.03	14.1	16.5	10.7	9.8	3.2	11.7	5.0	11.9
KR01	5.05	1.05	13.1	16.3	16.3	11.9	3.5	13.9	0.0	11.9
RU01	4.98	1.13	15.0	17.8	12.9	9.6	2.8	10.2	4.2	1.5
RU02	5.20	1.03	24.9	16.0	9.9	13.0	2.6	11.0	4.9	12.2
TH01	5.19	0.96	15.5	16.5	11.0	9.3	2.8	8.7	3.8	11.8
TH02	5.13	1.10	14.4	16.9	10.8	9.4	3.0	15.8	5.1	9.8
TH04	5.58	0.99	14.6	18.1	12.8	11.6	3.4	15.1	5.7	12.1
TH05	5.52	1.06	14.0	16.6	11.5	5.2	2.1	10.6	4.2	12.9
TH06	5.05	1.07	14.3	17.4	13.1	9.5	3.1	9.2	4.3	10.6
TH08	5.01	0.99	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
VN01	5.20	1.03	15.7	16.2	11.9	10.6	3.1	10.4	4.3	11.2
VN02	5.20	1.00	14.2	17.5	11.9	12.7	2.4	8.6	4.0	8.6
VN03	5.23	1.08	13.3	---	---	9.5	3.9	12.9	4.1	12.5
VN04	5.23	0.98	13.7	16.8	14.6	11.3	3.5	9.7	3.2	10.7
VN05	5.11	0.97	14.0	16.7	13.7	10.9	3.2	11.5	4.2	10.9
<b>Prepared value</b>	<b>5.10</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>10.6</b>
Number of data	33	34	32	32	31	33	33	32	32	32
Average	5.15	1.02	14.3	17.1	11.7	9.8	3.0	10.0	4.3	10.8
Minimum	4.95	0.89	13.1	15.0	9.9	5.2	2.0	8.1	2.5	4.6
Maximum	5.52	1.19	15.7	18.5	14.6	13.0	3.9	15.1	5.7	12.9
Standard deviation	0.11	0.06	0.67	0.74	1.00	1.58	0.43	1.59	0.61	1.53

Note: The outliers judged by 3S.D. method were painted with light mesh and were excluded from statistics;  
"---", Not measured

## Appendix 2.3 Normalized data

**Appendix Table 2.3.1 Deviation% from prepared values of sample No. 131w**

Lab. ID	pH %	EC %	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> %	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> %	Cl <sup>-</sup> %	Na <sup>+</sup> %	K <sup>+</sup> %	Ca <sup>2+</sup> %	Mg <sup>2+</sup> %	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> %
KH01	-0.4	-13.5	-0.9	1.4	-5.3	-0.6	-7.0	2.3	-35.1	-44.8
CN01	6.1	-7.2	-1.9	-0.8	-2.4	0.6	2.8	-3.2	-2.1	3.1
CN02	0.0	1.6	1.5	3.3	-0.8	1.2	4.2	-4.5	-1.0	4.5
CN03	1.5	-4.4	8.2	1.9	1.2	-7.8	-2.8	-8.2	-10.3	-1.2
CN04	1.3	-0.9	-1.5	-1.1	-1.2	-0.9	1.4	-4.5	-9.3	0.4
ID01	-1.3	-6.3	-3.0	-3.6	-3.8	-4.7	0.0	-6.8	5.2	9.9
ID02	1.7	-11.3	5.2	5.8	1.6	-5.2	-8.5	0.5	6.2	-2.3
ID03	2.0	-8.2	-3.7	2.7	-5.1	0.3	2.8	-1.4	2.1	-2.1
JP01	-0.7	0.3	1.7	4.1	3.2	1.7	2.8	4.5	1.0	6.4
JP03	2.2	-3.4	-0.6	-1.9	0.6	-1.2	-4.2	5.0	-4.1	-0.2
JP04	0.9	-3.4	-1.7	-0.8	-2.0	-5.2	-2.8	-3.6	-7.2	0.6
JP05	1.1	-2.8	-0.9	-3.8	-1.2	-7.8	0.0	-5.0	0.0	1.0
JP07	-1.7	-4.4	1.3	1.9	0.8	-1.7	-18.3	0.5	2.1	-2.1
JP08	1.7	-6.0	-1.7	-1.1	-0.4	-2.6	-1.4	-1.4	-3.1	-1.9
JP09	1.7	-5.3	7.6	7.7	1.2	1.5	0.0	0.5	3.1	5.0
JP10	2.0	-3.8	-1.9	-4.1	-2.4	-4.9	-7.0	-4.5	-3.1	-2.7
MY01	0.9	0.0	-6.1	-1.4	-2.4	-0.3	-1.4	1.8	-5.2	0.0
MM01	4.6	7.2	-3.9	-15.1	-1.8	-1.2	-8.5	8.2	0.0	11.8
PH01	-0.7	-1.6	-9.3	-12.1	-6.1	-2.3	-4.2	-8.2	-1.0	-18.8
PH02	0.9	-3.4	1.5	-4.1	-4.9	2.3	5.6	16.8	12.4	6.4
KR01	0.2	-3.8	-7.8	-3.0	-28.5	-9.3	-5.6	9.5	-91.8	19.0
RU01	0.0	1.6	5.0	4.4	10.3	4.4	4.2	3.2	2.1	1.9
RU02	-0.7	0.3	3.7	2.5	1.0	-1.5	11.3	0.0	10.3	1.9
TH01	1.1	-0.9	2.6	-1.9	-2.4	0.0	-8.5	-1.4	-3.1	6.2
TH02	1.3	1.3	3.7	0.8	-0.4	-3.2	-2.8	24.1	3.1	-4.5
TH04	1.7	-3.8	1.9	3.3	2.6	16.0	15.5	41.8	27.8	-11.8
TH05	10.9	-0.9	3.5	-0.8	-3.4	-9.0	-14.1	15.9	15.5	26.0
TH06	1.3	-4.1	0.0	2.5	-9.3	-6.7	7.0	1.4	7.2	-1.9
TH08	-7.6	-6.0	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
VN01	1.3	-3.1	7.1	-0.3	-3.8	2.9	0.0	17.3	5.2	-0.8
VN02	2.2	-1.3	-1.3	0.0	0.0	8.7	-1.4	-1.4	0.0	-7.0
VN03	0.9	-4.4	-4.3	---	---	-4.4	18.3	5.0	-10.3	0.6
VN04	4.8	-5.6	1.5	-6.9	-1.2	7.6	16.9	16.8	-22.7	6.2
VN05	-1.5	-3.4	4.3	-1.9	0.6	-7.0	18.3	20.5	-20.6	-1.0
Number of data	34	34	33	32	32	33	33	33	33	33
Average	1.2	-3.3	0.3	-0.7	-2.1	-1.2	0.4	4.3	-3.8	0.2
Minimum	-7.6	-13.5	-9.3	-15.1	-28.5	-9.3	-18.3	-8.2	-91.8	-44.8
Maximum	10.9	7.2	8.2	7.7	10.3	16.0	18.3	41.8	27.8	26.0


Note: "----", Not measured

**Appendix Table 2.3.2 Deviation% from prepared values of sample No. 132w**


Lab. ID	pH %	EC %	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> %	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> %	Cl <sup>-</sup> %	Na <sup>+</sup> %	K <sup>+</sup> %	Ca <sup>2+</sup> %	Mg <sup>2+</sup> %	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> %
KH01	0.2	-12.7	2.1	1.7	-4.3	-4.2	-29.0	9.9	-39.0	-56.6
CN01	2.9	2.0	-7.6	1.7	-2.6	11.5	0.0	-2.2	2.4	-5.7
CN02	2.9	-5.9	-2.1	0.6	-7.8	12.5	3.2	-3.3	7.3	-5.7
CN03	0.4	-2.9	8.3	0.6	0.9	-13.5	6.5	-6.6	-4.9	-5.7
CN04	4.9	-9.8	-1.4	1.2	1.7	33.3	22.6	4.4	9.8	-6.6
ID01	3.1	-5.9	-0.7	0.0	-6.0	-19.8	3.2	5.5	29.3	14.2
ID02	-0.6	-9.8	8.3	6.9	3.4	-11.5	3.2	6.6	17.1	7.5
ID03	2.0	2.9	-2.8	5.2	-0.9	8.3	9.7	24.2	26.8	7.5
JP01	-1.4	5.9	-1.4	2.3	-1.7	2.1	-3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0
JP03	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.6	-2.6	-5.2	-9.7	14.3	2.4	-4.7
JP04	0.0	1.0	-0.7	-1.2	-2.6	-11.5	-9.7	-5.5	-9.8	-0.9
JP05	0.6	-1.0	-2.1	-1.2	0.0	-18.8	-6.5	-11.0	0.0	-3.8
JP07	-2.0	2.0	0.0	1.2	-2.6	-10.4	-35.5	-2.2	14.6	6.6
JP08	-0.6	2.0	-2.1	-1.2	-0.9	-6.3	0.0	-1.1	-2.4	-10.4
JP09	2.4	-2.9	7.6	6.9	18.1	2.1	0.0	1.1	2.4	8.5
JP10	0.4	2.9	-3.5	-5.2	-5.2	-7.3	-9.7	-4.4	-4.9	2.8
MY01	0.2	3.9	-3.5	-2.3	6.9	1.0	6.5	1.1	-9.8	9.4
MM01	2.5	16.7	-4.9	-13.3	-3.4	1.0	-6.5	14.3	14.6	20.8
PH01	-2.9	0.0	-5.6	-5.2	-3.4	-10.4	-12.9	-5.5	-2.4	-13.2
PH02	0.4	1.0	-2.1	-4.6	-7.8	2.1	3.2	28.6	22.0	12.3
KR01	-1.0	2.9	-9.0	-5.8	40.5	24.0	12.9	52.7	-100.0	12.3
RU01	-2.4	10.8	4.2	2.9	11.2	0.0	-9.7	12.1	2.4	-85.8
RU02	2.0	1.0	72.9	-7.5	-14.7	35.4	-16.1	20.9	19.5	15.1
TH01	1.8	-5.9	7.6	-4.6	-5.2	-3.1	-9.7	-4.4	-7.3	11.3
TH02	0.6	7.8	0.0	-2.3	-6.9	-2.1	-3.2	73.6	24.4	-7.5
TH04	9.4	-2.9	1.4	4.6	10.3	20.8	9.7	65.9	39.0	14.2
TH05	8.2	3.9	-2.8	-4.0	-0.9	-45.8	-32.3	16.5	2.4	21.7
TH06	-1.0	4.9	-0.7	0.6	12.9	-1.0	0.0	1.1	4.9	0.0
TH08	-1.8	-2.9	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
VN01	2.0	1.0	9.0	-6.4	2.6	10.4	0.0	14.3	4.9	5.7
VN02	2.0	-2.0	-1.4	1.2	2.6	32.3	-22.6	-5.5	-2.4	-18.9
VN03	2.5	5.9	-7.6	---	---	-1.0	25.8	41.8	0.0	17.9
VN04	2.5	-3.9	-4.9	-2.9	25.9	17.7	12.9	6.6	-22.0	0.9
VN05	0.2	-4.9	-2.8	-3.5	18.1	13.5	3.2	26.4	2.4	2.8
Number of data	34	34	33	32	32	33	33	33	33	33
Average	1.2	0.1	1.6	-1.0	2.4	1.7	-2.8	11.9	1.3	-1.0
Minimum	-2.9	-12.7	-9.0	-13.3	-14.7	-45.8	-35.5	-11.0	-100.0	-85.8
Maximum	9.4	16.7	72.9	6.9	40.5	35.4	25.8	73.6	39.0	21.7

Note: "----", Not measured


## Appendix 2.4 Data distribution




Appendix Figure 2.4.1 Data distribution for pH (Left: 131w, Right: 132w)




Appendix Figure 2.4.2 Data distribution for EC (Left: 131w, Right: 132w)








Appendix Figure 2.4.3 Data distribution for SO4^2- (Left: 131w, Right: 132w)



Appendix Figure 2.4.4 Data distribution for NO3^- (Left: 131w, Right: 132w)



Appendix Figure 2.4.5 Data distribution for Cl^- (Left: 131w, Right: 132w)





### **3. 9<sup>th</sup> INTER-LABORATORY COMPARISON PROJECT ON DRY DEPOSITION**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

In the Inter-laboratory Comparison on dry deposition, impregnated filters which contained either  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  and  $\text{Cl}^-$ , or  $\text{NH}_4^+$  were prepared and distributed to the participating laboratories by the Network Center (NC) in October 2013. Most of the laboratories which monitor with the filter pack method in EANET joined this activity and submitted their analytical results to the NC. These results were compared with the corresponding prepared value and statistically analyzed.

#### **3.2 Procedures**

##### **3.2.1 Participating Laboratories**

A total of 28 laboratories in charge of EANET monitoring in 13 countries of EANET participated in this ninth activity and 24 laboratories submitted the results to the NC. The participating laboratories and data submission status are shown in Table 1.1.

##### **3.2.2 Description of Samples**

Two kinds of filter samples, one contained two ions ( $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  and  $\text{Cl}^-$ ), the other contained one ion ( $\text{NH}_4^+$ ), were prepared and distributed to the laboratories. Blank filters, which were impregnated with  $\text{K}_2\text{CO}_3$  or  $\text{H}_3\text{PO}_4$  but did not contain any  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ,  $\text{Cl}^-$ , or  $\text{NH}_4^+$ , were also prepared and distributed. The details of the filter samples were described in Table 3.1. The analytical precision and accuracy on the individual analyte were summarized through statistical calculations of the submitted analytical results from each participating laboratory.

**Table 3.1 Outline of filter samples**

Name	Details	Container	Number of filters	Note
No.131d-1	Alkali ( $\text{K}_2\text{CO}_3$ ) impregnated filter	Polyethylene centrifuge tube	3	Two kinds of the standard solutions which contained known concentration of sulfate or chloride ion were added.
No.131d-2	Acid ( $\text{H}_3\text{PO}_4$ ) impregnated filter	Polyethylene centrifuge tube	3	One kind of the standard solution which contained known concentration

				of ammonium ion was added.
No.132d-1	Alkali ( $K_2CO_3$ ) impregnated filter	Polyethylene centrifuge tube	3	Two kinds of the standard solutions which contained known concentration of sulfate or chloride ion were added.
No.132d-2	Acid ( $H_3PO_4$ ) impregnated filter	Polyethylene centrifuge tube	3	One kind of the standard solution which contained known concentration of ammonium ion was added.
No.133d-1	Alkali ( $K_2CO_3$ ) impregnated filter	Polyethylene centrifuge tube	3	Blank
No.133d-2	Acid ( $H_3PO_4$ ) impregnated filter	Polyethylene centrifuge tube	3	Blank

### 3.2.3 Analytes

All participating laboratories were expected to analyze these filter samples and to submit their values as the net quantity of each ion ( $SO_4^{2-}$ ,  $Cl^-$  and  $NH_4^+$ ) in micrograms ( $\mu g$ ).

### 3.2.4 Analytical Methodologies

The recommended procedure for sample analysis on the filter pack method is described in the document, "Technical Document for Filter Pack Method in East Asia" (EANET, 2003). As each filter sample was put in a centrifuge tube, a solvent was directly poured into the tube for extraction. The extraction procedure is as follows;

#### (1) Sample No.131d-1, No.132d-1, No.133d-1

Add 20 mL of  $H_2O_2$  solution (0.05% v/v) as an extracting solvent into each centrifuge tube, then shake or agitate them for 20 minutes.

#### (2) Sample No.131d-2, No.132d-2, No.133d-2

Add 20 mL of pure water ( $EC < 0.15 \text{ mS L}^{-1}$ ) as an extracting solvent into each centrifuge tube, then shake or agitate them for 20 minutes.

#### (3) Filtration

Remove insoluble matter from the solution using a membrane filter (pore size 0.45  $\mu m$ ). The membrane filter must be prewashed with pure water (more than 100 mL) before filtration. After filtration, those filtrates are assigned identification numbers and sealed tightly.

Note 1) Carry out the analysis immediately after extraction.

Note 2) In principle, it is strongly recommended that the filtrate be analyzed immediately

after extraction, however, in the case that they need to be kept for certain reasons, store them in a refrigerator at 4°C.

The participating laboratories were expected to use the analytical methods specified in the Technical Manual (EANET, 2010) in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2 Analytical methods specified in the Technical Manual**

Analyte	Analytical method
$\text{SO}_4^{2-}, \text{Cl}^-$	Ion Chromatography Spectrophotometry
$\text{NH}_4^+$	Ion Chromatography Spectrophotometry (Indophenol Blue)

### 3.2.5 Data Check Procedures

All participating laboratories were requested to report as the net quantity of each ion ( $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ,  $\text{Cl}^-$  and  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ) in the filter sample.

Each quantity ( $M_{\text{sol}}$ ) is calculated as follows:

$$M_{\text{sol}} = C_{\text{sol}} \times V_{\text{sol}} \times MW / 10^3 \quad (1)$$

where  $M_{\text{sol}}$  : quantity of each component in the filtrate ( $\mu\text{g}$ );

$C_{\text{sol}}$  : concentration of each component in the filtrate ( $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ );

$V_{\text{sol}}$  : volume of the solvent (20 mL);

$MW$ : molecular weight of analyte ( $\text{Cl}^-$ : 35.45,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ : 96.06,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ : 18.04)

The net quantity of each ion ( $netM_{\text{sol}}$ ) is calculated as follows :

$$net M_{\text{sol}} = M_{\text{sol, Sample}} - M_{\text{sol, Blank}} \quad (2)$$

where  $netM_{\text{sol}}$  : net quantity of each ion on the filter.

