Continuous

COMPETITIVE BATTLECARD · INTERNAL & PARTNER ENABLEMENT

Continuous Control vs. the field

Six named competitors, three camps, one question underneath all of them: **where do billing and revenue actually live?** Find your camp, take the four talking points, and run the play on architecture.

HOW TO USE THIS CARD

Find the camp first. The talking points are opposite by camp.

THE ONE LINE TO REMEMBER

Continuous Control only runs on Revenue Cloud Advanced. Every Continuous deal is an RCA deal. We cannot shrink the platform, we are built on it.

CAMP A · SLIDES 6 TO 9

Billing moves to the ERP

SuiteBilling, ZoneBilling, 360 Subscription Billing. They agree with the CFO that billing belongs next to the ledger. Their win kills the RCB deal.

CAMP B · SLIDES 10 TO 13

A platform beside the CRM

Nue, DealHub with Subskribe. They quote, bill and recognize in their own platform and push results to NetSuite. Their win displaces RCA and RCB.

CAMP C · SLIDE 14

The SI builds it

Celigo, Boomi, MuleSoft, or a custom project. Not a vendor in the deal, a reason to delay it. Countered with the prebuilt story.

READ THE LABELS

Verified means confirmed from the vendor's own pages, Oracle documentation, or our own build. **Vendor claim** means quoted but not independently validated. Where a fact could not be confirmed, this card says so rather than softening it.

Salesforce now brands Revenue Cloud Advanced as Agentforce Revenue Management. This card says RCA and RCB throughout. Use whichever name the account team uses.

MARKET MAP

The question underneath every deal: where do billing and revenue actually live?

CAMP A

In the ERP

NetSuite SuiteBilling · ZoneBilling · 360 Subscription Billing

Billing sits next to the GL, so the books tie out. The cost is that quoting, amendments, renewals and usage all migrate into NetSuite.

CAMP B

In a platform beside the CRM

Nue · DealHub with Subskribe

Quote and bill in their platform, then push documents or journal entries to NetSuite. The subledger lives in their cloud, not the ERP.

CAMP C

Built by an SI

Celigo · Boomi · MuleSoft · custom

RCA and RCB stay, and a middleware project carries the data. Months of field mapping the customer has to believe in before it works once.

CAMP D · CONTINUOUS

Unified books

Continuous Control

Salesforce runs the deal. The order graph lands in NetSuite as first-class records. Billing and revenue are **one system of record** where the GL lives.

THE STRATEGIC POINT

Continuous is not a billing-feature competitor, it is an architecture competitor. Every camp is a different answer to who owns the subledger. Fight there, not on feature lists.

EARLY WARNING

Spot the camp before the competitor is named

In most deals nobody says a vendor name for weeks. The camp announces itself in the language the customer uses and in who joins the call.

CAMP A SIGNALS

You hear: "our books are in NetSuite," "finance wants billing near the ledger," "we already have a NetSuite partner looking at this."

In the room: the controller and the NetSuite implementation partner, early.

On screen: a NetSuite Subscriptions or Billing tab, or a Zone SuiteApp already installed.

CAMP B SIGNALS

You hear: "we are evaluating a modern quote-to-revenue platform," "we want one system from quote to cash," "our CPQ is too rigid."

In the room: RevOps driving, finance invited later.

On screen: a non-Salesforce quoting UI, or a managed package you do not recognize.

CAMP C SIGNALS

You hear: "IT wants this on our integration platform," "the SI can map that," "we already pay for Boomi."

In the room: enterprise architecture and the SI, and the finance sponsor goes quiet.

On screen: an integration line item sitting in a draft SOW.

WHY THIS MATTERS

Camp A and Camp B need opposite openings. Camp A already agrees the books belong in NetSuite, so never argue that point with them. Camp B disputes it, so that is the entire conversation.

QUALIFY THE DEAL

Three questions that route the deal and expose the weak point

QUESTION 1

"Where does finance want revenue recognized, and what does the auditor open?"

If the answer is NetSuite and the trial balance, Camp B is already losing and does not know it. Their subledger lives somewhere else.

QUESTION 2

"When you amend a deal mid-term, where does the seller do it?"

Camp A's honest answer is NetSuite. That is the moment the customer realises billing is not the only thing moving into the ERP.

