

Comparative Analysis of Mass Balance and Radiocarbon Dating for Verifying Sustainable and Circular Products

An ever-growing consumer and regulatory demand for sustainable products has placed a significant burden on manufacturers to verify the renewable content of their goods.¹ This white paper explores two prominent methodologies used for this purpose: the Mass Balance approach and Radiocarbon Dating. It delves into the fundamental principles of each, their geographical usage, and a comparative analysis of their pros and cons. Finally, it addresses the critical question of which approach serves as a more reliable indicator of a truly "sustainable and circularity" product.

The Mass Balance Approach: A Chain of Custody Model

The Mass Balance approach is a system designed to track the total amount of sustainable material through a complex production process. In this model, renewable or recycled feedstocks are mixed with traditional fossil-based feedstocks. The total volume of sustainable input is then allocated to a portion of the output products.

For instance, if a plastics manufacturer introduces 20 tons of bio-based feedstock into a system that produces 100 tons of plastic, they can claim that 20 tons of their final product are bio-based. It is crucial to understand that the specific molecules in the final "sustainable" product may not have originated from the renewable source due to the mixing process. The integrity of this approach relies on third-party certification schemes like the International Sustainability and Carbon Certification (ISCC) PLUS, which audit the entire supply chain to ensure the claims are credible.

Geographical Usage

The Mass Balance approach is predominantly used in **Europe**, driven by strong regulatory frameworks and industry-led sustainability initiatives. The chemical and plastics industries, in particular, have widely adopted this methodology to support the transition to a circular economy without necessitating the construction of entirely new, segregated production facilities.

Pros and Cons

Pros	Cons
Facilitates Gradual Transition: Allows companies to incrementally increase the use of renewable feedstocks in existing infrastructure, accelerating the shift towards sustainability.	Potential for Greenwashing: The disconnect between the physical product and the sustainability claim can be misleading to consumers who may assume the product is 100% derived from renewable sources.
Cost-Effective: Avoids the significant capital investment required for separate production lines dedicated to renewable materials.	Lack of Physical Traceability: It is impossible to analytically verify the exact percentage of renewable content in a specific product batch.
Scalable: Enables the large-scale production of more sustainable products, making them more accessible and affordable.	Complex Certification: Requires rigorous and transparent third-party auditing to maintain credibility and prevent fraudulent claims.

Radiocarbon Dating: A Scientific Fingerprint

Radiocarbon dating, a technique traditionally used in archaeology, offers a direct scientific method for determining the amount of carbon in a product that comes from renewable resources such as plants including corn, soy or other plant-based oils. The basis of this approach lies in the presence of Carbon-14 (14C), a naturally occurring radioactive isotope of carbon.

Living organisms, such as plants used for bio-based materials, constantly absorb 14C from the atmosphere. When these organisms die, they no longer take in 14C, and the existing isotope begins to decay at a known rate. In contrast, fossil fuels, having been sequestered from the atmosphere for millions of years, contain no detectable 14C. By measuring the concentration of 14C in a product, laboratories can precisely determine the percentage of carbon that is derived from modern, renewable biomass versus ancient, fossil-based sources. The internationally recognized standard for this method is ASTM D6866.

Geographical Usage

The use of radiocarbon dating to verify bio-based content is widespread globally, with a significant presence in **North America and Asia**. In the United States, the USDA's BioPreferred® Program relies on ASTM D6866 testing to certify products for preferred federal purchasing. This has driven its adoption across a wide range of industries.

An Important Part of LCA

Finally, radiocarbon dating is an important metric used in Life Cycle Analysis (LCA), a method to evaluate the environmental impacts of a product, service, or process throughout its entire life cycle, from raw material extraction to final disposal or recycling. This is because only radiocarbon dating can provide the accurate amount of petroleum and plant-based carbon in the feedstocks of a product.

Pros and Cons

Pros	Cons
Scientific Accuracy: Provides a direct, quantifiable measurement of the bio-based carbon content in a product, offering a high degree of certainty.	Destructive Testing: The analysis requires a small portion of the product to be destroyed.
Unambiguous Results: The results are clear and easy to understand for consumers and regulators, leaving little room for misinterpretation.	Higher Cost per Test: Can be more expensive than the administrative costs associated with mass balance certification, especially for frequent testing.
Verifiable Claim: Any claim made based on radiocarbon dating can be independently verified by other accredited laboratories.	Limited to Carbon Content: Only measures the carbon from renewable sources and does not provide a broader picture of the product's overall environmental impact.
LCA compatible: Provides the accurate amount of petroleum and plant based carbon in the feedstocks of a product.	

A Tale of Two Approaches: Similarities and Differences

Feature	Mass Balance	Radiocarbon Dating
Methodology	Chain of custody accounting	Direct scientific measurement
Verifiability	Auditing of supply chain records	Laboratory analysis of the product
Physical Content	Not guaranteed to contain renewable molecules	Directly measures renewable carbon molecules
Consumer Clarity	Can be ambiguous	Clear and quantifiable
Primary Use	Industrial-scale transition	Product certification and labeling

While both methods aim to promote the use of renewable resources, their fundamental approaches are vastly different. The Mass Balance approach is a "bookkeeping" exercise that facilitates a gradual shift in industrial processes. In contrast, Radiocarbon Dating provides a definitive "fingerprint" of a product's renewable carbon content.

Which Approach is a Better Indicator of a "Truly Sustainable or Circular" Product?

While both methodologies have their merits, **radiocarbon dating is arguably the superior indicator of a truly sustainable product from a consumer perspective.** The transparency and scientific certainty of radiocarbon analysis provide an unambiguous measure of the bio-based content. When a product is certified to contain a certain percentage of bio-based carbon via radiocarbon dating, the consumer can be confident that the physical item in their hands contains that proportion of renewable material.

The Mass Balance approach, while valuable for driving industrial change, presents a significant potential for consumer misunderstanding. A product marketed as "bio-based" under a mass balance scheme may, in reality, contain no molecules from renewable feedstocks. This can erode consumer trust and devalue legitimate sustainability claims.

Conclusion

The Mass Balance approach and Radiocarbon Dating are two distinct yet important tools in the journey toward a more sustainable economy. The Mass Balance method is a pragmatic and effective enabler of industrial transition, particularly in sectors with complex, integrated supply chains. Radiocarbon Dating, on the other hand, offers unparalleled accuracy and transparency for product-level claims, empowering consumers to make informed choices.

For a product to be considered "truly sustainable," a combination of approaches may be necessary. While radiocarbon dating provides the most accurate snapshot of renewable content, this should be complemented by a broader life cycle assessment that considers factors such as responsible sourcing, energy efficiency, and end-of-life management. Ultimately, the choice of methodology depends on the specific goals of the manufacturer, the expectations of the consumer, and the regulatory landscape in which they operate.

Greg Piche-Vice President Products
BioBond Adhesives, Inc.
October 12, 2025

BioBond is accelerating the shift in the \$190B coatings and adhesives sector from petroleum-based products to a safer, sustainable, and circular future—eliminating microplastics and forever chemicals while reducing CO₂ emissions through a capital-efficient execution model.