$M_{\text{sol, Sample}}$  : quantity ( $\mu\text{g}$ ) of each component in the filtrate from sample No.131d-1, No.131d-2, No.132d-1 and No.132d-2;

$M_{\text{sol, Blank}}$  : the average quantity ( $\mu\text{g}$ ) in the filtrate from blank sample No.133d-1 and No.133d-2.

### 3.3 Results

The NC distributed the filter samples to 28 laboratories in the participating countries of EANET,

and received their results from 24 laboratories. The results compared to the prepared values are summarized in Table 3.3. The average, minimum, maximum, standard deviation (S.D.) and number of data (N) were calculated from each analyzed ion quantity. Analytical results of Samples No.131d and No.132d are shown in Table 3.5 and Table 3.7.

Outliers exceeding three times the standard deviation (S.D.) were rejected before calculation. In this study, three data were rejected.

As shown in Table 3.3, the deviations ( $\Delta V/V_p$ ) for  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  in Sample No. 131d and Sample No.132d were -12.2% and -3.35%. The deviations for  $\text{Cl}^-$  in Sample No. 131d and Sample No.132d were -14.1% and -8.47%. The deviations for  $\text{NH}_4^+$  in Sample No. 131d and Sample No.132d were -6.04% and -5.65%. All deviations were negative values.

The Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) of EANET are specified on the QA/QC program of EANET that determined values are expected to fall within  $\pm 15\%$  deviation from the prepared values. Each laboratory analyzed each sample 3 times, averaged the values, and these average values were compared with the corresponding prepared values for this report. The flag "E" indicates that the deviation exceeds  $\pm 15\%$  but not  $\pm 30\%$ , and the flag "X" indicates that the deviation exceeds  $\pm 30\%$ .

$$\text{Deviation (\%)} = (\text{Determined value} - \text{Prepared value}) / \text{Prepared value} \times 100 (\%) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Flag E: } 15\% < |\text{Deviation}| \leq 30\%$$

$$\text{Flag X: } 30\% < |\text{Deviation}|$$

The evaluation of the results on both Samples No.131d and No.132d is described in "3.3.1 Evaluation of Laboratories' Performance (by sample)". The comparison of the results for each analyte is described in "3.3.2 Comparison of Laboratories' Performance (by analyte)". The evaluation of their analytical circumstance, such as analytical method, experience of personnel, and other analytical conditions is described in " 3.3.3 Information on Laboratories".

**Table 3.3 Summary of analytical results of the filter samples**

(The results do not include outliers.)

Analyte	Prepared*	Average	$\Delta V/V_p^*$	S.D.	Number (N)	Minimum	Maximum
<u>Sample No. 131d</u>							
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (μg)	10	8.78	-12.2	1.41	24	5.39	11.5
Cl <sup>-</sup> (μg)	2.6	2.23	-14.1	0.270	23	1.76	3.02
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> (μg)	6.0	5.64	-6.04	1.58	24	1.73	10.1
<u>Sample No. 132d</u>							
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (μg)	70	67.7	-3.35	3.01	23	59.3	73.2
Cl <sup>-</sup> (μg)	13	11.9	-8.47	1.06	24	9.51	14.0
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> (μg)	40	37.7	-5.65	4.13	23	27.7	49.2

\* Prepared: Prepared values

\*  $\Delta V/V_p$ : (Average result ( $V_a$ ) – Prepared value ( $V_p$ )) / Prepared value ( $V_p$ ) × 100 (%)

### 3.3.1 Evaluation of Laboratories' Performance (by sample)


#### Samples No. 131d-1, No.131d-2

For Sample No.131d, 22 analytical data in 72 results were flagged E, and 9 analytical data were flagged X. The total percentage of flagged samples was 43.1%. (Figure 3.1, Table 3.4 and 3.5).

**Table 3.4 Number of flagged data for Sample No.131d**

	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	Cl <sup>-</sup>	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	Total
Flag E *	7	12	3	22
Flag X *	2	2	5	9
Data within DQOs	15	10	16	41
Ratio of Flagged (%)	37.5	58.3	33.3	43.1

\*Flag E:  $15\% < |\text{Deviation}| \leq 30\%$ \*Flag X:  $30\% < |\text{Deviation}|$



**Figure 3.1 Percentage of flagged data for Sample No.131d**

**Table 3.5 Average analytical results of Sample No.131d**

Lab. Code	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (µg)	Cl <sup>-</sup> (µg)	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> (µg)		
KH01	9.17	2.09	E	3.29	X
ID01	11.5	3.02	E	4.52	E
ID03	8.69	2.08	E	5.71	
JP01	7.49	E	2.18	E	5.51
JP02	9.59		2.36		5.60
JP03	10.3		2.16	E	5.70
JP04	9.71		2.39		6.09
JP05	9.92		3.83	X	5.55
JP08	9.61		2.35		5.57
JP09	10.5		2.56		6.13
JP10	8.48	E	2.26		5.68
MY01	7.39	E	2.39		6.68
MM01	5.39	X	1.86	E	1.73
PH01	7.68	E	2.16	E	5.13
PH02	8.58		1.76	X	6.83
KR01	6.12	X	2.03	E	4.61
RU01	8.52		2.33		10.1
TH01	8.92		2.32		6.00

TH02	7.65	E	1.86	E	5.50
TH04	9.63		2.03	E	4.31 E
TH05	7.74	E	2.54		8.55 X
TH06	9.34		2.13	E	6.73
VN01	10.7		2.02	E	5.68
VN02	8.03	E	2.49		4.10 X

\*Flag E:  $15\% < |\text{Deviation}| \leq 30\%$

\*Flag X:  $30\% < |\text{Deviation}|$

### Samples No. 132d-1, No.132d-2


For Sample No.132d, 12 analytical data in 72 results were flagged E and 2 analytical data were flagged X. The total percentage of flagged samples was 19.4%. (Figure 3.2, Table 3.6 and 3.7).

**Table 3.6 Number of flagged data for Sample No.132d**

	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$	$\text{Cl}^-$	$\text{NH}_4^+$	Total
Flag E *	2	7	3	12
Flag X *	0	0	2	2
Data within DQOs	22	17	19	58
Ratio of Flagged (%)	8.3	29.2	20.8	19.4

\*Flag E:  $15\% < |\text{Deviation}| \leq 30\%$

\*Flag X:  $30\% < |\text{Deviation}|$



**Figure 3.2 Percentage of flagged data for Sample No.132d**

**Table 3.7 Average analytical results of Sample No.132d**

Lab. Code	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (μg)	Cl <sup>-</sup> (μg)	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> (μg)
KH01	67.7	10.6	E
ID01	72.3	13.2	40.7
ID03	64.8	11.8	36.1
JP01	69.4	12.3	36.8
JP02	69.2	12.5	38.4
JP03	67.9	12.2	38.2
JP04	69.5	12.5	38.4
JP05	69.5	12.7	38.0
JP08	68.1	12.5	38.6
JP09	73.2	14.0	39.8
JP10	67.1	12.8	39.4
MY01	61.9	12.4	38.4
MM01	51.6	E	9.51
PH01	65.3	11.0	E
PH02	65.4	10.9	E
KR01	70.3	12.7	35.9
RU01	68.7	13.0	43.4
TH01	67.4	12.0	39.1
TH02	59.3	E	10.7
TH04	67.8	11.9	E
TH05	70.8	10.9	E
TH06	67.6	11.5	39.4
VN01	66.9	9.85	E
VN02	65.9	12.1	35.2

\*Flag E:  $15\% < |\text{Deviation}| \leq 30\%$ \*Flag X:  $30\% < |\text{Deviation}|$ **Blank Sample (No.133d)**

Each quantity of SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>, Cl<sup>-</sup>, and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> was determined for blank sample No.133d-1 and No.133d-2. Their obtained values are shown in Table 3.8. Blank values were detected in a wide range, including 0 μg. Table 3.9 showed the ratio of the blank value to analytical results by laboratory. Light gray color cells indicate that the sample was flagged E and dark gray color cells indicate that the sample was flagged X. At some laboratories, results were not flagged even though some blank values were high.

**Table 3.8 Analytical results of Sample No.133d (blank)**

Lab. Code	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ( $\mu\text{g}$ )	$\text{Cl}^-$ ( $\mu\text{g}$ )	$\text{NH}_4^+$ ( $\mu\text{g}$ )
KH01	0.59	1.01	0.00
ID01	0.66	1.11	0.92
ID03	0.15	0.52	0.65
JP01	0.08	0.31	0.19
JP02	0.00	0.22	0.31
JP03	0.00	0.69	0.28
JP04	0.42	0.46	0.16
JP05	0.00	0.78	0.23
JP08	0.00	0.45	0.12
JP09	0.00	0.50	0.68
JP10	0.14	0.39	0.35
MY01	0.31	0.46	0.24
MM01	0.69	2.86	1.98
PH01	1.64	1.06	0.00
PH02	2.48	1.71	1.22
KR01	0.00	0.45	2.29
RU01	0.12	0.64	1.57
TH01	2.58	0.96	0.93
TH02	0.64	0.58	0.83
TH04	1.73	1.45	1.95
TH05	2.88	2.48	0.06
TH06	0.37	0.42	0.72
VN01	0.00	0.36	0.32
VN02	1.04	0.84	0.98
Average	0.69	0.86	0.71
Median	0.34	0.61	0.50
Minimum	0.00	0.22	0.00
Maximum	2.88	2.86	2.29
Standard deviation	0.88	0.65	0.65

**Table 3.9    Ratio of blank value to analytical value ( $M_{sol,blank}/M_{sol,sample}$ ) (%)**

Lab. Code	Sample No.131d			Sample No.132d		
	$SO_4^{2-}$	$Cl^-$	$NH_4^+$	$SO_4^{2-}$	$Cl^-$	$NH_4^+$
KH01	6.0	32.7	0.0	0.9	8.7	0.0
ID01	5.4	26.9	16.9	0.9	7.7	2.2
ID03	1.7	20.1	10.3	0.2	4.2	1.8
JP01	1.0	12.3	3.3	0.1	2.4	0.5
JP02	0.0	8.6	5.3	0.0	1.7	0.8
JP03	0.0	24.2	4.7	0.0	5.4	0.7
JP04	4.1	16.2	2.6	0.6	3.5	0.4
JP05	0.0	17.0	4.0	0.0	5.8	0.6
JP08	0.0	16.2	2.1	0.0	3.5	0.3
JP09	0.0	16.4	10.0	0.0	3.5	1.7
JP10	1.7	14.8	5.7	0.2	3.0	0.9
MY01	4.0	16.1	3.5	0.5	3.6	0.6
MM01	11.4	60.5	53.3	1.3	23.1	6.7
PH01	17.6	32.9	0.0	2.5	8.8	0.0
PH02	22.4	49.3	15.1	3.7	13.6	3.5
KR01	0.0	18.2	33.2	0.0	3.4	6.0
RU01	1.4	21.5	13.4	0.2	4.7	3.5
TH01	22.4	29.3	13.4	3.7	7.4	2.3
TH02	7.7	23.8	13.2	1.1	5.2	2.3
TH04	15.3	41.7	31.2	2.5	10.9	6.2
TH05	27.1	49.4	0.7	3.9	18.5	0.1
TH06	3.9	16.4	9.7	0.6	3.5	1.8
VN01	0.0	15.0	5.3	0.0	3.5	0.8
VN02	11.5	25.2	19.3	1.6	6.5	2.7


: Data Flagged E

: Data Flagged X

### 3.3.2 Comparison of Laboratories' Performance (by Analyte)

The overview of the results is shown in the following figures and tables for each analyte ( $SO_4^{2-}$ ,  $Cl^-$  and  $NH_4^+$ ). The obtained values from each laboratory were evaluated for their deviations. The number of flagged data is shown in Table 3.4 and 3.6 for each analyte.

### SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> (Sulfate)



**Figure 3.3 Deviation for SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>**

Deviation (%) = (Determined value - Prepared value) / Prepared value × 100 (%)

**Table 3.10.1 Analytical method of SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>**

*Analytical Method*


Ion Chromatography      24/24

**Table 3.10.2 Flagged data of SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>**

<i>Flagged Data</i>	Flag E	Flag X	Flagged (%)
Sample No.131d	7	2	37.5
Sample No.132d	2	0	8.3

All laboratories used Ion Chromatography for the determination of SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>. E flag appeared at 7 laboratories and X flag appeared at 2 laboratories for Sample No.131d. E flag appeared at 2 laboratories for Sample No.132d. Two laboratories were flagged E or X for both samples.

### Cl<sup>-</sup> (Chloride)



**Figure 3.4 Deviation for Cl<sup>-</sup>**

**Table 3.11.1 Analytical method of Cl<sup>-</sup>**

*Analytical Method*


Ion Chromatography	24/24
--------------------	-------

**Table 3.11.2 Flagged data of Cl<sup>-</sup>**

<i>Flagged Data</i>	Flag E	Flag X	Flagged (%)
Sample No.131d	12	2	58.3
Sample No.132d	7	0	29.2

As with the analysis of Cl<sup>-</sup>, all laboratories used Ion Chromatography for the determination of Cl<sup>-</sup>. E flag appeared at 12 laboratories and X flag appeared at 2 laboratories for Sample No.131d. E flag appeared at 7 laboratories for Sample No. 132d. Six laboratories were flagged E or X for both samples.

### NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (Ammonium)



**Figure 3.5 Deviation for NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>**

**Table 3.12.1 Analytical method of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>**

*Analytical Method*

Ion Chromatography	23/24
Spectrophotometry (Indophenol Blue)	1/24

**Table 3.12.2 Flagged data of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>**

<i>Flagged Data</i>	Flag E	Flag X	Flagged (%)
Sample No.131d	3	5	33.3
Sample No.132d	3	2	20.8

Twenty three laboratories used Ion Chromatography and one laboratory used Spectrophotometry (Indophenol Blue) for the determination of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>. E flag appeared at 3 laboratories and X flag appeared at 5 laboratories for Sample No.131d. E flag appeared at 3 laboratories and X flag appeared at 2 laboratories for Sample No. 132d. Four laboratories were flagged E or X for both samples.

### 3.3.3 Information on Laboratories

#### Methodologies used

As shown in Table 3.13, most participating laboratories used the recommended methods of EANET and all laboratories used Ion Chromatography for the determination of anions. On the other hand, for the determination of  $\text{NH}_4^+$ , twenty-three laboratories used ion chromatography and one laboratory used Spectrophotometry (Indophenol Blue) .

**Table 3.13 Analytical methods used for sample analysis**

Lab. Code	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}, \text{Cl}^-$	$\text{NH}_4^+$
KH01		Ion Chromatography
ID01		Ion Chromatography
ID03		Ion Chromatography
JP01		Ion Chromatography
JP02		Ion Chromatography
JP03		Ion Chromatography
JP04		Ion Chromatography
JP05		Ion Chromatography
JP08		Ion Chromatography
JP09		Ion Chromatography
JP10		Ion Chromatography
MY01		Ion Chromatography
MN01		Ion Chromatography
MM01		Ion Chromatography
PH01		Ion Chromatography
PH02	Ion Chromatography	Spectrophotometry (Indophenol Blue)
KR01		Ion Chromatography
RU01		Ion Chromatography
TH01		Ion Chromatography
TH02		Ion Chromatography
TH04		Ion Chromatography
TH05		Ion Chromatography
TH06		Ion Chromatography
VN01		Ion Chromatography
VN02		Ion Chromatography

### **Years of staff experience**

Years of staff experience are summarized in Table 3.14. Data in light gray color cells indicate that there is a flag for Sample No.131d or 132d. Data in dark gray color cells indicate flagged data in both Sample No.131d and No.132d.

**Table 3.14 Years of staff experience (unit: year)**


Lab. Code	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	Cl <sup>-</sup>	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>
KH01	4	4	4
ID01	12	12	12
ID03	3	3	3
JP01	29	29	29
JP02	9	9	9
JP03	2	2	2
JP04	6	6	6
JP05	1	1	1
JP08	3	3	3
JP09	2	2	2
JP10	2	2	2
MY01	3	3	7
MM01	2	2	2
PH01	10	10	10
PH02	6	6	6
KR01	10	10	10
RU01	15	34	15
TH01	4	4	4
TH02	10	10	10
TH04	2	2	2
TH05	10	10	10
TH06	8	8	8
VN01	20	20	20
VN02	9	9	9

: One datum (either sample) is flagged.

: Two data (both samples) are flagged.

### **Flagged Data**

In the results of Sample No.131d and 132d, the total number of flagged data was 45 (E: 34, X: 11) in the whole values (144). The number of flagged data in each laboratory is shown in Figure 3.6. Five laboratories met DQOs (20.8%).



**Figure 3.6 Number of flagged data and laboratories**

### **Calibration standard solution**

Table 3.15 shows the lowest and highest concentrations of their calibration standard solutions ( $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ,  $\text{Cl}^-$ ,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ) used in each laboratory, and also shows their concentrations of the prepared values in  $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ . The concentrations of the standard solutions in some laboratories were not in the appropriate range. A gray highlighted value in Table 3.15 indicates that the concentration value of standard solution is lower than that of the prepared value. In contrast, some laboratories used extremely high concentration standards comparing with samples concentrations.