QUESTION 3

"Is this a product you will watch work, or a project you have to believe in?"

Camp C dies on this question. So does any Camp A or Camp B answer that starts with "the connector can be configured to."

WHERE WE PLANT THE FLAG

Finance wants revenue recognized and tied out in NetSuite, the seller wants to keep the customer lifecycle in Salesforce, and nobody wants a mapping project. **All three at once is the Continuous deal**, and no other camp offers it.

CAMP A · NETSUITE-SIDE BILLING

Billing gravity: the instinct, not the product, is what beats us

The CFO's instinct is their whole pitch.

In a NetSuite account, finance wants billing next to the ledger. That single instinct is what sells SuiteBilling, ZoneBilling and 360 Subscription Billing. Arguing with the instinct loses.

Every Camp A win kills the RCB deal.

Billing moves to NetSuite, and the Salesforce revenue footprint stops at the quote. This is the fight the Salesforce account team cares about most.

We remove the reason instead of debating it.

RCB bills, and every invoice, credit memo and payment lands in NetSuite tied to the penny. Finance keeps its system of record. The seller keeps billing.

Follow the money.

Budget that would have gone to a NetSuite billing app and its implementation becomes RCB consumption instead.

> *"Integration requires careful orchestration through middleware platforms or custom API development."*
>
> ZONE & CO, GUIDE TO NETSUITE SUITEBILLING · ON CONNECTING SUITEBILLING TO CRM AND CPQ · VERIFIED

THE LINE THAT WINS THE ROOM

"Without us, the CFO pulls billing into NetSuite and Zone gets the deal. With us, RCB bills, the books tie out in NetSuite, and the Zone deal never happens."

KNOW THE COMPETITOR

Camp A in facts

All three are **native to NetSuite**, which means all three genuinely keep the subledger at the GL. Concede that immediately. The fight is about what else has to move.

SUITEBILLING · VERIFIED

Oracle, native module

Subscriptions, billing schedules, change orders, and a 1:1 line-to-revenue-element path into native ARM. The baseline every other Camp A product is sold against.

ZONEBILLING · VERIFIED

Zone & Co, native SuiteApp

The strongest Camp A player. Usage mediation, flexible amendments, consolidated invoicing across entities, ASC 606 and IFRS 15 inside NetSuite. Sold explicitly as the fix for SuiteBilling's gaps.

360 SUBSCRIPTION BILLING · VERIFIED

Now Moss Adams, Baker Tilly network

Native SuiteApp for recurring invoices, renewals, usage charges and revenue synchronization. 360 Cloud Apps was acquired effective 31 Jan 2025, so it is now an accounting firm's product, sold implementation-led.

NAME CHECK

Our own collateral calls this one **"360 Subscription Billing."** The product is **360 Subscription Billing**. Use the real name in front of a customer, and note that the same firm also ships a Salesforce-side subscription billing app and CPQ connector.

Sources: Oracle NetSuite documentation; zoneandco.com SuiteBilling guide and ZoneBilling pages; Moss Adams acquisition press, Feb 2025; Baker Tilly product pages; suiteapp.com listing.

THE CORE WEDGE

Camp A does not just move billing. It moves the customer lifecycle.

Billing is never the only thing that travels. Quoting, amendments, renewals and usage follow it into the ERP, and then the two systems have to be reconnected anyway.

WHAT ACTUALLY MIGRATES

The seller's workflow

Amendments, renewals, co-terms and usage all become NetSuite tasks. Sales asks finance to change a deal, and the Salesforce record stops being the truth.

THE RECONNECTION TAX

You still need the integration

Zone's own SuiteBilling guide says CRM and CPQ integration needs middleware or custom API work. Camp A does not remove the integration project, it relocates it.

SUITEBILLING'S OWN RIGIDITY

One change order, one change

Per Zone: each change order handles one type of update, and an existing subscription line cannot be updated, only superseded. Oracle's billing schedules are reusable templates with no renewal automation.

THE IMPLEMENTATION SHAPE

Services-led, by design

These are partner-implemented products. The scoping conversation is a statement of work, and the finance-side timeline becomes the deal's timeline.

THE REFRAME

The customer thinks they are choosing where invoices are generated. They are actually choosing which system the sales team lives in. Ask what happens to a mid-term upsell on a Friday afternoon.

