

Product Comparison: Blue Onion vs. Celigo



We're breaking down the key differences between Blue Onion and Celigo. This comparison aims to serve as an informative guide explaining the unique advantages that Blue Onion offers over Celigo.

Blue Onion at a Glance

Powered by machine learning, Blue Onion automates order-to-cash reconciliation and revenue recognition across order management systems, payment processors, and bank payouts. We follow the money from beginning to end, so no sale or refund is missed during the reconciliation process.

We ensure that companies get paid for every order no matter how complex - and can focus on delivering efficient and cost-effective strategies to scale the business with accurate data.



Key Benefits

ACCURACY

Blue Onion significantly reduces discrepancies by providing detailed control over each transaction.

COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT

More payment processors supported by Blue Onion ensure that businesses have a single platform for all their reconciliation needs.

TIMING ALIGNMENT

Blue Onion aligns posting transactions with actual bank transfers, offering more accurate financial records. You can see what's in transit and what hasn't been settled yet.

Automated vs. Manual **Rules Matching**

Blue Onion automates these rules, minimizing the need for manual intervention and significantly reducing the chances of errors.

On the other hand, Celigo requires users to set up rules manually for matching transactions. This process can be timeconsuming and prone to human error.

Granular Control, Accuracy, & Transparency

Blue Onion emphasizes meticulous control over financial data ensuring both accuracy and transparency. Rather than lumping discrepancies into a variance account, specific line items like fees, chargebacks, or tax adjustments are pinpointed for precise tracking and reconciliation.

This detailed control over each transaction allows for better investigation and significantly reduces discrepancies helping ensure every transaction is matched accurately and transparently.

Celigo posts transactions to a variance account if it cannot match them accurately. This approach can lead to significant discrepancies over time as these variance accounts grow without clear reasons for the mismatches.





Detailed Workflow Comparison

BANK RECONCILIATION



BLUE ONION

Reconciles payouts with granular detail, identifying specific discrepancies and allowing users to categorize them appropriately.



CELIGO

Matches payouts from Shopify and Amazon to bank transactions. Discrepancies are posted to a variance account automatically.

MANUAL ADJUSTMENTS



BLUE ONION

Surfaces mismatches for review at the transaction level for better investigating, ensuring discrepancies are addressed before finalizing records.



CELIGO

Does not provide tools for detailed variance investigation, leading to large, unexplained variances accumulated in an account without detailed explanations.

PAYMENT PROCESSOR COVERAGE



BLUE ONION

Supports multiple payment processors, including smaller niche platforms, ensuring broad coverage.



CELIGO

Limited to Shopify and Amazon.

Payment Processor Support

Blue Onion supports a wide array of payment processors, ensuring more comprehensive coverage for your business needs. This broad compatibility ensures seamless integration regardless of your ecommerce ecosystem.

Celigo supports a limited number of payment processors, mainly focusing on Shopify and Amazon.

Timing of Transactions

Blue Onion posts transactions when they actually land in your bank account, providing more accurate financial records.

Celigo posts transactions based on when platforms like Shopify send payouts, which might not align with when the payouts land in your bank account.

Variance Visibility

Blue Onion offers users complete visibility and a deep understanding of each variance through manual review, allowing variances to be pushed to NetSuite and avoiding delays in the reconciliation process to ensure an accurate and efficient monthend close.

In contrast, Celigo chooses simplicity over transparency and control with their vague variance holding account.