Each concentration of the prepared values was expected within the range of both concentrations of lowest and highest standard solutions. However, some laboratories used inappropriate solution ranges. If the concentrations of their obtained values were not in the range of the calibration standard, laboratories should have analyzed again with the appropriate concentration range of standard solution.

**Table 3.15 Ranges of the calibration standard solution in each laboratory**

Lab Code.	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (μmol L <sup>-1</sup> )		Cl <sup>-</sup> (μmol L <sup>-1</sup> )		NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> (μmol L <sup>-1</sup> )	
	Lowest	Highest	Lowest	Highest	Lowest	Highest
KH01	0.0	52.0	0.0	141	0.0	277
ID01	0.0	52.1	0.0	141	0.0	111
ID03	0.0	104	0.0	113	0.0	111
JP01	0.0	105	0.0	284	0.0	277
JP02	0.0	104	0.0	282	0.0	133
JP03	0.0	104	0.0	56.4	0.0	111
JP04	0.0	104	0.0	141	0.0	277
JP05	0.0	104	0.0	141	0.0	277
JP08	0.0	104	0.0	282	0.0	277
JP09	0.6	62.5	0.9	169	0.0	55.4
JP10	0.0	52.1	0.0	28.2	0.0	111
MY01	0.0	62.5	0.0	169	0.0	167
MM01	0.0	78.0	0.0	42.8	0.0	162
PH01	0.0	52.1	0.0	141	0.0	1109
PH02	0.0	104	0.0	282	0.0	111
KR01	0.0	104	0.0	282	0.0	554
RU01	0.0	46.1	0.0	10.9	0.0	111
TH01	0.0	104	0.0	282	0.0	166
TH02	0.2	62.5	0.6	169	1.1	139
TH04	0.0	41.8	0.0	113	0.0	111
TH05	0.0	41.6	0.0	113	0.0	222
TH06	0.0	72.9	0.0	198	0.0	166
VN01	0.0	104	0.0	141	0.0	277
VN02	0.0	83.3	0.0	113	0.0	111
*Sample No. 131d	5.21		3.67		16.6	
*Sample No. 132d	36.4		18.3		111	

Gray Cell : The measured value was out of the calibration range.

Lowest and Highest : lowest/highest concentrations in the calibration standard solutions.

\*Sample concentration (μmol L<sup>-1</sup>) = Prepared value (μg) / Solvent (mL) / MW

MW: molecular weight

### 3.4 Comparison with past surveys

This Inter-laboratory Comparison on dry deposition has been implemented since 2005. The results showing the percentages of flagged data and percentages of data that were satisfied the DQOs were shown in Figure 3.7.




Figure 3.7 Comparison of DQOs' results for the past years

The comparison for each analyte in Inter-laboratory Comparison on dry deposition year-by-year is shown in Figure 3.8.




Figure 3.8 Comparison for each parameter in inter-laboratory comparison project

## **References**

- EANET (2000a). *Guidelines for Acid Deposition Monitoring in East Asia*. Acid Deposition and Oxidant Research Center, Niigata, Japan, 25p.
- EANET (2010). *Technical Manual for Wet Deposition Monitoring in East Asia-2010*. Asia Center for Air Pollution Research, Niigata, Japan, 113p.



## **4. 15th INTER-LABORATORY COMPARISON PROJECT ON SOIL**

### **4.1 Introduction**

The Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on Soil started in 1999 as one of the activities within the QA/QC program on Soil and Vegetation Monitoring. The inter-laboratory precision will be clarified as well as the within-laboratory and repeatability precision in the project to improve the analytical quality of the EANET laboratories. Possible factors affecting precisions have been discussed through the previous projects.

Soil analysis has complicated procedures and steps in comparison with environment water. Steps in the procedures of soil analysis may be related to the variation among laboratories; e.g. extraction, instrumental analysis and/or titration. Results of the first three projects from 1999 to 2001 suggested that instrumental analysis have relatively large effect on the total precision of soil analysis, and the following analytical conditions could affect results:

- Addition of La or Sr solution for AAS analysis of Ex-Ca
- Preparation method of standard solution
- Instrument for Ex-K and Na analysis

The participating laboratories shared the information on these possible factors to improve the precision.

In the 15th project, Network Center (NC) provided two soil samples (No.131s and No.132s) to laboratories to improve the inter-laboratory precision further more by standardization of methods. In this report, the data from participating laboratories were evaluated statistically according to the QA/QC program for soil monitoring. The results may contribute to the assessment of the inter-laboratory variation in soil monitoring and provide useful information to improve precision of soil analysis on EANET.

## 4.2 Procedures

### 4.2.1 Participating Laboratories

Fourteen laboratories of 8 countries participated in the 15th project. The results from 12 laboratories of those have been submitted to the network center and analyzed statistically. Names of the participating laboratories are listed in Table 1.1.

### 4.2.2 Description of Samples

The characteristics of the soil samples were as follows:

**Sample No.131s: Dydstric Cambisols**

**Sample No.132s: Eutric Fluvisols**

Soils for Sample No.131s and No.132s were collected in a secondary forest including bamboo bush and *C. japonica* plantation, respectively, in Osaka Prefecture, Japan. Both soils were collected from B-horizon composed chiefly of soil minerals. The soils were air-dried, sieved to separate the fine earth fraction (< 2 mm) and mixed well by the following procedures; 1) the bulk sample was divided into two parts, 2) each part was mixed well, 3) the parts were joined and mixed well and 4) the sample was divided again. This procedure was repeated 15 times to ensure a completely homogeneous bulk sample. Finally, portions of 400 - 500 g were weighed out, packed in 500 ml plastic bottles, and then, sterilized using radioisotope (20kGy) for distributing (exporting) to the participating countries.

### 4.2.3 Parameters Analyzed

All the participating laboratories were expected to measure the parameters shown in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1 Parameters to be measured**

Parameters	Unit	No.131s and 132s
a) Moisture Content	wt %	M
b) pH (H <sub>2</sub> O)		M
c) pH (KCl)		M
d) Exchangeable Ca <sup>2+</sup>	cmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	M
e) Exchangeable Mg <sup>2+</sup>	cmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	M
f) Exchangeable K <sup>+</sup>	cmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	M
g) Exchangeable Na <sup>+</sup>	cmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	M
h) Exchangeable acidity	cmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	M
i) Exchangeable Al <sup>3+</sup>	cmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	M
j) Exchangeable H <sup>+</sup>	cmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	M

M: Mandatory items

“Exchangeable” were abbreviated to “Ex-“ in this report; e.g. Ex-Ca, Ex-Mg, etc.

#### **4.2.4 Analytical Methodologies**

All the procedures for chemical analysis were carried out basically according to the “Technical Manual for Soil and Vegetation Monitoring in East Asia” (EANET, 2000). In the respective laboratories, all the parameters were analyzed three times under the same conditions (as analyst, time, and instrument). Then, under within-laboratory-reproducibility condition (i.e. different analyst, time, and instrument), all the analytical procedures should be repeated twice.

##### **4.2.4.1 Standardization of methods**

All the procedures for chemical analysis should be carried out basically according to the “Technical Documents for Soil and Vegetation Monitoring in East Asia (March 2000, Adopted at: The Second Interim Scientific Advisory Group Meeting of Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia)”. Additionally, the following analytical procedures were standardized;

- (1) **Atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS)** method should be used basically for analysis of Ex-Ca, Mg, K and Na. (If it is impossible to use AAS, Flame (emission) photometry method is allowable for Ex-K and Na).
- (2) **Titration method** should be used for analysis of Ex-acidity, Al and H.
- (3) **Calibration curve method** should be used for determination of Ex-Ca, Mg, K and Na.
- (4) The Samples should be extracted and diluted with **1M CH<sub>3</sub>COONH<sub>4</sub> (pH 7.0)** for analysis of Ex-Ca, Mg, K and Na. Then, 1M CH<sub>3</sub>COONH<sub>4</sub> (pH 7.0) solution should be used to prepare each standard solution as the solvent.
- (5) **Sr** should be added to the samples and each standard solution to eliminate the interference of the sample for analysis of Ex-Ca and Mg. These are to be the same concentration Sr. (If Sr cannot be obtained, La is allowable.)

##### **4.2.4.2 Procedures for Ex-base cations**

- (1) Extract from air-dry sample with 1M CH<sub>3</sub>COONH<sub>4</sub> (pH 7.0) solution.
- (2) Pipette an appropriate aliquot of the soil extract into volumetric flask and add 100g-Sr/L solution to be 1000mg-Sr/L as final concentration Sr. (SrCl<sub>2</sub> solution eliminates the interference of the sample.) And then make to volume with 1M CH<sub>3</sub>COONH<sub>4</sub> (pH 7.0). This solution is named “Prepared sample”.
- (3) Prepare three “prepared samples”.
- (4) Prepare each standard solution with diluting 1M CH<sub>3</sub>COONH<sub>4</sub> (pH 7.0) solution.
- (5) Add 100g-Sr/L solution to each standard solution to be the same concentration SrCl<sub>2</sub> as the sample.
- (6) Analyze the standard solution and the prepared samples by AAS.
- (7) Store the calibration curves certainly and report them together with reporting formats.

(8) **Repeat the procedure 1) - 7) twice.**

(9) Calculation of content in the soil

Content in the soil could be calculated by the following formulas:

$$\text{Ex-Ca (cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ soil)} = [A * B * V * \text{mcf}] / [10 * 20.04 * S]$$

$$\text{Ex-Mg (cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ soil)} = [A * B * V * \text{mcf}] / [10 * 12.15 * S]$$

$$\text{Ex-K (cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ soil)} = [A * B * V * \text{mcf}] / [10 * 39.10 * S]$$

$$\text{Ex-Na (cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ soil)} = [A * B * V * \text{mcf}] / [10 * 23.00 * S]$$

Where

$A$  = Measurement values of prepared (diluted) samples (mg/L)

$B$  = Dilution ratio ( $B = 2$ , if 25mL sample was diluted to 50 mL for making prepared sample.)

$\text{mcf}$  = Moisture correction factor (Measured value)

$S$  = Weight of air-dry sample (g)

$V$  = Volume of extract (mL)

#### **4.2.4.3 Procedures for Ex-acidity**

(1) Extraction and titration would be carried out according to the “Technical Documents for Soil and Vegetation Monitoring in East Asia” basically.

(2) Prepare three samples. Analyze each sample and at least one blank.

(3) Repeat the procedure twice

(4) Calculation of content in the soil

Content in the soil could be calculated by the following formulas:

$$\text{Ex-acidity (cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ soil)} = [(A_{\text{NaOH}} - bl_{\text{NaOH}}) * M_{\text{NaOH}} * c * 100 * \text{mcf}] / S$$

$$\text{Ex-Al (cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ soil)} = [(A_{\text{HCl}} - bl_{\text{HCl}}) * M_{\text{HCl}} * c * 100 * \text{mcf}] / S$$

$$\text{Ex-H (cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ soil)} = [(A_{\text{NaOH}} - bl_{\text{NaOH}}) * M_{\text{NaOH}} - (A_{\text{HCl}} - bl_{\text{HCl}}) * M_{\text{HCl}}] * c * 100 * \text{mcf} / S$$

Where

$A_{\text{NaOH}}$  = Titration volume of 0.025 M NaOH solution needed for percolate (mL)

$A_{\text{HCl}}$  = Titration volume of 0.02 M HCl solution needed for percolate (mL)

$bl_{\text{NaOH}}$  = Titration volume of 0.025M NaOH solution needed for blank (mL)

$bl_{\text{HCl}}$  = Titration volume of 0.02M HCl solution needed for blank (mL)

$M_{\text{NaOH}}$  = Molarity of NaOH solution (mol/L)

$M_{\text{HCl}}$  = Molarity of HCl solution (mol/L)

$S$  = Weight of air-dry sample (g)

$c$  = Aliquot factor ( $c = 2$ , if 50mL percolate of 100mL is used.)

#### **4.2.4.4 Reporting**

(1) Preparation of the report

Digital formats (Microsoft Excel) were provided to the participating laboratories. Chemical

properties of soil sample were calculated automatically by the formula written in the formats.

## (2) Submission of the report

Entered data in digital formats and other information (e.g. calibration curve) were submitted by E-mail.

### **4.2.4.5 Data Checking Procedures**

We statistically evaluated the data according to the following procedures described in the “Technical Manual for Soil and Vegetation Monitoring in East Asia” (2<sup>nd</sup> ISAG, 2000). Dataset with one decimal place for pH and two decimal places for Ex-cations concentrations and Ex-acidity were used for the statistical analysis.

#### 1) General description of the data variability

Mean, median, variance and coefficient variation (CV) were calculated for entire dataset in inter-laboratory project. Box-and-whisker plots were also used for checking the data variability and detecting outliers in the dataset, visually.

#### 2) Detection of outliers to prepare the verified dataset

Evenness of within-laboratory precision (variation in each laboratory) and inter-laboratory precision (variation between 12 laboratories) were verified by Cochran and Grubbs methods, respectively. We also computed “verified” mean, median and other statistical summary from verified datasets. In inter-laboratory comparison project on soil, “verified” mean will be a good reference to assess the analyzed value of each laboratory.

#### 3) Analysis of variance

Total variation among laboratories includes within-laboratory and inter-laboratory variations. As described in the following equation, Total sum of square ( $S_T$ ) is consisted of Sum of square inter-laboratories ( $S_R$ ), Sum of square within-laboratory ( $S_{RW}$ ) and Sum of square repeatability ( $S_r$ ).

$$S_T = S_R + S_{RW} + S_r$$

Based on the above equation, inter-laboratories variance, within-laboratory-reproducibility variance, and repeatability variance were calculated, and then the precision was estimated.

#### 4) Calculation of permissible tolerance

Permissible tolerances were calculated based on the above precision; 1) repeatability limit, 2) within-laboratory reproducibility limit and 3) inter-laboratory reproducibility limit. Permissible tolerances are meaningful to determine “5% significant difference” in actual monitoring data. For instance, significantly temporal changes in the same site or significant difference between two laboratories would be indicated if those changes or the difference were more than “within-laboratory reproducibility limit” or “inter-laboratory reproducibility limit”.

## 4.3 Results

### 4.3.1 General description of the data variability

The statistical summary was shown in Table 4.2. On the 15th inter-laboratory project, pH, cation exchangeable capacity and exchangeable acidity were clearly different between both samples, respectively. pH, exchangeable Ca, Mg, K and Na were higher in No.131s than in No.132s, whereas exchangeable acidity, Al and H were lower in No.131s than in No.132s. We observed the large variations in the analyzed data (CVs) of Ex-Ca, Na, Al and H in both samples (e.g. 166% and 144% in Ex-Ca of No.131s and No.132ss, respectively). Meanwhile, in both samples, CVs were enough small for pH (<5%) and Ex-K (<15%).


**Table 4.2 Statistical summary**

Statistics	pH(H <sub>2</sub> O)	pH(KCl)	Ex-Ca	Ex-Mg	Ex-K	Ex-Na	Ex-acidity	Ex-Al	Ex-H
	cmol kg <sup>-1</sup>								
<b>No. 131s</b>									
Number of Laboratories	12	12	10	10	10	10	12	12	12
Total average	5.5	4.2	4.4	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.2
Median	5.5	4.1	2.2	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.2
Maximum	6.1	4.8	24.9	0.9	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.4
Minimum	5.3	4.0	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.1
Standard deviation	0.2	0.2	7.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
CV (%) <sup>*1</sup>	3.2	5.5	165.8	36.9	12.8	77.2	14.2	80.9	52.1
<b>No. 132s</b>									
Number of Laboratories	12	12	10	10	10	10	12	12	12
Total average	4.2	3.6	0.31	0.17	0.12	0.04	9.81	8.22	1.62
Median	4.1	3.5	0.04	0.13	0.12	0.04	9.60	8.19	1.24
Maximum	5.1	4.2	0.99	0.34	0.15	0.08	12.53	12.10	6.88
Minimum	4.1	3.4	0.00	0.03	0.09	0.02	8.74	3.51	0.43
Standard deviation	0.3	0.2	0.44	0.10	0.02	0.02	1.04	1.94	1.69
CV (%) <sup>*1</sup>	7.1	5.5	143.8	60.1	15	52	10.6	23.6	104

Note: \*1. CV, Coefficient of variance (%) = (standard deviation/average)\*100

We also have an overview of the data by box-and-whisker plot (Figure 4.1) of No.131s and 132ss analyzed by 12 laboratories. Box-and-whisker plot provides the five-number summaries: lower quartile, median and upper quartile shown by a box and a bold line, and lowest and highest value within the range between the lower quartile minus 1.5 times the inter-quartile range and the upper quartile plus 1.5 times the inter-quartile range drawn by error bar. In addition, the values outside the error bar are shown as outliers, that is, non-parametrical outliers.

The plots showed several “non-parametrical” outliers in each property. Those outliers might be due to wrong calculation, procedure, irregular contamination, and so on because the values were 5-20 times higher or lower than average. Therefore, in following section, we removed these outliers by parametrically statistical method to calculate the good reference more close to true value.