OBJECTION HANDLING · CAMP A

They say, we say

They say	We say
"Billing belongs next to the ledger."	Agreed, and the books do belong in NetSuite. That is why every invoice, credit memo and payment we sync is a native NetSuite transaction. The question is whether your sellers should have to work in NetSuite to change a deal.
"It's native, so there's no integration."	There is, it just moved. Their own guidance says connecting SuiteBilling to CRM and CPQ needs middleware or custom API development. You are still integrating, only now the quoting side is the orphan.
"We handle amendments and usage."	Inside NetSuite, yes. Ask where the seller does a mid-term upsell and how it gets back to the opportunity and the forecast. Then ask what a three-year ramp looks like as one obligation.
"This is a shorter project than a two-system model."	Compare the two statements of work. Ours is a package install and a mapping review. Theirs is a billing implementation plus the CRM integration they still owe you.
"Your revenue records are custom, ours are native."	True, and deliberate. NetSuite has no native record for a Salesforce contract, obligation or billing period, and Oracle's docs say the revenue arrangement record is scriptable in server SuiteScript only. We built the records the data lands in, and each obligation maps 1:1 to a native ARM element when they graduate.

Never disparage NetSuite. Camp A wins on an instinct that is correct. We are not arguing that the books belong somewhere else, we are refusing to move the sales team.

CAMP B · SALESFORCE-SIDE QUOTE-TO-REVENUE

They replace Salesforce. We complete it.

Every Camp B win displaces RCA and RCB.
These platforms are sold as the alternative to Salesforce CPQ and Revenue Cloud. That makes the Salesforce account team an ally, not a bystander.

Do not use one opening for the whole camp.
Nue's quoting really is a native Salesforce managed package. DealHub is an external platform connected by API. Calling Nue "off-platform" gets you corrected in the first demo.

DealHub acquired Subskribe on 19 November 2025.
Two of the names on your list are now one company. Today they are still two products: DealHub's own FAQ says existing environments continue as they are and integration happens over time.

The revenue tell.
Whoever recognizes revenue owns the subledger. Subskribe recognizes in its own system and exports journal entries out. That is the whole fight in one sentence.

> *"Effortlessly export journal entries to your general ledger."*
>
> SUBSKRIBE.COM, QUOTE-TO-REVENUE PLATFORM · VERIFIED · NETSUITE RECEIVES JOURNAL ENTRIES, NOT A REVENUE SUBLEDGER

> *"All existing CPQ and Billing environments will continue to operate as they do today."*
>
> DEALHUB.IO ACQUISITION FAQ · VERIFIED · THE UNIFIED PLATFORM IS A ROADMAP, NOT A SHIPPED PRODUCT

KNOW THE COMPETITOR

Camp B in facts

Three products, two companies, and **two different architectures**. Check which one you are facing before you open.

NUE · VERIFIED

Dual platform

CPQ and Lifecycle Manager ship as a genuinely native Salesforce managed package. Billing, usage rating and revenue run in Nue's own AWS cloud. No rev rec engine of their own: they defer ASC 606 to NetSuite ARM or RightRev.

DEALHUB · VERIFIED

External platform, API connected

Enterprise CPQ and deal desk. Not a Salesforce managed package: it connects to Salesforce, Dynamics and HubSpot through APIs. Here the off-platform framing is fair, unlike with Nue.

SUBSKRIBE · VERIFIED

Standalone, with its own 606 engine

CPQ, billing, usage metering and its own revenue recognition, built by ex-Zuora engineers. It bills and recognizes in its own system, then exports journal entries to the ERP.

UNCONFIRMED · DO NOT ASSERT

DealHub publishes **no record-level NetSuite specification**. Their integration page claims bidirectional sync supporting invoicing, subscriptions and revenue recognition, with no statement of which NetSuite records are created. Ask their SE. Do not assert what it does or does not create.

Sources: nue.io platform and NetSuite pages, Series A press Jan 2025; dealhub.io platform, Salesforce and NetSuite integration pages, acquisition FAQ; subskribe.com platform and CPQ pages; DealHub acquisition of Subskribe announced 19 Nov 2025.

THE CORE WEDGE

The subledger is in their cloud, and the ERP gets the summary

CAMP B · REVENUE IS RECOGNIZED OFF THE LEDGER

SALESFORCE
QUOTE ONLY

- **Quote · Order**
  native for Nue, API for DealHub

→

THEIR CLOUD
WHERE THE SUBLEDGER LIVES

- **Billing · usage rating**
- **Revenue recognition**
  Subskribe's own 606 engine

→

NETSUITE
RECEIVES OUTPUT

- **Standalone invoices**
- **Exported journal entries**
  the drill stops here

The auditor asking "why is this number what it is" has to leave NetSuite and open a second system.

CONTINUOUS · BILLING AND REVENUE AT THE GL

SALESFORCE
OWNS THE CUSTOMER

- RCA orders · amendments
- Billing schedules · invoices

→

NETSUITE
OWNS A/R, BILLING, REVENUE, BOOKS

- **Contract, orders, lines, obligations**
  the full mirrored order graph
- **Native invoices · obligation details**
  Booked, Billed, Recognized
- **Period JEs, drillable from the trial balance**

The drill goes JE to obligation to invoice line to Salesforce order, without leaving NetSuite.

Second structural break, both vendors: a NetSuite document total cannot be negative, so a mid-term contraction cannot post as-is. And native ARM only credits an element's Billed when the invoice is transformed from the sales order, so standalone invoices leave Billed at $0.

OBJECTION HANDLING · CAMP B

They say, we say

They say	We say
"We're native to Salesforce."	For Nue, true of quoting. Billing, usage rating and revenue run in their AWS cloud. For DealHub it is not true at all: it connects to Salesforce through APIs. Either way, native where you sell is not native where the books live.
"We handle ASC 606 ourselves."	Then your revenue subledger is in their system and your ERP receives exported journal entries. Ask the controller who they would rather have the auditor talk to, and where the drill from the trial balance should end.
"NetSuite stays your single source of truth."	Only for the documents that arrive. Subscription state, billing logic and revenue schedules live in their cloud. That is a second system of record your controller reconciles every month.
"One unified quote-to-revenue platform."	DealHub and Subskribe merged in November 2025 and their own FAQ says both environments keep running as they are, with integration happening over time. Ask which product you are actually buying today, and when the unified data model ships.
"We do the lifecycle events NetSuite can't."	In your platform, yes. The problem is the handoff. Those events still have to become native NetSuite records to hit the GL, and a NetSuite document cannot go negative. Ask their SE for a tied-out mid-term downsell and a three-year ramp inside NetSuite.

Never disparage the Revenue Cloud platform itself. We are an RCA ally, and so is the Salesforce account team fighting the same displacement.

CAMP C · BUILD IT YOURSELF

"Why not Boomi? Why not MuleSoft? The SI can map it."

They are right that integration is a boring story.

So do not tell it. Middleware is not a competitor with a product to demo, it is a reason to postpone the decision.

Boomi is a project the customer has to believe in.

An SI maps fields for months, and the deal waits while the customer decides whether to fund it. There is nothing to watch work.

The revenue half cannot be built in middleware at all.

Oracle's docs say the revenue arrangement record is scriptable in server SuiteScript only. Grouping obligations and posting period journal entries is application logic running inside NetSuite. A pipe cannot do it.

Never a blocker.

If IT insists on their platform, our mappings run on their middleware too. Do not turn this into a fight with enterprise architecture.

THE LINE

"Boomi is a project your customer has to believe in. We're a product their CFO watches work in demo one. You're not buying integration, you're killing the veto."

WHAT THE SOW LOOKS LIKE

\+ Ours: install two packages, review the shipped mappings, drop a card on the record pages. The integration line disappears from the SI proposal.

WHAT THEIRS LOOKS LIKE

− Discovery, field mapping, error handling, retry design, idempotency, then a second phase for revenue that ends with someone writing SuiteScript anyway.

WHERE WE WIN · THE PREBUILT STORY

A product, not an integration project

Every number here is countable in the shipping package. Use them, they hold up under an SE's scrutiny.

SALESFORCE SIDE

One package, no key

Continuous Control 1.0.0, a single self-contained unlocked package that installs straight into production. No installation key.

NETSUITE SIDE

One command

A versioned installer that validates against the account before anything deploys, and upserts without ever deleting on a re-run.