**Figure 4.1 Data variability of No.131s and No.132s**

**Table 4.3 Data verification by Cochran-Grubbs methods**

**No.131s**

Country	Lab.	Repeat analysis	pH(H <sub>2</sub> O)	pH(KCl)	Ex-Ca	Ex-Mg	Ex-K	Ex-Na	Ex-acidity	Ex-Al	Ex-H
			cmol kg <sup>-1</sup>								
China	CN01	1st	5.6	4.1	0.17	0.13	0.17	0.015	0.38	0.00	0.38
		2nd	5.6	4.1	0.17	0.13	0.18	0.016	0.38	0.00	0.38
	CN02	1st	5.5	4.1	2.3	0.59	0.20 c	0.045 c	0.35	0.26	0.09
		2nd	5.5	4.1	2.3	0.59	0.19 c	0.031 c	0.37	0.27	0.10
	CN03	1st	5.6	4.3 g	2.1	0.48	0.20	0.032	0.40	0.20	0.20
		2nd	5.6	4.3 g	2.1	0.49	0.20	0.033	0.40	0.20	0.20
	CN04	1st	5.5	4.1	2.2	0.51	0.19	0.010	0.37	0.00	0.37
		2nd	5.5	4.1	2.2	0.51	0.19	0.009	0.39	0.00	0.39
Indonesia	ID01	1st	5.5	4.0	2.3	0.55	0.21	0.018	0.45	0.28	0.17
		2nd	5.4	4.0	2.3	0.54	0.21	0.018	0.45	0.28	0.17
Mongolia	MN01	1st	6.1 g	4.8 g					0.40	0.0	0.40
		2nd	6.1 g	4.8 g					0.40	0.0	0.40
Russia	RU01	1st	5.5	4.1	25 c	0.60	0.19	0.030 c	0.34	0.1	0.20
		2nd	5.5	4.1	25 c	0.61	0.19	0.037 c	0.39	0.1	0.20
Thailand	TH01	1st	5.6 c	4.0	2.2	0.35 c	0.16 c	0.010	0.45	0.4	0.11 c
		2nd	5.5 c	4.0	2.1	0.33 c	0.18 c	0.008	0.42	0.4	0.02 c
Vietnam	VN01	1st	5.5	4.1	2.6	0.58	0.19	0.022	0.40	0.3	0.11
		2nd	5.5	4.1	2.6	0.58	0.19	0.022	0.40	0.3	0.11
	VN02	1st	5.5	4.0					0.54	0.2	0.34
		2nd	5.5	4.0					0.54	0.2	0.34
	VN03	1st	5.3 g	4.1	4.6	0.89	0.26 g	0.090 g	0.38	0.1	0.19
		2nd	5.3 g	4.1	4.7	0.88	0.26 g	0.090 g	0.37	0.1	0.17
	VN04	1st	5.5	4.0	0.66	0.57	0.21	0.041	0.52	0.1	0.34 c
		2nd	5.5	4.1	0.67	0.57	0.21	0.041	0.52	0.1	0.40 c

Note; The outliers judged by Cochran and Grubbs methods were marked with c and g, respectively.

**No.132s**

Country	Lab.	Repeat analysis	pH(H <sub>2</sub> O)	pH(KCl)	Ex-Ca	Ex-Mg	Ex-K	Ex-Na	Ex-acidity	Ex-Al	Ex-H
			cmol kg <sup>-1</sup>								
China	CN01	1st	4.2	3.5	0.02	0.03	0.09	0.02 g	9.9	3.6	6.8 g
		2nd	4.2	3.5	0.02	0.03	0.09	0.02 g	9.9	3.4	7.0 g
	CN02	1st	4.2	3.6	0.03	0.12	0.11	0.04	9.0	8.0	0.95
		2nd	4.2	3.6	0.04	0.12	0.11	0.05	8.9	8.0	0.90
	CN03	1st	4.1	3.6	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.08	9.3	8.2	1.1
		2nd	4.1	3.6	0.09	0.10	0.14	0.08	9.3	8.2	1.1
	CN04	1st	4.1	3.5	0.03	0.11	0.12	0.02	8.9	7.2	1.7
		2nd	4.1	3.5	0.03	0.11	0.12	0.02	8.9	7.1	1.8
Indonesia	ID01	1st	4.1	3.4	0.05	0.13	0.13	0.03	9.3	8.1	1.1
		2nd	4.1	3.4	0.05	0.13	0.13	0.03	9.3	8.2	1.1
Mongolia	MN01	1st	5.1 g	4.2 g					13 g	12	0.43
		2nd	5.1 g	4.2 g					13 g	12	0.43
Russia	RU01	1st	4.2	3.5	0.85	0.21 c	0.14	0.06	11	9.2	1.5
		2nd	4.2	3.5	0.90	0.20 c	0.13	0.07	11	9.2	1.4
Thailand	TH01	1st	4.1	3.5	0.83 c	0.25 c	0.11 c	0.01	10	9.4 c	1.4 c
		2nd	4.1	3.5	1.13 c	0.41 c	0.15 c	0.02	10	9.3 c	1.2 c
Vietnam	VN01	1st	4.2	3.6	0.00	0.13	0.11	0.03	8.7	7.5	1.2
		2nd	4.2	3.6	0.00	0.13	0.11	0.03	8.8	7.5	1.3
	VN02	1st	4.1	3.4					10	8.7	1.3
		2nd	4.1	3.4					10	8.6	1.3
	VN03	1st	4.1	3.5	0.99	0.34	0.15	0.06	9.4 c	8.2	0.79
		2nd	4.1	3.5	0.99	0.34	0.15	0.06	9.2 c	8.2	0.78
	VN04	1st	4.1	3.5	0.01	0.15	0.10	0.05	10	8.6	1.2
		2nd	4.1	3.5	0.00	0.16	0.10	0.05	10	8.6	1.2

Note; The outliers judged by Cochran and Grubbs methods were marked with c and g, respectively.

### 4.3.2 Detection of outliers

Detection of outliers by Cochran-Grubbs methods were shown in Table 4.3. The laboratory which has a large difference in repeat analyses was judged as outlier by Cochran method (examination of the evenness of within-laboratory precision); e.g. “TH01” in Ex-Mg, “VN04” in Ex-H of No.131s. Then, the rest of data were tested by Grubbs method (examination of the average value of each laboratory). In this method, the laboratory which has remarkably large or small average was judged as outliers. Cochran-Grubbs method detected the several outliers for each parameter. As a result of removing outliers, the “verified” dataset consisting of 9-11 laboratories in pH, 9-11 laboratories in base cations and 10-12 laboratories in acid cations and exchangeable acidity were used for further analysis in the following section.

### 4.3.3 Statistical summary for verified data

The statistical summary for verified datasets in No.131s and No.132s were shown in Table 4.4. Although chemical properties in both soils were not largely changed by verification, the data variability of exchangeable acidity decreased from entire dataset. The variation included an error produced by same person (repetition), different person (within-laboratory) or different laboratories (inter-laboratory). We separated this variation in next section to detect the source of it.

**Table 4.4 Statistical summary of the “verified” dataset<sup>\*2</sup>**

Statistics	pH(H <sub>2</sub> O)	pH(KCl)	Ex-Ca	Ex-Mg	Ex-K	Ex-Na	Ex-acidity	Ex-Al	Ex-H
	cmol kg <sup>-1</sup>								
<b>No. 131s</b>									
Number of Laboratories	9	10	9	9	7	7	12	12	10
Total average	5.5	4.1	2.13	0.55	0.19	0.02	0.42	0.16	0.25
Median	5.5	4.1	2.18	0.57	0.19	0.02	0.40	0.17	0.20
Maximum	5.6	4.1	4.65	0.89	0.21	0.04	0.54	0.40	0.40
Minimum	5.5	4.0	0.17	0.13	0.18	0.01	0.36	0.00	0.09
Standard deviation	0.0	0.0	1.26	0.19	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.13	0.12
CV (%) <sup>*1</sup>	0.8	1.2	59.1	35.5	6.2	56.8	14.2	80.9	47.9
<b>No. 132s</b>									
Number of Laboratories	11	11	9	8	9	9	10	11	10
Total average	4.1	3.5	0.23	0.14	0.12	0.04	9.58	8.12	1.13
Median	4.1	3.5	0.04	0.12	0.12	0.05	9.58	8.17	1.17
Maximum	4.2	3.6	0.99	0.34	0.15	0.08	10.66	12.10	1.75
Minimum	4.1	3.4	0.00	0.03	0.09	0.02	8.74	3.51	0.43
Standard deviation	0.1	0.1	0.40	0.09	0.02	0.02	0.65	2.00	0.36
CV (%) <sup>*1</sup>	1.3	1.9	170.4	63.8	15.9	48.5	6.8	24.7	32.1

Note: \*1. CV, Coefficient of variance (%) = (standard deviation/average)\*100, \*2.dataset is verified removing outliers judged by Cochran-Grubbs methods.

#### **4.3.4 Analysis of variance for verified data**

“Repeatability-precision”, “within-laboratory-precision” and “inter-laboratories-precision” were discussed using analysis of variance model (ANOVA) to detect the source of data variability (Table 4.5).

##### **1) Repeatability-precision**

Repeatability-precision was enough high for all properties. The CVs were less than 0.5% in pH and about 10% in exchangeable base cations. Meanwhile, the CVs of Ex-Al and H in No. 131s and Ex-Ca in No.132s were relatively high because of very low concentration. The result suggests that triplicate analyses were carried out under the same condition. In general, the participating laboratories could analyze the parameters with their own standard procedures and stable instruments.

##### **2) Within-laboratory precision**

CVs in within-laboratory precision for almost all parameters were smaller than CVs in repeatability precision. It was suggested that the average of triplicate analyses under the repeatability condition could be representative value for the analysis in a laboratory. We assumed that participating laboratories could analyze the parameters with their own standard procedures.

##### **3) Inter-laboratories precision**

The CVs in the inter-laboratories precision were less than 2% in pH ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) and pH (KCl). However, the CVs of exchangeable bases and acidity ranged 6 to 170%. We discussed the possible factor of the relatively high CVs in inter-laboratory precision, in the following section.

##### **4) Calculation of permissible tolerance**

The repeatability limit and within-laboratory reproducibility limit might be enough small to use as a reference value for the repeat analysis on the instrumental analysis in the respective laboratories. For assessment of temporal pH change of monitoring data at each site, participating laboratories can detect the significant change more than 0.1 pH units. Meanwhile, the result about reproducibility limit (inter-laboratories reproducibility limit) suggested that participating laboratories can detect the significant difference between the monitoring sites if the differences are more than about 0.1-0.2 for pH, 1.1– 3.5  $\text{cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1}$  in Ex-Ca, 0.2 – 0.5  $\text{cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1}$  in Ex-Mg and 0.3 – 5.6  $\text{cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1}$  in Ex-Al and H.

**Table 4.5 Analysis of variance for “verified” dataset**

Statistics	No. 131s								
	pH(H <sub>2</sub> O)	pH(KCl)	Ex-Ca	Ex-Mg	Ex-K	Ex-Na	Ex-acidity	Ex-Al	Ex-H
Number of Laboratories	9	10	9	9	7	7	12	12	10
Number of Data	54	60	54	54	42	42	72	72	60
Total average	5.5	4.1	2.1	0.55	0.19	0.02	0.42	0.16	0.25
Inter-laboratories variance ( $V_R = S_R/\phi_R$ )	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Within-laboratory variance ( $V_{RW} = S_{RW}/\phi_{RW}$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Repeatability variance ( $V_t = S_t/\phi_t$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Laboratory component of variance ( $s_b^2 = (V_R - V_{RW})/(2*3)$ )	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Within-laboratory component of variance ( $s_c^2 = (V_{RW} - V_t)/3$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Repeatability component of variance ( $s_r^2 = V_t$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Inter-laboratories standard deviation ( $S_R = \text{SQRT}(s_r^2/(2*3) + s_c^2/2 + s_b^2)$ )	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Within-laboratory standard deviation ( $S_{RW} = \text{SQRT}(s_r^2/3 + s_c^2)$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Repeatability standard deviation ( $S_t = \text{SQRT}(s_r^2)$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Inter-laboratories precision CV (%)	0.8	1.2	59	36	6.2	57	14	81	48
Within-laboratory precision CV (%)	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.6	1.2	2.8	3.2	1.7	2.4
Repeatability precision CV (%)	0.2	0.3	2.0	2.2	2.9	10	5.2	23	10
Reproducibility limit ( $R = D(2, 0.95)*S_R$ )	0.1	0.1	3.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.3
Within-laboratory-reproducibility limit ( $R_w = D(2, 0.95)*S_{RW}$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Repeatability limit ( $r = D(3, 0.95)*S_t$ )	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Statistics	No. 132s								
	pH(H <sub>2</sub> O)	pH(KCl)	Ex-Ca	Ex-Mg	Ex-K	Ex-Na	Ex-acidity	Ex-Al	Ex-H
Number of Laboratories	11	11	9	8	9	9	10	11	10
Number of Data	66	66	54	48	54	54	60	66	60
Total average	4.1	3.5	0.23	0.14	0.12	0.04	9.6	8.1	1.1
Inter-laboratories variance ( $V_R = S_R/\phi_R$ )	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	24	0.8
Within-laboratory variance ( $V_{RW} = S_{RW}/\phi_{RW}$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Repeatability variance ( $V_t = S_t/\phi_t$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Laboratory component of variance ( $s_b^2 = (V_R - V_{RW})/(2*3)$ )	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	4.0	0.1
Within-laboratory component of variance ( $s_c^2 = (V_{RW} - V_t)/3$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Repeatability component of variance ( $s_r^2 = V_t$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Inter-laboratories standard deviation ( $S_R = \text{SQRT}(s_r^2/(2*3) + s_c^2/2 + s_b^2)$ )	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.7	2.0	0.4
Within-laboratory standard deviation ( $S_{RW} = \text{SQRT}(s_r^2/3 + s_c^2)$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Repeatability standard deviation ( $S_t = \text{SQRT}(s_r^2)$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Inter-laboratories precision CV (%)	1.3	1.9	170	64	16	48	6.8	25	32
Within-laboratory precision CV (%)	0.2	0.4	4.8	0.9	1.5	5.6	0.3	0.6	2.4
Repeatability precision CV (%)	0.3	0.3	10	4.2	2.9	8.9	0.9	1.1	4.6
Reproducibility limit ( $R = D(2, 0.95)*S_R$ )	0.2	0.2	1.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	1.8	5.6	1.0
Within-laboratory-reproducibility limit ( $R_w = D(2, 0.95)*S_{RW}$ )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Repeatability limit ( $r = D(3, 0.95)*S_t$ )	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2

### 4.3.5 Inter-laboratory variations in each parameter

To assess the precision in each laboratories and properties, we showed scatter plots between No.131s and No.132s with its “verified” mean indicated by solid line. As a guide for comparison, 20% of verified mean is added by dashed lines, while 0.2 units from the average are used for pH. The plot did not include extreme outliers for eye-friendly.

### **1) pH**


Linear correlation between No.131s and No.132s indicated the systematic errors of the inter-laboratory variation in pH (Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.3). The systematic error might be caused by the condition of pure water, standard solution or glass electrode. In addition, measuring time to the stabilization of value may lead to the variation because a carbon dioxide pressure, leakage of KCl solution from the electrode or settling the clay particles in the sample tube change the ion balance in soil suspension. Meanwhile, most laboratories were included within the range of 0.2 pH unit for No.131s and No.132s.

### **2) Base cations**


The plots of exchangeable base cations (Figure 4.4 to 4.7) also suggested the large random errors of the inter-laboratory variation. The error might be caused by the contamination, quality of ammonium acetate (extraction liquid), and calculation error and so on. In the analysis of base cations, higher concentration or higher pH of extraction liquid may result in an increase of the base cations in the solution. To prepare appropriate standard solution from low to high concentrations is also important factor for reducing the error. Extraction liquid should be used for standard solution to harmonize the background with that of the samples. Particularly, no samples were included in the range of 20% of verified mean for Ex-Ca in No. 132s. This might be due to the very low concentration of the sample (*ca.* 0.2 cmol<sub>c</sub> kg<sup>-1</sup>).

### **3) Acidity**


The plots of Ex-acidity, Ex-Al and Ex-H indicated random error of inter-laboratory variation (Figure 4.8 to 4.10). The error might be derived from the manipulation of titration by each analyst, which is easily affected by factor of volumetric solution or end-point detection. Participating laboratories should check the standard of procedure based on the Technical Manual for Soil and Vegetation Monitoring (EANET, 2000).




**Figure 4.2 Scatter diagram of pH ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) between No.131s and No.132s** (Solid lines show mean of verified datasets and dashed lines show 0.2 pH units from the mean.)




**Figure 4.3 Scatter diagram of pH (KCl) between No.131s and No.132s** (Solid lines show mean of verified datasets and dashed lines show 0.2 pH units from the mean.)




**Figure 4.4 Scatter plot of Ex-Ca between No.131s and No.132s (Solid lines show mean of verified datasets and dashed lines show 20% from the mean.)**




**Figure 4.5 Scatter plot of Ex-Mg between No.131s and No.132s (Solid lines show mean of verified datasets and dashed lines show 20% from the mean.)**




**Figure 4.6 Scatter plot of Ex-K between No.131s and No.132s (Solid lines show mean of verified datasets and dashed lines show 20% from the mean.)**




**Figure 4.7 Scatter plot of Ex-Na between No.131s and No.132s (Solid lines show mean of verified datasets and dashed lines show 20% from the mean.)**



**Figure 4.8 Scatter plot of Ex-acidity between No.131s and No.132s** (Solid lines show mean of verified datasets and dashed lines show 20% from the mean.)