MAPPINGS SHIPPED

17 nodes

Customer, product, contract, order, order line, billing group, schedule, period, invoice, credit memo, payment, refund and their applications. Mapped on day zero.

AUTOMATION SURFACE

11 Flow actions

Plus one sync card that self-configures on 9 objects. No Apex to write to automate any of it.

SETUP

A 9-step wizard

Credentials through health, in-app. Step 4 probes the NetSuite account live and reports every expected record, script and saved search as present or missing.

CHANGES

Config, not code

Mapping rows are data. The editor reads real NetSuite fields over the connection, gates incompatible types before you can save, and bridges picklists with value maps.

SAFETY

Idempotent by design

Every record keys on its Salesforce id, so re-running a sync is safe and self-healing rather than a duplicate incident.

EVIDENCE

Every run audited

Each sync stores the exact payload sent and result returned, on a dashboard with status, source record links and error detail.

Speed: say "weeks, not quarters" and let the demo do the talking. We do not have a named customer time-to-live proof point yet, so do not invent one.

WHERE WE WIN · THE PROOF

What the CFO watches work in the first demo

Their own subsidiaries and accounts.
Not sample data. The reference layer syncs first, so the controller sees their own legal entities before anything else happens.

An invoice that ties to the penny.
Tax carried line by line so the NetSuite total matches the Salesforce total exactly. Controllers check this, and it is the moment the veto turns into a sponsor.

Obligations mirrored back onto the Salesforce contract.
Booked, Billed and Recognized visible to the seller without leaving Salesforce.

A journal entry that explains itself.
The line memo carries the item, the period and the position in the schedule. Evidence, not an import.

The audit trail, on a dashboard.
Every run with its payload, result and errors, and a deep link to the NetSuite record it created.

PROOF POINT · THE ESCAPE HATCH

+ Each obligation is 1:1 with a native ARM revenue element. When revenue gets complex, the customer graduates to native ARM **without a rebuild**. Start simple, bridge later.

PROOF POINT · THE HARD EVENTS

+ A mid-term downsell nets into its effective month. A three-year ramp collapses into one obligation and can recognize evenly across the term. These are the demo, because they are what the other camps cannot land.

PROOF POINT · THE ALLY

+ Every Continuous deal is an RCA deal. We grow the Salesforce revenue footprint while Camp A shrinks it and Camp B replaces it.

HEAD TO HEAD · MEASURED IN NETSUITE

Does it land in NetSuite as tied-out native records?

Measured as native NetSuite records	Continuous	Camp A · ERP billing	Camp B · QTC platform	Camp C · build it
Quoting and amendments stay in Salesforce	✓ Yes RCA owns the lifecycle end to end	✕ Moves to NetSuite	◑ Moves to their platform	✓ Yes
Multi-year ramp as one obligation	✓ Live ramp segments collapse into one obligation	◑ Line per segment	◑ No grouping on arrival	✕ Nothing to group into
Even spread across a ramp term	✓ Live flat per month instead of stepped	✕ No native counterpart	✕ No native counterpart	✕ No
Mid-term downsell posts and nets	✓ Live credit memo, day-weighted, prospective re-spread	◑ Via change order	✕ Document cannot go negative	✕ No
Prospective amendment, posted periods freeze	✓ Live no restatement, remainder re-spreads	◑ New line per change	◑ Only if lineage survives	✕ No
Usage recognized as billed	✓ Live	◑ Zone yes, SuiteBilling needs ETL	◑ In their engine	✕ No
Booked, Billed and Recognized tie out in NetSuite	✓ Live rolled to obligation and contract	✓ Native	✕ Standalone invoices leave Billed at $0	✕ No
Revenue subledger and audit trail live at the GL	✓ Yes	✓ Yes their genuine strength, concede it	✕ In their cloud	◑ Whatever gets built
Ships prebuilt, no mapping project	✓ 17 nodes shipped	◑ Billing yes, CRM link no	◑ Connector plus config	✕ The project is the product
Mapping changes are config, not code	✓ In-app editor	◑ Varies	◑ Varies	✕ Developer ticket

✓ Lands tied-out ◑ Partial or conditional ✕ Does not survive the handoff

Camp columns measure what arrives in NetSuite as tied-out native records, not what each product does inside its own system.