**Figure 4.9 Scatter plot of Ex-Al between No.131s and No.132s** (Solid lines show mean of verified datasets and dashed lines show 20% from the mean.)



**Figure 4.10 Scatter plot of Ex-H between No.131s and No.132s (Solid lines show mean of verified datasets and dashed lines show 20% from the mean.)**

#### 4.3.6 Comparison with information on Laboratories

##### 1) Number of analysts and their experience

Number of analysts and years of their experience were shown in Table 4.6. The same analyst carried out the repeat analyses in some laboratories for all parameters. No relationship between the number of analyst, years of experience and the outliers was suggested.

##### 2) Analytical instruments and condition of instruments

Analytical instruments used for the measurement, procedures for extraction of base cations, and size of burette used for the titration method in Ex-acidity were shown in Table 4.7. Almost all laboratories used AAS for measurement of Ex-Ca, Mg, K and Na, and 1 laboratory used FEP for Ex-K and Na. Two laboratory used ICP for measurement of Ex-Ca, Mg, K and Na. Years in use of instruments ranged from 1 to 28.

Five laboratories used percolation tube procedures for extraction of exchangeable base cations, while Buchner funnel procedures, centrifuge procedures and automatic extractor procedures were used in 2, 1 and 2 laboratories, respectively. No clear difference was observed among data by different procedures. As for the size of burette for titration of Ex-acidity, the capacities were varied from 10 to 50 ml while minimum graduates were 0.00125 to 0.1.

### 3) Date of analysis

Dates of analysis in the respective laboratories and days used for the analysis were shown in Table 4.8. There were no significant implication between date of analysis and the data. Days used for the analysis were only one or two days in most laboratories. Interval between the first and second analyses of the repeat analyses was varied from 0 (in a same day) to 151 days. It was suggested that repeat analyses would be carried out with several-day interval (three days or more) in order to estimate actual within-laboratory reproducibility, as a supplementary instruction for the project, based on the discussion at SAC3 (The third session of the Scientific Advisory Committee on EANET). Mostly half of the laboratories followed the recommendation, although a few laboratories might conduct the instrumental analysis of both samples in a same day.

**Table 4.6 Number and experience of analyst**

Lab.	Ex-base cations			Ex-acidity			Analyst	
	Number of analyst	Years of experience		Number of analyst	Years of experience			
		Chemical	Soil		Chemical	Soil		
CN01	3	5	4	3	5	4	s	
CN02	1	15	15	1	24	24	d	
CN03	1	18	15	1	18	15	s	
CN04	1	27	9	1	7	5	d	
ID01	1	9	6	1	9	6	s	
ID04	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
MN01	-	-	-	1	12	12	-	
MY04	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
PH03	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
PH04	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
RU01	1	28	15	1	13	10	d	
TH01	1	10	10	1	20	4	d	
TH06	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
VN01	1	21	16	1	21	16	s	
VN02	-	-	-	1	9	5	-	
VN03	1	1	1	1	7	7	d	
VN04	1	12	10	1	10	9	d	

Note: -, Not measured; n, no information; s, Same analysts; d, Different analysts

**Table 4.7 Analytical instruments and their conditions for exchangeable cations**

Lab.	Sample	Ex-Ca		Ex-Mg		Ex-K		Ex-Na		Procedures for extraction of Ex-base cations	Ex-Acidity, Al and H Size of burette (ml)				
		Instrument	Years <sup>*1</sup>	Instrument	Years	Instrument	Years	Instrument	Years		method	Capacity	Minimum graduate		
CN01	No.131	AAS	6	AAS	6	La	AAS	6	AAS	6	Automatic extractor	Titration	25	0.1	
	No.132	AAS	6	AAS	6	La	AAS	6	La	La		25	0.1		
CN02	No.131	AAS	4	AAS	4	Sr	AAS	4	AAS	4	Percolation tube	Titration	50	0.1	
	No.132	AAS	4	AAS	4	Sr	AAS	4	AAS	4		50	0.1		
CN03	No.131	AAS	4	AAS	3	Sr	AAS	3	AAS	3	Automatic extractor	Titration	5	1/800	
	No.132	AAS	4	AAS	3	Sr	AAS	3	AAS	3		5	1/800		
CN04	No.131	ICP	1	ICP	1	+	ICP	1	ICP	1	Percolation tube	Titration	25	0.1	
	No.132	ICP	1	ICP	1	+	ICP	1	ICP	1		25	0.1		
ID01	No.131	AAS	8	AAS	8	Sr	AAS	8	AAS	8	Sr	Centrifuge	Titration	50	0.05
ID04	No.131	-								-			-		
MN01	No.131	-								Titration			25	0.1	
MY04	No.131	-								-			-		
	No.132	-								-			-		
PH03	No.131	-								-			-		
PH04	No.131	-								-			-		
RU01	No.131	AAS	28	AAS	28	La	FEP	27	FEP	28	La	Percolation tube	Titration	25	0.1
	No.132	AAS	28	AAS	28	La	FEP	27	FEP	28	La		25	0.1	
TH01	No.131	ICP	5	ICP	5	na	ICP	5	ICP	5	na	Percolation tube	Titration	25	0.05
TH06	No.131	-								-			-		
VN01	No.131	AAS	7	AAS	7	na	AAS	7	AAS	7	na	Buchner funnel	Titration	10	0.05
VN02	No.131	-								Titration			10	0.05	
VN03	No.131	AAS	4	AAS	4	na	AAS	4	AAS	4	na	Buchner funnel	Titration	10	0.02
VN04	No.131	AAS	9	AAS	9	na	AAS	9	AAS	9	na	Percolation tube	Titration	10	0.05
	No.132	AAS	9	AAS	9	na	AAS	9	AAS	9	na		10	0.05	


**Table 4.8 Date of analysis and days used for the analysis**

Lab.	Repeat	pH			Ex-Ca and Mg			Ex-K and Na			Ex-acidity, Al and H		
		Date <sup>*1</sup>	Analysis <sup>*2</sup> Interval <sup>*3</sup>		Date <sup>*1</sup>	Analysis <sup>*2</sup> Interval <sup>*3</sup>		Date <sup>*1</sup>	Analysis <sup>*2</sup> Interval <sup>*3</sup>		Date <sup>*1</sup>	Analysis <sup>*2</sup> Interval <sup>*3</sup>	
			Days	Days		Days	Days		Days	Days		Days	Days
CN01	1st	2013/11/7	1	1	2013/11/8	2	0	2014/11/8	2	0	2013/11/7	1	1
	2nd	2013/11/8	1		2013/11/8	1		2014/11/8	1		2013/11/8	1	
CN02	1st	2014/2/22	2	2	2014/2/14	2	7	2014/2/14	2	7	2014/1/17	5	35
	2nd	2014/2/24	1		2014/2/21	2		2014/2/21	2		2014/2/21	5	
CN03	1st	2014/1/14	2	1	2014/1/16	3	7	2014/1/16	3	7	2014/1/16	3	7
	2nd	2014/1/15	2		2014/1/23	3		2014/1/23	3		2014/1/23	3	
CN04	1st	2014/1/15	1	5	2014/2/12	3	9	2014/2/12	3	9	2014/1/26	2	2
	2nd	2014/1/20	1		2014/2/21	6		2014/2/21	6		2014/1/28	2	
ID01	1st	2014/1/2	1	7	2014/1/17	1	7	2014/1/17	1	7	2014/1/9	1	6
	2nd	2014/1/9	1		2014/1/24	1		2014/1/24	1		2014/1/15	1	
ID04	1st	-			-			-			-		
MN01	1st	2014/2/25	2	0	-			-			2014/2/27	4	0
MY04	1st	-			-			-			-		
	2nd	-			-			-			-		
PH03	1st	-			-			-			-		
PH04	1st	-			-			-			-		
RU01	1st	2014/1/28	1	14	2013/1/30	3	13	2014/1/30	3	13	2014/1/29	1	15
	2nd	2014/2/11	1		2013/2/12	2		2014/2/12	2		2014/2/13	1	
TH01	1st	2014/1/5	1	151	2013/4/19	2	13	2014/5/6	2	10	2014/2/5	1	83
	2nd	2014/6/5	1		2013/5/2	2		2014/5/16	2		2014/4/29	1	
TH06	1st	-			-			-			-		
VN01	1st	2013/12/9	1	7	2012/12/11	1	3	2013/12/9	1	7	2013/12/9	1	7
	2nd	2013/12/16	1		2012/12/14	1		2013/12/16	1		2013/12/16	1	
VN02	1st	2013/12/21	1	0	-			-			2013/12/22	2	0
	2nd	2013/12/21	1		-			-			2013/12/22	2	
VN03	1st	2014/2/13	1	0	-			2014/2/20	1	0	2014/2/20	1	0
	2nd	2014/2/13	1		-			2014/2/20	1		2014/2/20	1	
VN04	1st	2012/12/12	1	0	2012/12/11	2	0	2013/12/17	2	0	2013/12/16	1	0
	2nd	2012/12/12	1		2012/12/11	2		2013/12/17	2		2013/12/16	1	

#### 4.4 Needs for improvement of soil analysis

Figure 4.11 shows the change of outlier ratio in all properties and laboratories from 2002 to 2013 (the ratio is calculated by  $N$  of outliers /  $N$  of all data). Although the ratio decreased from first experiment in 2002, this is still high (10-20% from 2003 to 2013). Outliers may disturb evaluation and understanding of actual monitoring data. For inter-laboratory comparison project on soil, a decrease in the outliers is most important task in near future. Appropriate standard solution, extraction liquid,

dilution rate and calculation should be checked to reduce the extremely wrong value which is considered as outlier.



**Figure 4.11 Change of the outlier ratio in all properties and laboratories from 2002 to 2013 (N of outliers / N of all data). "a" and "b" show the 2 kinds of the samples in each year (e.g. 131s and 132s). The ratios from 2002 to 2012 were from *Report of Inter-laboratory Comparison Project 2000-2012* (<http://www.eanet.asia/product/index.html>).**

#### 4.5 Recommendations

Reducing the outliers (about 15% of all data) in exchangeable base and acid cations will be considered firstly. In addition, the precision for the sample with low concentration should be improved. The condition of standard solution, extraction liquid (potassium chloride and ammonium acetate), dilution rate and calculation will be checked. Precision for exchangeable acidity should be more improved to evaluate the actual monitoring data. Analyst needs an effort to improve the manipulation of titration in terms of appropriate reagent concentration, volume and so on. Not only analytical procedures but also reporting procedures should be checked carefully in the respective laboratories.

#### References

- EANET (2000). *Technical Documents for Soil and Vegetation Monitoring in East Asia: Acid Deposition and Oxidant Research Center*, Niigata, Japan, 185p.
- Japanese Standards Association (1991). *General rules for permissible tolerance of chemical analyses and physical tests (JIS Z-8402-1991)*: Japanese Standards Association, Tokyo, Japan, 110p.

**Appendix Table 4.1 Results submitted by the laboratories (sample No.131s)**

Lab	pH(H <sub>2</sub> O)			pH(KCl)			Ex-Ca (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )			Ex-Mg (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )			Ex-K (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )			Ex-Na (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )			Ex-Al (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )			Ex-H (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )						
	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.) repeat					
CN01	5.6	5.6 (0.0)	5.6	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	0.17	0.17	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13	0.18	0.17 (0.00)	0.17	0.02	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.0	0.0 (0.00)	0.0	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4		
	5.6	5.6 (0.0)	5.6	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	0.17	0.17	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13	0.18	0.17 (0.00)	0.18	0.02	0.01 (0.00)	0.02	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.0	0.0 (0.00)	0.0	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4		
	5.6 (0.0)	5.6	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	0.17	0.17	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13	0.17	0.17 (0.00)	0.17	0.02	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.0	0.0 (0.00)	0.0	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4		
	5.6 (0.0)	5.6	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	0.18	0.18	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.0	0.0 (0.00)	0.0	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4		
CN02	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	0.27	0.27	0.22	0.29 (0.02)	0.29	0.59	0.59 (0.02)	0.61	0.20	0.20 (0.04)	0.18	0.04	0.04 (0.01)	0.04	0.4	0.4 (0.02)	0.4	0.3	0.3 (0.01)	0.3		
	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	0.28	0.28	0.26	0.26 (0.00)	0.26	0.57	0.57 (0.00)	0.57	0.25	0.25 (0.00)	0.18	0.04	0.04 (0.01)	0.04	0.4	0.4 (0.02)	0.4	0.3	0.3 (0.01)	0.3		
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	0.26	0.26	0.27	0.27 (0.00)	0.27	0.59	0.59 (0.01)	0.59	0.25	0.25 (0.00)	0.19	0.05	0.04 (0.01)	0.05	0.4	0.4 (0.02)	0.4	0.3	0.3 (0.01)	0.3		
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24 (0.00)	0.24	0.60	0.60 (0.00)	0.60	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.03	0.04 (0.01)	0.03	0.4	0.4 (0.02)	0.4	0.3	0.3 (0.03)	0.3		
CN03	5.6	5.6 (0.0)	5.6	4.3	4.3 (0.0)	4.3	2.11	2.09	0.06	2.04	0.49	0.48	0.48 (0.02)	0.49	0.20	0.20 (0.01)	0.20	0.03	0.03 (0.00)	0.03	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.2	0.2 (0.00)	0.2		
	5.6	5.6 (0.0)	5.6	4.3	4.3 (0.0)	4.3	2.08	2.08	2.15	2.15 (0.00)	2.15	0.50	0.50 (0.00)	0.50	0.20	0.20 (0.00)	0.20	0.03	0.03 (0.00)	0.03	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.2	0.2 (0.00)	0.2		
	5.6 (0.0)	5.6	4.3 (0.0)	4.3	4.3 (0.0)	4.3	2.12	2.12	0.07	2.04	0.49	0.49	0.49 (0.00)	0.49	0.20	0.20 (0.00)	0.20	0.03	0.03 (0.00)	0.03	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.2	0.2 (0.00)	0.2		
	5.6 (0.0)	5.6	4.3 (0.0)	4.3	4.3 (0.0)	4.3	2.15	2.15	0.49	0.49 (0.00)	0.49	0.58	0.58 (0.00)	0.58	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.04	0.04 (0.01)	0.04	0.4	0.4 (0.02)	0.4	0.3	0.3 (0.01)	0.3		
CN04	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.6	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	2.18	2.16	0.04	2.20	0.51	0.51	0.51 (0.01)	0.50	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.0	0.0 (0.00)	0.0		
	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	2.17	2.17	0.13	2.13	0.52	0.52	0.52 (0.00)	0.52	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.0	0.0 (0.00)	0.0		
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	2.19	2.19	0.03	2.16	0.51	0.51	0.51 (0.01)	0.51	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.0	0.0 (0.00)	0.0		
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	2.20	2.20	0.13	2.20	0.50	0.50	0.50 (0.00)	0.50	0.18	0.18 (0.00)	0.18	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.0	0.0 (0.00)	0.0		
ID01	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.0	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	2.33	2.34	0.03	2.35	0.55	0.55	0.55 (0.00)	0.55	0.21	0.21 (0.00)	0.21	0.02	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	0.5	0.5 (0.00)	0.5	0.3	0.3 (0.00)	0.3		
	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.0	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	2.36	2.36	0.13	2.31	0.54	0.54	0.54 (0.00)	0.54	0.21	0.21 (0.00)	0.21	0.02	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	0.5	0.5 (0.00)	0.5	0.3	0.3 (0.00)	0.3		
	5.4 (0.0)	5.4	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	2.32	2.32	0.03	2.28	0.54	0.54	0.54 (0.00)	0.54	0.21	0.21 (0.00)	0.21	0.02	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	0.5	0.5 (0.00)	0.5	0.3	0.3 (0.00)	0.3		
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.34	2.34	0.03	2.35	0.55	0.55	0.55 (0.00)	0.55	0.21	0.21 (0.00)	0.21	0.02	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	0.5	0.5 (0.00)	0.5	0.3	0.3 (0.00)	0.3		
MN01	6.1	6.1 (0.2)	5.9	4.8	4.8 (0.0)	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	2.33	2.33	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.02	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	0.5	0.5 (0.00)	0.5	0.3	0.3 (0.00)	0.3
	6.1 (0.0)	6.1	4.8 (0.0)	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	2.34	2.34	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.04	0.04 (0.00)	0.04	0.5	0.5 (0.00)	0.5	0.3	0.3 (0.00)	0.3
	6.1 (0.0)	6.1	4.8 (0.0)	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	2.35	2.35	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.04	0.04 (0.00)	0.04	0.5	0.5 (0.00)	0.5	0.3	0.3 (0.00)	0.3
RU01	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	24.05	25.07	0.29	25.24	0.61	0.60	0.60 (0.03)	0.63	0.19	0.19 (0.01)	0.20	0.04	0.03 (0.01)	0.03	0.4	0.3 (0.00)	0.3	0.1	0.1 (0.06)	0.1		
	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	21.16	21.17	0.04	24.73	0.59	0.59	0.59 (0.02)	0.57	0.17	0.16 (0.01)	0.17	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.13)	0.1		
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	24.82	24.82	0.96	23.98	0.61	0.62	0.61 (0.02)	0.62	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.04	0.04 (0.00)	0.04	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.06)	0.1		
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	21.14	21.14	0.04	21.19	0.33	0.33	0.33 (0.02)	0.35	0.18	0.18 (0.01)	0.19	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.06)	0.1		
	5.5	5.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	21.11	21.11	0.04	21.11	0.32	0.32	0.32 (0.02)	0.32	0.18	0.18 (0.01)	0.18	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.06)	0.1		
TH01	5.6	5.6 (0.0)	5.6	4.0	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	2.16	2.17	0.04	2.16	0.34	0.35	0.35 (0.02)	0.35	0.17	0.16 (0.01)	0.17	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.13)	0.1		
	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	2.21	2.21	0.04	2.21	0.33	0.33	0.33 (0.02)	0.33	0.17	0.17 (0.01)	0.17	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.13)	0.1		
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	2.14	2.14	0.04	2.19	0.33	0.33	0.33 (0.02)	0.35	0.18	0.18 (0.01)	0.19	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.13)	0.1		
	5.5	5.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.11	2.11	0.04	2.11	0.32	0.32	0.32 (0.02)	0.32	0.18	0.18 (0.01)	0.18	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.01	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.13)	0.1		