THE HONEST READ

Where they are genuinely ahead, and where we are thin

CAMP A IS GENUINELY AHEAD

- They keep the subledger at the GL with no second system, and they do not require RCA. ZoneBilling's usage mediation and consolidated cross-entity invoicing are real and mature. If the customer has no Salesforce revenue ambition, Camp A is a rational choice.

CAMP B IS GENUINELY AHEAD

- They are full quote-to-cash front ends with mature usage rating catalogs. We are not a CPQ or a billing front end. We ride on RCA and RCB, so if the customer is replacing their quoting stack, we are not the answer to that question.

WHERE WE ARE THIN

- The NetSuite half installs by CLI today, not click-to-install from SuiteApp. Retry is a pluggable seam, not a shipped retry engine. There is no unbilled receivable or contract-asset reclassification. Running one recognizer per contract is operator discipline, not a code guard.

KNOW BEFORE AN SE ASKS

- Native ARM element Billed reads $0 for contracts we bill, by design: billed visibility lives in our layer and the GL still nets correctly. And unless the native sales order option is on, NetSuite order-driven features like fulfillment, inventory and EDI have nothing to key off.

WHEN WE LOSE

The customer is not on RCA and will not move, or they are replacing their whole quoting stack and do not care where the books live, or NetSuite order operations, fulfillment and inventory are central to the business.

THE HARD DEPENDENCY, SAY IT EARLY

Continuous Control requires RCA and Billing. That is not a limitation to hide, it is the reason the Salesforce account team should be in the room. Never hedge this line.

THE COUNTER THAT SURVIVES ALL OF IT

Concede the front end, win the general ledger. The revenue still has to land in NetSuite and tie out, and that is exactly where every other camp's handoff breaks.

OBJECTION HANDLING · AIMED AT US

Landmines they will throw, and the counters

They say about us	We say
"Those are custom records, not native ARM."	Correct, and necessary. NetSuite has no native record for a Salesforce contract, obligation or billing period, and Oracle's docs say the revenue arrangement record is scriptable in server SuiteScript only. Every obligation maps 1:1 to a native ARM element, so graduating later is a switch, not a rebuild.
"You're a small vendor and this is early."	Fair. Which is why nothing here is a slide. Everything on this card is something you can watch run against their own data in the first demo, and every sync stores its exact payload and result for inspection.
"You require RCA, that's a big migration."	It is, and it is happening anyway. We give them a reason to do it now: the "our books are in NetSuite" problem is solved the day they move. We do not extend the life of legacy CPQ, and we never claim we can read it.
"That's another vendor in an already crowded stack."	It is two applications replacing an integration project and a billing purchase. Compare the vendor count honestly: Camp B adds a platform and a cloud, Camp C adds an SI and a middleware licence.
"Why not just bill in NetSuite?"	Then your sellers amend deals in the ERP. We keep the customer lifecycle in Salesforce and put the books in NetSuite, which is the only configuration where both teams get what they want.

RULES FOR EVERY SELLER CONVERSATION

1. Never knock RCA, RCB or the platform, we win when it wins. · 2. Never present native NetSuite billing as a normal option. · 3. Never hedge the CPQ line, "requires RCA" is absolute. · 4. Never pitch Command against Salesforce's own rating or billing, it feeds RCB. · 5. Talk deals, not architecture: the veto, the attach, the displacement. The sync engine is proof, not pitch.

Camp A moves your sales team into the ERP. Camp B keeps the subledger in their cloud. We put the deal in Salesforce and the books in NetSuite.

Nobody else offers all three at once: the lifecycle stays with the seller, the subledger stays at the general ledger, and there is no mapping project in between.

Find the camp first → Qualify on where revenue is recognized → Concede the front end, win the GL →

RCA ally, not RCA replacement

Competitor facts researched July 2026 from primary sources: Oracle NetSuite documentation, zoneandco.com, suiteapp.com, Moss Adams acquisition press (Feb 2025), nue.io, dealhub.io including the Subskribe acquisition FAQ (19 Nov 2025), and subskribe.com. "Verified" means confirmed from those sources or from our own build; "vendor claim" is quoted but not independently validated; anything unconfirmed is marked do-not-assert rather than softened. Continuous Control figures are counted from the shipping package.