**Appendix Table 4.1 continued**

Lab	pH(H <sub>2</sub> O)				pH(KCl)				Ex-Ca (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )				Ex-Mg (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )				Ex-K (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )				Ex-Na <sup>+</sup> (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )				Ex-Al (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )				Ex-H (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )						
	Lab.		Ave. (S.D.)		Lab.		Ave. (S.D.)		Lab.		Ave. (S.D.)		Lab.		Ave. (S.D.)		Lab.		Ave. (S.D.)		Lab.		Ave. (S.D.)		Lab.		Ave. (S.D.)		repeat						
	Ave.	S.D.	repeat	Ave.	Ave.	S.D.	repeat	Ave.	Ave.	S.D.	repeat	Ave.	Ave.	S.D.	repeat	Ave.	Ave.	S.D.	repeat	Ave.	Ave.	S.D.	repeat	Ave.	Ave.	S.D.	repeat	Ave.	Ave.	S.D.	repeat				
VN01	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	2.64	2.64 (0.08)	2.71	0.58	0.58 (0.01)	0.59	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.02	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.3	0.3 (0.01)	0.3	0.1	0.1 (0.01)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1			
	5.5	5.5	4.1	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	2.66	2.66	2.56	0.56	0.56 (0.01)	0.57	0.18	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.02	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.4	0.3 (0.01)	0.3	0.3	0.3 (0.01)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1			
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	4.1 (0.07)	4.1	2.64 (0.07)	2.70	0.58 (0.01)	0.59	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.4 (0.01)	0.4	0.3 (0.01)	0.3	0.3	0.1 (0.01)	0.1	0.1	0.1 (0.01)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		
VN02	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.0	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	-	-	2.57	0.58	0.58 (0.01)	0.59	0.19	0.19 (0.00)	0.19	0.02	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	0.5	0.5 (0.03)	0.5	0.5	0.2 (0.00)	0.2	0.3	0.3 (0.06)	0.3	0.3	0.3 (0.06)	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
	5.5	5.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	4.0	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	5.5	5.5	4.0	4.1	4.1	2.57	0.58	0.58 (0.01)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
VN03	5.3	5.3 (0.0)	5.3	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	4.65	4.65 (0.00)	4.64	0.89	0.89 (0.00)	0.89	0.26	0.26 (0.00)	0.27	0.09	0.09 (0.00)	0.09	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.00)	0.1	0.2	0.2 (0.02)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.02)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.02)	0.2	0.2	0.2
	5.3	5.3	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.65	4.65	4.65	4.65	0.89	0.89 (0.00)	0.89	0.26	0.26 (0.00)	0.26	0.09	0.09 (0.00)	0.09	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.00)	0.1	0.2	0.2 (0.02)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.02)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.02)	0.2	0.2	0.2
	5.3 (0.0)	5.3	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	4.65 (0.01)	4.65	4.65	4.65	4.65	0.88	0.88 (0.00)	0.88	0.26	0.26 (0.00)	0.26	0.09	0.09 (0.00)	0.09	0.4	0.4 (0.03)	0.3	0.1	0.1 (0.00)	0.1	0.2	0.2 (0.05)	0.1	0.2	0.2 (0.05)	0.1	0.2	0.2 (0.05)	0.1	0.2	0.2 (0.05)
	5.3	5.3	4.1	4.1	4.65	4.65	4.65	4.65	0.89	0.89	0.89 (0.00)	0.89	0.26	0.26 (0.00)	0.26	0.09	0.09 (0.00)	0.09	0.4	0.4 (0.00)	0.4	0.1	0.1 (0.00)	0.1	0.2	0.2 (0.02)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.02)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.02)			
VN04	5.5	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1	4.0 (0.0)	4.0	0.67	0.66 (0.01)	0.66	0.57	0.57 (0.00)	0.58	0.21	0.21 (0.01)	0.22	0.04	0.04 (0.00)	0.04	0.5	0.5 (0.03)	0.6	0.1	0.1 (0.12)	0.2	0.4	0.3 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)
	5.5	5.5	4.1	4.1	4.1	0.67	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.57	0.57 (0.00)	0.57	0.20	0.20 (0.00)	0.20	0.04	0.04 (0.00)	0.04	0.5	0.5 (0.03)	0.5	0.1	0.1 (0.12)	0.2	0.4	0.3 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)			
	5.5 (0.0)	5.5	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	0.67 (0.01)	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.57	0.57 (0.00)	0.57	0.21	0.21 (0.01)	0.21	0.04	0.04 (0.00)	0.04	0.5	0.5 (0.03)	0.5	0.1	0.1 (0.12)	0.2	0.4	0.3 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)			
	5.5	5.5	4.1	4.1	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.57	0.57 (0.00)	0.57	0.21	0.21 (0.01)	0.21	0.04	0.04 (0.00)	0.04	0.5	0.5 (0.03)	0.5	0.1	0.1 (0.12)	0.2	0.4	0.3 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)				
	5.5	5.5	4.0	4.0	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.57	0.57 (0.00)	0.57	0.20	0.20 (0.00)	0.20	0.04	0.04 (0.00)	0.04	0.5	0.5 (0.03)	0.5	0.1	0.1 (0.12)	0.2	0.4	0.3 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)	0.2	0.2	0.2 (0.12)				

**Appendix Table 4.2 Results submitted by the laboratories (sample No. 132s)**

Lab	pH(H <sub>2</sub> O)		pH(KCl)		Ex-Ca (cmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )		Ex-Mg (cmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )		Ex-K (cmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )		Ex-Na (cmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )		Ex-Al (cmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )		Ex-H (cmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )													
	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.)	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.)	repeat	Ave.	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.)	repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.)	repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.)	repeat	Lab. Ave.	Ave. (S.D.)	repeat										
CN01	4.2	4.2 (0.0)	4.2	3.5	3.5 (0.0)	3.5	0.02	0.02 (0.01)	0.02	0.03	0.03 (0.00)	0.09	0.09	0.02 (0.00)	0.02	9.9	9.9 (0.04)	10.0	3.5	3.6 (0.03)	3.7	6.9	6.8 (0.02)	6.8				
	4.2		4.2						0.02	0.03	0.03 (0.00)	0.09	0.09	0.02 (0.00)	0.02		9.9			3.6	3.6	9.5	9.5					
	4.2		4.2						0.02	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.03	0.03	0.01 (0.00)	0.01		9.9			3.6	3.6	9.3	9.3					
	4.2		4.2						0.02	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.08	0.08	0.02 (0.00)	0.02		9.9			3.6	3.6	9.3	9.3					
CN02	4.2	4.2 (0.0)	4.2	3.6	3.6 (0.0)	3.6	0.04	0.03 (0.01)	0.04	0.12	0.12 (0.01)	0.11	0.11	0.05 (0.01)	0.05	9.0	9.0 (0.02)	9.0	8.0	8.0 (0.02)	8.0	8.0	8.0 (0.03)	8.0				
	4.2		4.2						0.02	0.03	0.03 (0.00)	0.13	0.13	0.02 (0.00)	0.05		9.0			8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0					
	4.2		4.2						0.02	0.02	0.02 (0.01)	0.11	0.11	0.05 (0.01)	0.04		9.0			8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0					
	4.2		4.2						0.02	0.01	0.01 (0.00)	0.11	0.11	0.05 (0.00)	0.05		9.0			8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0					
CN03	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	3.6	3.6 (0.0)	3.6	0.10	0.10 (0.01)	0.10	0.10	0.10 (0.00)	0.11	0.14	0.18 (0.01)	0.14	9.3	9.3 (0.25)	9.1	8.2	8.2 (0.25)	8.0	8.1	8.1 (0.03)	8.0				
	4.1		4.1						0.10	0.11	0.10 (0.00)	0.10	0.10	0.13 (0.00)	0.13		9.5			8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5					
	4.1		4.1						0.10	0.09	0.09 (0.00)	0.11	0.11	0.15 (0.00)	0.15		9.1			8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0					
	4.1		4.1						0.10	0.08	0.08 (0.00)	0.10	0.10	0.14 (0.00)	0.14		9.5			8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5					
CN04	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	3.5	3.5 (0.0)	3.5	0.03	0.03 (0.00)	0.02	0.11	0.11 (0.00)	0.11	0.12	0.12 (0.00)	0.12	0.02	8.9	8.9 (0.03)	8.9	7.1	7.2 (0.03)	7.2	8.0	8.0 (0.01)	8.0			
	4.1		4.1						0.02	0.03	0.03 (0.00)	0.11	0.11	0.12 (0.00)	0.12		8.8			7.1	7.1	7.1	7.1					
	4.1		4.1						0.02	0.03	0.03 (0.00)	0.11	0.11	0.12 (0.00)	0.12		8.9			7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2					
	4.1		4.1						0.02	0.03	0.03 (0.00)	0.11	0.11	0.12 (0.00)	0.11		8.9			7.1	7.1	7.1	7.1					
ID01	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	3.4	3.4 (0.0)	3.4	0.05	0.05 (0.00)	0.05	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13	0.03	9.3	9.3 (0.00)	9.3	8.2	8.1 (0.00)	8.1	8.1	8.1 (0.01)	8.1			
	4.1		4.1						0.05	0.05	0.05 (0.00)	0.13	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13		9.3			8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1					
	4.1		4.1						0.05	0.05	0.05 (0.00)	0.13	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13		9.3			8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1					
	4.1		4.1						0.05	0.05	0.05 (0.00)	0.13	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13		9.3			8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1					
MN01	5.1	5.1 (0.0)	5.1	4.2	4.2 (0.1)	4.3	0.05	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.5	12.5 (0.00)	12.5	12.1	12.1 (0.00)	12.1	12.1	12.1 (0.00)	12.1				
	5.1		5.1						0.05	0.05	0.05 (0.00)	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.12		9.3			8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1					
	5.1		5.1						0.05	0.05	0.05 (0.00)	0.13	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13		9.3			8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1					
	5.1		5.1						0.05	0.05	0.05 (0.00)	0.13	0.13	0.13 (0.00)	0.13		9.3			8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1					
RU01	4.2	4.2 (0.0)	4.2	3.5	3.5 (0.0)	3.5	0.88	0.85 (0.07)	0.84	0.21	0.21 (0.02)	0.23	0.14	0.14 (0.00)	0.14	0.07	0.06 (0.01)	0.05	10.7	10.6 (0.05)	10.7	9.2	9.2 (0.06)	9.3	1.4	1.5 (0.06)	1.4	
	4.2		4.2						0.88	0.83	0.83 (0.06)	0.79	0.79	0.25 (0.02)	0.27	0.13	0.11 (0.01)	0.11	0.02	10.3	10.3 (0.03)	10.3	9.4	9.4 (0.12)	9.5	1.3	1.4 (0.12)	1.3
	4.2		4.2						0.92	0.92	0.92 (0.02)	0.20	0.20	0.23	0.23		9.0			10.6	10.6	10.6	10.6					
	4.2		4.2						0.81	0.81	0.80 (0.02)	0.18	0.18	0.13 (0.01)	0.14		9.0			10.7	10.7	10.7	10.7					
	4.2		4.2						0.95	0.95	0.95 (0.02)	0.22	0.22	0.13	0.13		9.0			10.7	10.7	10.7	10.7					
TH01	4.1	4.1 (0.0)	4.1	3.5	3.5 (0.0)	3.5	0.98	0.83 (0.05)	0.89	0.33	0.25 (0.02)	0.20	0.13	0.11 (0.01)	0.11	0.02	0.01 (0.00)	0.02	10.3	10.3 (0.03)	10.3	9.4	9.4 (0.12)	9.5	1.3	1.4 (0.12)	1.3	
	4.1		4.1						0.79	0.79	0.79 (0.02)	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25		9.0			10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3					
	4.1		4.1						0.82	0.82	0.82 (0.02)	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.19		9.0			10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3					
	4.1		4.1						0.41	0.41	0.41 (0.02)	0.40	0.40	0.15 (0.01)	0.14		9.0			10.3	10.3 (0.14)	10.1	1.4 (0.06)	1.4				
	4.1		4.1						0.40	0.40	0.40 (0.02)	0.40	0.40	0.16 (0.01)	0.15		9.0			10.4	10.4	10.4	10.4					
	4.1		4.1						1.16	1.16	1.16 (0.02)	0.43	0.43	0.14	0.14		9.0			10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3					
	4.1		4.1						1.06	1.06	1.06 (0.02)	0.43	0.43	0.14	0.14		9.0			10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3					

## Appendix Table 4.2 continued

## **5. 14<sup>th</sup> INTER-LABORATORY COMPARISON PROJECT ON INLAND AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT**

### **5.1 Introduction**

In the Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on inland aquatic environment, an artificial inland water sample containing known concentrations of major ions was prepared and sent to the EANET participating countries by the Network Center (NC). The measured results of pH, EC, alkalinity and concentrations of  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ,  $\text{Cl}^-$ ,  $\text{Na}^+$ ,  $\text{K}^+$ ,  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$  and  $\text{NH}_4^+$  in the participating laboratories were compared with the prepared values and the results were statistically analyzed.

### **5.2 Procedures**

#### **5.2.1 Participating Laboratories**

In the 14<sup>th</sup> Project, the NC shipped an artificial inland water sample on October 7, 2013 to 23 laboratories involved in the EANET activities, and most of them submitted their analytical data to the NC by February 28, 2014. Participating laboratories and their identification codes are listed in Table 1.1. For this attempt, the laboratory VN03 submitted all the data except alkalinity and  $\text{NO}_3^-$ .

#### **5.2.2 Description of Sample**

A description of the sample is given in Table 5.1.

**Table 5.1 Description of the artificial inland water sample**

Name	Amount of the sample	Container	Number of samples	Note
Artificial inland water sample	Approximately 1L	Poly-ethylene bottle 1L	One bottle	To analyze directly

The analytical parameters are shown in Table 5.2.

**Table 5.2 Analytical parameters**

Analytical Parameter	Reporting Units
pH	pH units
EC	milli siemens per meter
Alkalinity	milli equivalent per liter
$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$	milli gram per liter
$\text{NO}_3^-$	milli gram per liter
$\text{Cl}^-$	milli gram per liter
$\text{Na}^+$	milli gram per liter
$\text{K}^+$	milli gram per liter
$\text{Ca}^{2+}$	milli gram per liter
$\text{Mg}^{2+}$	milli gram per liter
$\text{NH}_4^+$	milli gram per liter

The participating laboratories were informed that concentration of each parameter was prepared within the range described in Table 5.3.

**Table 5.3 Concentration range of artificial inland water sample**

Parameter	Range	Parameter	Range
pH	5.0 – 8.0	$\text{Na}^+$	1 – 10 $\text{mg L}^{-1}$
EC	1.5 – 15 $\text{mS m}^{-1}$	$\text{K}^+$	0.2 – 2 $\text{mg L}^{-1}$
Alkalinity	0.05 – 0.5 $\text{meq L}^{-1}$	$\text{Ca}^{2+}$	0.5 – 5 $\text{mg L}^{-1}$
$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$	2 – 20 $\text{mg L}^{-1}$	$\text{Mg}^{2+}$	0.2 – 2 $\text{mg L}^{-1}$
$\text{NO}_3^-$	0.5 – 5 $\text{mg L}^{-1}$	$\text{NH}_4^+$	0.05 – 0.5 $\text{mg L}^{-1}$
$\text{Cl}^-$	1 – 10 $\text{mg L}^{-1}$		

### 5.2.3 Parameters analyzed

Participating laboratories are required to apply the analytical methods and data checking procedures specified in the technical documents in EANET to the analysis. The methods and procedures applied were specified in the “Technical Manual for Monitoring on Inland Aquatic Environment in East Asia (2000)” and the “QA/QC Program for Monitoring on Inland Aquatic Environment in East Asia (2000)”. Moreover, the latest version of the manual 2010 came to be available nowadays.

Analytical methods specified in the manual are described in Table 5.4.

**Table 5.4 Analytical methods specified in the Technical Manual for Monitoring on Inland Aquatic Environment in East Asia (2000)**

Parameter	Analytical method
pH	Glass electrode
EC	Conductivity cell
Alkalinity	Titration by Burette or Digital Burette with pH Meter (end-point pH4.8)
$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$	
$\text{NO}_3^-$	Ion Chromatography or Spectrophotometry
$\text{Cl}^-$	Ion Chromatography or Titration
$\text{Na}^+$	
$\text{K}^+$	Ion Chromatography or Atomic Absorption / Flame (emission)
$\text{Ca}^{2+}$	photometry
$\text{Mg}^{2+}$	
$\text{NH}_4^+$	Ion Chromatography or Spectrophotometry (Indophenol blue)

#### **5.2.4 Data Checking Procedures**

### a) Calculation of ion balance ( $R_1$ )

(1) Total anion ( $A$ ) equivalent concentration ( $\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}$ ) is calculated by sum up the concentration of anions ( $C$ :  $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ) and alkalinity ( $ALK$ :  $\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}$ ). Alkalinity considered to be corresponded to bicarbonate ions ( $\text{HCO}_3^-$ ).

$A$  ( $\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}$ ) =  $\Sigma n C_{Ai}$  ( $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ) =  $C(\text{SO}_4^{2-}) + C(\text{NO}_3^-) + C(\text{Cl}^-) + (ALK)$   
 $C_{Ai}$ : electric charge of ion and concentration ( $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ) of anion "i".

(2) Total cation ( $C$ ) equivalent concentration ( $\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}$ ) is calculated by sum up the concentration of all cations ( $C$ :  $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ).

$$C \text{ (μeq/L)} = \Sigma n C_{\text{Ci}} \text{ (μmol/L)} = 10^{(6-pH)} + C(\text{NH}_4^+) + C(\text{Na}^+) + C(\text{K}^+) + C(\text{Ca}^{2+}) + C(\text{Mg}^{2+})$$

$C_{\text{Ci}}$ : electric charge of ion and concentration ( $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ) of cation “i”.

### (3) Calculation of ion balance ( $R_1$ )

$$R_1 = 100 \times (C-A) / (C+A) [\%]$$

(4)  $R_1$ , which is calculated using the above equation, should be compared with standard values in Table 5.5. Re-measurement, check with standard solutions, and/or inspection of calibration curves should be undertaken, when  $R_1$  is not within the range.

**Table 5.5 Allowable ranges for  $R_1$  in different concentration ranges**

$(C+A)$ [ $\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}$ ]	$R_1$ [%]
< 50	+30 ~ -30
50 ~ 100	+15 ~ -15
>100	+8 ~ -8

Reference: "Technical Manual for Monitoring on Inland Aquatic Environment in East Asia (2000)"

### b) Comparison between calculated and measured electrical conductivity ( $R_2$ )

(1) Total electric conductivity ( $\Lambda_{\text{calc}}$ ) is calculated as follows;

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{\text{calc}} (\text{mS m}^{-1}) = & \{349.7 \times 10^{(3-\text{pH})} + 80.0 \times C(\text{SO}_4^{2-}) + 71.5 \times C(\text{NO}_3^-) + 76.3 \times C(\text{Cl}^-) \\ & + 73.5 \times C(\text{NH}_4^+) + 50.1 \times C(\text{Na}^+) + 73.5 \times C(\text{K}^+) + 59.8 \times C(\text{Ca}^{2+}) \\ & + 53.3 \times C(\text{Mg}^{2+}) + 44.5 \times (\text{ALK})\}/10000\end{aligned}$$

C: Molar concentrations ( $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ ) of ions in the parenthesis; each constant value is ionic equivalent conductance at 25°C. Alkalinity considered to be corresponded to bicarbonate ions ( $\text{HCO}_3^-$ ).

(2) Ratio ( $R_2$ ) of calculations ( $\Lambda_{\text{calc}}$ ) to measurements ( $\Lambda_{\text{meas}}$ ) in electric conductivity is calculated as follows;

$$R_2 = 100 \times (\Lambda_{\text{calc}} - \Lambda_{\text{meas}}) / (\Lambda_{\text{calc}} + \Lambda_{\text{meas}}) [\%]$$

(3)  $R_2$ , which is calculated using the above equation, is compared with standard values in Table 5.6. Re-measurement, check with standard solutions, and/or inspection of calibration curves are necessary, when  $R_2$  is not within the range.

**Table 5.6 Allowable ranges for  $R_2$  in different concentration ranges**

$\Lambda_{\text{meas}}$ [ $\text{mS m}^{-1}$ ]	$R_2$ [%]
< 0.5	+20 ~ -20
0.5 ~ 3	+13 ~ -13
> 3	+9 ~ -9

Reference: "Technical Manual for Monitoring on Inland Aquatic Environment in East Asia (2000)"

## 5.3 Results

### 5.3.1 Outline of Results

Original data from the laboratories are shown in APPENDIX5-2 and APPENDIX5-3. Table 5.7 shows summary of the analytical results. Outlying data that deviated from the average three times greater than standard deviation (S.D.) is not included for the calculation in Table 5.7. Average of submitted data agreed well with the prepared value/concentration within a range of  $\pm 10\%$ .

**Table 5.7 Summary of analytical results of the artificial inland aquatic environment sample**  
(Reported data after outliers were removed)

Constituents	Prepared	Average	S.D.	N	Min.	Max.
pH	7.10	6.94	0.29	21	6.32	7.66
EC ( $\text{mS m}^{-1}$ )	3.92	3.78	0.10	21	3.61	4.00
Alkalinity ( $\text{meq L}^{-1}$ )	0.155	0.155	0.02	20	0.126	0.180
$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ )	4.90	4.81	0.21	21	4.50	5.36
$\text{NO}_3^-$ ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ )	1.09	1.07	0.06	20	0.95	1.19
$\text{Cl}^-$ ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ )	2.08	2.02	0.08	20	1.88	2.27
$\text{Na}^+$ ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ )	3.60	3.49	0.18	21	3.06	3.74
$\text{K}^+$ ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ )	0.72	0.69	0.04	20	0.60	0.74
$\text{Ca}^{2+}$ ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ )	1.81	1.91	0.37	21	1.29	2.95
$\text{Mg}^{2+}$ ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ )	0.67	0.65	0.09	20	0.43	0.83
$\text{NH}_4^+$ ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ )	0.21	0.18	0.06	21	0.00	0.28

(note) Prepared: value calculated from the amount of chemicals used for the preparation of samples.

S.D.: standard deviation, N: number of data, Min: the minimum data, Max: the maximum data

The Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) of the EANET is specified as  $\pm 15\%$  for every constituent by the QA/QC program of the EANET. In this report, analytical data on artificial inland aquatic environmental samples is compared with the prepared value/concentration and evaluated by the DQO criteria: the flag "E" is put to the data that exceed DQO within a factor of 2 ( $\pm 15\% - \pm 30\%$ ) and the flag "X" is put to the data that exceed DQO more than a factor of 2 ( $<-30\%$  or  $> 30\%$ ). Data set for each laboratory was evaluated by the data checking procedures described in chapter 5.2.4 of this report. The results were evaluated following the two aspects: i) comparison of individual parameters, and ii) comparison of conditions in each participating laboratory. Evaluation of data for each constituent is presented in "5.3.2 Evaluation of laboratories' performance (by analytical parameters)", and evaluation of data by laboratory conditions such as analytical methods used for the project, experience of personnel, and other analytical

conditions is described in “5.3.4 Information on laboratories”.


Table 5.8 shows the number of flagged data for each parameters and Figure 5.1 shows the percentage of flagged data.

**Table 5.8 Number of flagged data**

Flag *	pH	EC	Alkalinity	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$	$\text{NO}_3^-$	$\text{Cl}^-$	$\text{Na}^+$	$\text{K}^+$	$\text{Ca}^{2+}$	$\text{Mg}^{2+}$	$\text{NH}_4^+$	Total	Ratio
E	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	3	13	5.7%
X	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	5	10	4.3%
Data within DQOs	21	21	17	21	20	20	21	18	18	16	13	206	90.0%
Flagged(%)	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	14.3	14.3	23.8	38.1	10.0	

\*E: Value exceeded the DQO within a factor of 2 ( $\pm 15\% - \pm 30\%$ )

\*X: Value exceeded the DQO more than a factor of 2 ( $< -30\%$  or  $> 30\%$ )




**Figure 5.1 Percentage of flagged data**

The data flagged by "E", which exceeded the DQOs within a factor of 2, shared 5.7% of all the reported data of samples. Furthermore, the data flagged by "X", which exceeded the DQOs more than a factor of 2, shared 4.3% of all the reported data of samples. Concerning the respective parameters, the percentage of flagged  $\text{NH}_4^+$  was comparatively high, 38.1%.

The distribution of flagged data in each laboratory is shown in Table 5.9 and Figure 5.2.

**Table 5.9 Number of flagged data in each laboratory**

Number of flagged data	Number of laboratories	Ratio
0	10	48%
1	6	28%
2	1	5%
3	2	9%
4	1	5%
5	1	5%
6	0	0%
7	0	0%
8	0	0%
9	0	0%
Total	21	100%

**Figure 5.2 Distribution of laboratories with the number of flagged data**

The percentage of the laboratories without flagged data was 48% in this attempt, while that in the last attempt (2012) was 33%. The maximum number of flagged data was five, which was submitted by one laboratory. Furthermore, the number of flagged data was one, which was submitted by 6 laboratories (correspond to 29%) as the largest ratio except the laboratories without flagged data.

The Analytical data submitted by the participating laboratories were shown in Table 5.10 with flags.

**Table 5.10 Analytical Results of Sample No.131i (artificial inland aquatic environment sample : EANET in 2013)**

Lab. ID	pH	EC mS m <sup>-1</sup>	Alkalinity neq L <sup>-1</sup>	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> mg L <sup>-1</sup>	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> mg L <sup>-1</sup>	Cl <sup>-</sup> mg L <sup>-1</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup> mg L <sup>-1</sup>	K <sup>+</sup> mg L <sup>-1</sup>	Ca <sup>2+</sup> mg L <sup>-1</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup> mg L <sup>-1</sup>	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> mg L <sup>-1</sup>	R1	R2
KH01	7.11	3.62	0.140	4.56	1.07	1.88	3.64	0.72	1.79	0.43 X	0.09 X	0.19	-0.24
CN01	7.05	3.85	0.163	5.01	1.19	2.01	3.41	0.73	1.88	0.63	0.16 E	-3.23	0.84
CN02	7.09	3.85	0.153	4.92	1.11	2.03	3.56	0.74	1.78	0.67	0.21	-0.18	0.52
CN03	7.08	3.68	0.150	4.90	1.13	2.10	3.27	0.70	1.59	0.66	0.15 E	-4.30	0.79
CN04	6.86	3.86	0.174	4.62	1.16	2.01	3.54	0.71	1.83	0.68	0.22	-2.10	1.19
ID01	7.02	3.62	0.172	4.65	1.03	1.98	3.36	0.64	1.93	0.71	0.23	-1.67	4.00
ID05	6.83	4.00	0.140	4.63	1.10	1.97	3.06	0.65	2.00	0.53 E	0.21	-0.75	-4.51
JP04	7.06	3.85	0.127 E	4.78	1.09	1.97	3.46	0.71	1.75	0.60	0.21	2.82	-2.32
JP05	7.15	3.61	0.158	4.90	1.09	1.99	3.63	0.70	1.95	0.71	0.21	1.34	4.86
MY01	7.01	3.79	0.167	4.69	1.00	1.99	3.59	0.69	1.62	0.61	0.22	-3.05	0.42
MN01	7.66	3.77	0.162	4.74	0.95	1.95	3.17	0.74	1.29 E	0.48 E	0.00 X	-11.86 I	-4.23
PH01	6.69	3.88	0.150	4.52	1.03	1.94	3.56	0.70	1.87	0.68	0.19	2.62	-0.99
PH02	7.08	3.69	0.157	4.93	1.05	1.95	3.73	0.71	2.02	0.71	0.23	3.09	4.25
RU01	6.96	3.76	0.143	4.82	1.06	2.27	3.51	0.74	1.72	0.65	0.19	-0.45	0.99
RU02	6.86	3.77	0.140	5.00	1.15	2.15	3.47	0.69	1.71	0.70	0.21	-0.02	0.96
TH01	7.05	3.70	0.165	5.36	1.05	2.05	3.51	0.66	2.03	0.67	0.20	-2.03	4.65
TH02	6.56	3.86	0.126 E	5.05	1.06	2.07	3.59	0.67	2.86 X	0.83 E	0.07 X	11.76	3.46
VN01	6.92	3.73	0.160	4.74	1.00	2.03	3.67	0.73	1.83	0.65	0.14 X	-0.16	2.04
VN02	6.35	3.71	0.175	4.75	1.14	2.03	3.51	0.61 E	1.86	0.68	0.20	-3.20	3.35
VN03	6.94	3.84		4.84	4.23 X		3.25	0.87 E	2.95 X	1.26 X	0.28 X	-	-
VN04	6.32	3.73	0.180 E	4.50	1.01	2.03	3.74	0.60 E	1.86	0.71	0.25 E	-0.64	3.60
Expected value	7.10	3.92	0.155	4.90	1.09	2.08	3.60	0.72	1.81	0.67	0.21	-	-

E: Value exceeded the DQO within a factor of 2 ( $\pm 15\% - \pm 30\%$ )


X: Value exceeded the DQO more than a factor of 2 ( $< -30\%$  or  $> 30\%$ )

I: Poor ion balance (R1)

C: Rich Conductivity agreement (R2)


### 5.3.2 Evaluation of laboratories' performance (by analytical parameters)

The general overviews of data are presented below in Figures from 5.3 to 5.13 for each analytical parameter. The results received from each laboratory are normalized by the prepared values to evaluate deviation from the prepared values.




**Figure 5.3 Distribution of results for pH (normalized by the prepared value)**

All the submitted data of pH were within DQOs. Almost all of them were lower than the prepared value.




**Figure 5.4 Distribution of results for EC (normalized by the prepared value)**

All the submitted data of pH were within DQOs. Almost all of them were lower than the prepared value.




**Figure 5.5 Distribution of results for alkalinity (normalized by prepared concentration)**

Data from three laboratories were flagged. Differences between laboratories became smaller than last attempt.




**Figure 5.6 Distribution of results for SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> (normalized by prepared concentration)**

All the submitted data of SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> were within DQOs.




**Figure 5.7 Distribution of results for  $\text{NO}_3^-$  (normalized by prepared concentration)**

All the submitted data of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  were within DQOs.




**Figure 5.8 Distribution of results for  $\text{Cl}^-$  (normalized by prepared concentration)**

Except for VN03, all the submitted data of  $\text{Cl}^-$  were within DQO, 15%. Almost all of them were lower than the prepared value and their differences between laboratories were small, although the data of VN03 significantly deviated from the prepared value.




**Figure 5.9 Distribution of results for  $\text{Na}^+$  (normalized by prepared concentration)**

All of the submitted data of  $\text{Na}^+$  were within DQOs. Most of the participating laboratories used ion chromatography for the determination, while four laboratories used atomic absorption spectrometry / flame (emission) photometry.




**Figure 5.10 Distribution of results for  $\text{K}^+$  (normalized by prepared concentration)**

Data from three laboratories were flagged. Two of them used ion chromatography for the determination, and another one used atomic absorption spectrometry / flame (emission) photometry.




**Figure 5.11 Distribution of results for  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  (normalized by prepared concentration)**

Three data were flagged, and two of them were deviated more than 30%. One of them used ion chromatography for the determination, and another one used atomic absorption spectrometry / flame (emission) photometry.



**Figure 5.12 Distribution of results for  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$  (normalized by prepared concentration)**

Five data were flagged, and two of them were deviated more than 30%. One of them used ion chromatography for the determination, and another one used atomic absorption spectrometry / flame (emission) photometry.




**Figure 5.13 Distribution of results for  $\text{NH}_4^+$  (normalized by prepared concentration)**

Data from eight laboratories were flagged, and five of them were deviated more than 30%. Among 21 participating laboratories, 17 laboratories used ion chromatography, 3 laboratories used spectrophotometry (Indophenol) and 1 laboratory used spectrophotometry (other method) for the determination of  $\text{NH}_4^+$ . Flagged data were found through seven laboratories used ion chromatography, and another one found through spectrophotometry (Indophenol) methods.

$\text{NH}_4^+$  was the parameter that has the highest flagged percentage in this attempt, too. This parameter had also the highest flagged percentage in the attempts in 2003-2012. It may be necessary to pay more attention to the accuracy of  $\text{NH}_4^+$  analysis in the inland water sample in each laboratory.

### 5.3.3 Overall Evaluation

Calculated relative standard deviation of the whole sets of analytical data is presented in Figure 5.14 with comparison to last attempt (2012).



(Relative standard deviation (%) = Standard deviation / Average  $\times$  100, Reported data after outliers were removed)


**Figure 5.14 Relative standard deviation of each constituent**

The relative standard deviation (RSD) of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> results from laboratories had tendency to be larger than the other parameters comparatively as similar to that of the last attempt. Although the values in some parameters decreased, those in some parameters increased remarkably in this attempt. In particular, it was clear concerning Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Mg<sup>2+</sup>, the RSDs of these parameters were from 6.9% to 19.4%, and from 4.5% to 13.6%, respectively. The RSD of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> was the largest in this attempt in the same manner as before. Thus, it may be necessary to pay more attention to the variation among the laboratories of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> analysis in the inland water than other analytical parameters.

### 5.3.4 Information on laboratories

#### Methodologies used

The percentages of laboratories using the recommended methods are shown in Figure 5.15, and the codes used for the various analytical methods are shown in Table 5.11 and 5.12.



**Figure 5.15 Percentage of laboratories using the recommended methods**

**Table 5.11 List of methods**

Code	Method
0	pH meter with electrode
1	Conductivity cell
2	Titration
3	Atomic absorption / Flame (emission) photometry
4	Ion chromatography
5	Inductively Coupled Plasma - Atomic Emission Spectrometry (ICP - AES)
6	Calculation
7	Spectrophotometry
8	Spectrophotometry (Indophenol blue)
9	Inductively Coupled Plasma - Mass Spectrometry (ICP - MS)
10	Graphite Furnace Atomic Absorption spectrometry (GFAA)
11	Other method

**Table 5.12 Analytical methods**

Code	pH	EC	Alkalinity	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$	$\text{NO}_3^-$	$\text{Cl}^-$	$\text{Na}^+$	$\text{K}^+$	$\text{Ca}^{2+}$	$\text{Mg}^{2+}$	$\text{NH}_4^+$
0	21										
1		21									
2			20(3)			3(1)					
3							4	4(1)	4(1)	4(2)	
4				18	18	18	17	17(2)	17(2)	17(3)	17(7)
5											
6											
7					3	2					1
8											3(1)
9											
10											
11											
Flagged E	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	3
Flagged X	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	5

Reverse mesh is a recommended method of EANET

( ) : Number of data, which flagged by "E" or "X"

The participating laboratories used recommended methods of the EANET except for measurement of  $\text{NH}_4^+$ . One laboratory used spectrophotometry without indophenol blue for  $\text{NH}_4^+$  analysis.

For the determination of anions/cations, most of the participating laboratories used ion chromatography, while some of them used other methods. Either data of all anions/cations obtained through ion chromatography included some flagged data. As a conclusion, there was no clear relationship between analytical methods and appearance of flagged data.

### Staff (numbers and years of experience)

Number of staff in charge of measurement in each laboratory is shown in Table 5.13.

**Table 5.13 Staff in charge of measurement**

Lab.ID	Total	pH	EC	Alkalinity	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$	$\text{NO}_3^-$	$\text{Cl}^-$	$\text{Na}^+$	$\text{K}^+$	$\text{Ca}^{2+}$	$\text{Mg}^{2+}$	$\text{NH}_4^+$
KH01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
CN01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
CN02	3	A	A	B	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
CN03	2	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	B
CN04	2	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
ID01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
ID05	6	A	B	A	C	D	C	E	C	C	F	B
JP04	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
JP05	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
MY01	3	A	A	A	B	B	B	C	C	C	C	C
MN01	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
PH01	4	A	A	B	C	C	C	D	D	D	D	D
PH02	3	A	A	B	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
RU01	4	A	A	B	C	C	C	D	D	D	D	A
RU02	4	A	A	A	B	B	A	C	C	C	C	D
TH01	2	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
TH02	2	A	B	A	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A
VN01	2	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
VN02	3	A	A	B	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
VN03	3	A	A	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	C	B
VN04	3	A	A	B	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C

Letters represent individuals of staff in each laboratory who are in charge of measurement.

Reverse mesh: "E" or "X" in sample flagged Data.

-: no information

blank: not analyzed

In many laboratories, 2 or 3 persons analyzed the sample, and usually they shared the works according to the methods such as pH, EC and ionic items.

There was no clear relationship between data quality and the number of staff in charge of measurement.

Years of experience of each laboratory are shown in Table 5.14.

**Table 5.14 Years of experience**

Lab.ID	pH	EC	Alkalinity	$\text{SO}_4^{2?}$	$\text{NO}_3^?$	$\text{Cl}^?$	$\text{Na}^+$	$\text{K}^+$	$\text{Ca}^{2+}$	$\text{Mg}^{2+}$	$\text{NH}_4^+$
KH01	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
CN01	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
CN02	23	23	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
CN03	18	18	18	2	2	2	2	2	2	18	2
CN04	7	7	7	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
ID01	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
ID05	7	31	7	3	7	3	5	3	3	5	31
JP04	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
JP05	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
MY01	1	1	1	3	3	3	7	7	7	7	7
MN01	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
PH01	3	3	5	6	6	6	16	16	16	16	16
PH02	22	22	9	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
RU01	20	20	11	18	18	18	28	28	28	28	20
RU02	53	53	53	19	19	53	22	22	22	22	19
TH01	8	8	8	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
TH02	16	10	16	10	10	10	16	16	16	16	16
VN01	1	1	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
VN02	7	7	9	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
VN03	6	6	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	7
VN04	11	11	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10

Reverse mesh: Data were Flagged by "E" or "X" in sample

1 year means experienced with one year or less.


-: no information

blank: not analyzed

There was no clear relationship between data quality and years of experience.

#### 5.4. Comparison with past surveys


The inter-laboratory comparison projects of the EANET have been carried out 14 times, and the results showing the percentage of flagged data and the percentage of data that satisfied the DQOs are shown in Figure 5.16.



**Figure 5.16 Comparison of the results from the inter-laboratory comparison projects**

The percentage of data satisfied the DQOs kept on increasing since 2008 to 2012, but it decreased slightly in this attempt. The percentage of each data in this attempt were almost same as last attempt.

The values/concentrations for each parameter from the 1<sup>st</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> project were compared with the percentage of flagged data in Figure 5.17.



**Figure 5.17 Concentrations and the percentage of flagged data for each parameter in inter-laboratory comparison projects**

There was no flagged data for pH, EC,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{Na}^+$  in this attempt. The analysis for  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$  was improved, but flagged data appeared in  $\text{Cl}^-$ ,  $\text{K}^+$  and  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ . The low concentrations for these may affect the quality. Flagged data by "X" appeared in  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ . Flagged percentage of  $\text{NH}_4^+$  was still not so good in this attempt. The low concentrations for these may affect the quality.

Furthermore, the percentage of flagged data was larger for  $\text{NH}_4^+$  than for other parameters in every survey except for the 1<sup>st</sup>- 3<sup>rd</sup> project. The percentage of flagged  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  in the 7<sup>th</sup> - 11<sup>th</sup> project was also comparatively high. Therefore, it is necessary to pay more attention to the analysis not only of  $\text{NH}_4^+$  but also of  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  in the inland water than the other analytical parameters.

## **5.5. Recommendations for improvement**

The following fundamental matters should be taken into account in measurement, analysis, and data control processes for improvement of precision.

### **5.5.1 Measurement and Analysis**

#### **1) General**

- ▶ Clearance from contamination of the apparatus, materials and reagents used for measurement and analysis must be confirmed beforehand.
- ▶ Blank values of target substances should be as low as possible.
- ▶ Measurement and analysis should be conducted by persons who are well trained.
- ▶ To maintain high analytical quality, SOP (Standard Operating Procedures) must be prepared for the management of apparatus, reagents, and procedure of operation.

#### **2) Deionized water**

- ▶ Water with conductivity less than  $0.15\text{mS m}^{-1}$  is acceptable for measurements, analyses, dilution of precipitation samples and cleaning.

#### **3) Certified materials and certified samples**

- ▶ The measurements are evaluated by comparison of measured results of samples and certified materials.
- ▶ In order to assure the reliability of measurements, the certified solutions and materials should be used as much as possible.

#### **4) Pretreatment of samples at analytical laboratory**

- ▶ Conductivity and pH should be measured as soon as possible after sample receiving, and checking agreement of samples and sample list.
- ▶ Effort should be made to start analysis of the other parameters within a week of sample arrival in the laboratory and to complete the data sets by measuring EC, pH and all other chemical parameters.

#### **5) Calibration of analytical instruments**

- ▶ Each of the analytical instruments must be calibrated when they are used, and they should be adjusted as appropriate.

## **5.5.2 Evaluation of reliability**

### **1) Sensitivity fluctuation of analytical instruments**

When numerous samples are measured, measurements should only be continued after confirming that the sensitivity fluctuation is within the prescribed range.

For example, in ion chromatography

- A new calibration should be performed before the measurements are reached to over 30 samples.
- Reference materials should be measured after the calibration. It should also be done once or twice before the next calibration.
- Control charts should be applied for the measurement of the reference materials.
- Standard solutions and reference solutions must be prepared from different stock solutions in order to be independent.
- If the results of the control solutions are outside of 3 standard deviations, or out of 15 % from the expected value, the reasons should be found and corrections should be made, and reference solution should be measured again.
- If the retention time changes slowly while the separator column is deteriorating, then adequate actions should be taken as appropriate. If it changes significantly in a relatively short time, the reasons should be found and removed, then the reference material must be measured again.

## **5.5.3 Data control**

### **1) Data checks by the analytical laboratories**

- When the sensitivity of instruments is not stable, when the results of duplicate analyses or re-measurements are significantly different, or when the percentage of a theoretical value to that for determined data in ion balances and electrical conductivity is significantly different from 1.0, measurement should be repeated since reliability is low.
- When samples seem to be obviously contaminated, these data should be treated as unrecorded data.
- Abnormal or unrecorded data can corrupt research results. So, careful checks are needed to avoid data of questionable quality. When abnormal or unrecorded data is detected, the process should be carefully reviewed to prevent the occurrence of the same problem in the future.

## **References**

EANET (2000). *Technical Manual for Monitoring on Inland Aquatic Environment in East Asia*. Acid Deposition and Oxidant Research Center, Niigata, Japan, 46p.

EANET (2000). *Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Program for Monitoring on Inland Aquatic Environment in East Asia*. Acid Deposition and Oxidant Research Center, Niigata, Japan, 22p.

EANET (2010). *Technical Manual for Inland Aquatic Environment Monitoring in East Asia -2010*. Asia Center for Air Pollution Research, Niigata, Japan, 124p.

**Appendix Table 5.1 Results submitted by the laboratories**

Lab. ID	pH	EC - (mS m <sup>-1</sup> )	Alkalinity (meq L <sup>-1</sup> )	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (mg L <sup>-1</sup> )	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> (mg L <sup>-1</sup> )	Cl <sup>-</sup> (mg L <sup>-1</sup> )	Na <sup>+</sup> (mg L <sup>-1</sup> )	K <sup>+</sup> (mg L <sup>-1</sup> )	Ca <sup>2+</sup> (mg L <sup>-1</sup> )	Mg <sup>2+</sup> (mg L <sup>-1</sup> )	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> (mg L <sup>-1</sup> )
KH01	7.11	3.62	0.140	4.56	1.07	1.88	3.64	0.72	1.79	0.43	0.09
CN01	7.05	3.85	0.163	5.01	1.19	2.01	3.41	0.73	1.88	0.63	0.16
CN02	7.09	3.85	0.153	4.92	1.11	2.03	3.56	0.74	1.78	0.67	0.21
CN03	7.08	3.68	0.150	4.90	1.13	2.10	3.27	0.70	1.59	0.66	0.15
CN04	6.86	3.86	0.174	4.62	1.16	2.01	3.54	0.71	1.83	0.68	0.22
ID01	7.02	3.62	0.172	4.65	1.03	1.98	3.36	0.64	1.93	0.71	0.23
ID05	6.83	4.00	0.140	4.63	1.10	1.97	3.06	0.65	2.00	0.53	0.21
JP04	7.06	3.85	0.127	4.78	1.09	1.97	3.46	0.71	1.75	0.60	0.21
JP05	7.15	3.61	0.158	4.90	1.09	1.99	3.63	0.70	1.95	0.71	0.21
MY01	7.01	3.79	0.167	4.69	1.00	1.99	3.59	0.69	1.62	0.61	0.22
MN01	7.66	3.77	0.162	4.74	0.95	1.95	3.17	0.74	1.29	0.48	0.00
PH01	6.69	3.88	0.150	4.52	1.03	1.94	3.56	0.70	1.87	0.68	0.19
PH02	7.08	3.69	0.157	4.93	1.05	1.95	3.73	0.71	2.02	0.71	0.23
RU01	6.96	3.76	0.143	4.82	1.06	2.27	3.51	0.74	1.72	0.65	0.19
RU02	6.86	3.77	0.140	5.00	1.15	2.15	3.47	0.69	1.71	0.70	0.21
TH01	7.05	3.70	0.165	5.36	1.05	2.05	3.51	0.66	2.03	0.67	0.20
TH02	6.56	3.86	0.126	5.05	1.06	2.07	3.59	0.67	2.86	0.83	0.07
VN01	6.92	3.7	0.160	4.74	1.00	2.03	3.67	0.73	1.83	0.65	0.14
VN02	6.35	3.7	0.175	4.75	1.14	2.03	3.51	0.61	1.86	0.68	0.20
VN03	6.94	3.8		4.84		4.23	3.25	0.87	2.95	1.26	0.28
VN04	6.32	3.7	0.180	4.50	1.01	2.03	3.74	0.60	1.86	0.71	0.25
Expected value	7.10	3.92	0.155	4.90	1.09	2.08	3.60	0.72	1.81	0.67	0.21
Number of data	21	21	20	21	20	21	21	21	21	21	21
Average	6.94	3.8	0.155	4.81	1.07	2.13	3.49	0.70	1.91	0.68	0.18
Minimum	6.32	3.6	0.126	4.50	0.95	1.88	3.06	0.60	1.29	0.43	0.00
Maximum	7.66	4.0	0.180	5.36	1.19	4.23	3.74	0.87	2.95	1.26	0.28

blank: not analyzed

**Appendix Table 5.2 Data normalized by the prepared value**

(Original data / Expected Value – 1) × 100 (%)

Lab. ID	pH (%)	EC (%)	Alkalinity (%)	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (%)	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> (%)	Cl <sup>-</sup> (%)	Na <sup>+</sup> (%)	K <sup>+</sup> (%)	Ca <sup>2+</sup> (%)	Mg <sup>2+</sup> (%)	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> (%)
KH01	0.2	-7.6	-9.4	-6.9	-2.1	-9.5	1.3	-0.4	-0.9	-35.7	-57.9
CN01	-0.6	-1.8	5.4	2.2	8.9	-3.4	-5.1	1.0	4.0	-5.8	-25.2
CN02	0.0	-1.7	-1.0	0.4	1.9	-2.6	-1.0	3.4	-1.7	-0.3	-0.3
CN03	-0.2	-6.1	-3.0	0.0	3.4	0.9	-9.1	-3.1	-12.0	-0.8	-29.9
CN04	-3.3	-1.5	12.6	-5.7	6.2	-3.2	-1.5	-1.7	1.3	1.2	2.8
ID01	-1.0	-7.6	11.3	-5.0	-5.4	-5.0	-6.5	-11.5	6.8	6.2	7.5
ID05	-3.7	2.1	-9.4	-5.5	0.7	-5.3	-14.9	-10.0	10.7	-20.3	-1.8
JP04	-0.6	-1.8	-17.6	-2.4	-0.2	-5.5	-3.9	-1.3	-3.1	-9.8	-0.3
JP05	0.8	-8.0	2.2	0.1	0.1	-4.5	0.9	-2.7	7.7	6.2	-3.4
MY01	-1.2	-3.3	7.8	-4.2	-8.5	-4.2	-0.2	-4.1	-10.3	-9.3	2.8
MN01	7.9	-3.8	4.8	-3.3	-13.1	-6.4	-11.9	2.4	-28.8	-27.7	0.0
PH01	-5.7	-1.0	-3.0	-7.8	-6.0	-6.6	-1.1	-2.7	3.7	1.2	-11.2
PH02	-0.2	-5.9	1.3	0.5	-3.6	-6.4	3.7	-1.3	11.6	6.2	7.5
RU01	-1.9	-4.2	-7.7	-1.6	-2.7	9.3	-2.3	2.4	-4.8	-2.8	-12.8
RU02	-3.3	-3.8	-9.4	2.0	4.9	3.3	-3.6	-4.1	-5.5	4.7	-1.8
TH01	-0.7	-5.6	6.5	9.4	-3.6	-1.5	-2.3	-8.2	12.2	0.2	-6.5
TH02	-7.6	-1.5	-18.3	3.1	-3.0	-0.7	-0.3	-6.8	58.5	24.6	-67.3
VN01	-2.5	-5	3.5	-3.2	-8.8	-2.6	2.1	1.5	1.1	-2.8	-34.6
VN02	-10.5	-5	13.2	-3.0	4.6	-2.3	-2.4	-15.2	2.9	1.2	-8.1
VN03	-2.2	-2	-	-1.2	-	103.5	-9.6	21.4	63.3	88.5	32.4
VN04	-10.9	-5	16.4	-8.2	-7.6	-2.3	4.0	-17.0	2.8	5.7	15.3
Minimum	-10.9	-8.0	-18.3	-8.2	-13.1	-9.5	-14.9	-17.0	-28.8	-35.7	-67.3
Maximum	7.9	2	16.4	9.4	8.9	103.5	4.0	21.4	63.3	88.5	32.4
Average	-2.3	-3.8	0.3	-1.9	-1.7	2.1	-3.0	-2.8	5.7	1.5	-9.6

blank: not analyzed



## **6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

ACAP wishes to thank Osaka Prefecture for their cooperation in the collection of soil samples used for the Inter-laboratory Comparison Project on soil.

## **7. CONTACT INFORMATION**

Please address all inquiries, comments and suggestions to:

Asia Canter for Air Pollution Research (ACAP)  
1182, Sowa, Nishi-ku, Niigata-shi, 950-2144, Japan  
Tel: +81 25-263-0550  
Fax: +81 25-263-0567  
E-mail: eanetdata@acap.asia  
URL: <http://www.eanet.asia>

Contact person:

---

Name	Department & E-mail address
Dr. Keiichi SATO	Chief Senior Researcher, Data Management Department E-mail: ksato@acap.asia

---

