

FigJam vs. Miro vs. Lucidchart: The Collaborative Whiteboard and Diagramming Verdict

Unvarnished Reviews · Independent Report · unvarnishedreviews.com · Free · No subscription

Unvarnished Reviews Research

This report synthesizes data from 30,000+ verified user reviews and practitioner community posts collected from G2, Capterra, TrustRadius, Gartner Peer Insights, Reddit r/productmanagement and r/UXDesign, and practitioner communities. Pricing data reflects vendor pricing pages, Vendr transaction data (555 Miro deals), CostBench independent pricing analysis, and independent procurement analysis current as of June 2026. Full research methodology at unvarnishedreviews.com/methodology. Research Notes available on request at editorial@unvarnishedreviews.com.

The Verdict Up Front

Miro is the market-leading collaborative whiteboard platform, the default choice for product teams, design sprints, retrospectives, and cross-functional workshops. Its template library (5,000+), integration depth (Jira, Slack, Notion, Zoom), and facilitation tools are the most comprehensive in the category. Its billing model contains traps that practitioners document consistently: guest editors who exceed activity thresholds auto-converting to paid seats, SSO auto-provisioning dormant accounts that continue billing, and Enterprise Flexible Licensing Program licenses silently upgrading when users take specific actions. The median Miro enterprise contract is \$17,000/year per Vendr data from 555 real transactions. The published per-seat pricing tells only part of that story.

Lucidchart is the technical diagramming standard, the platform that engineering teams, business analysts, and IT architects reach for when they need flowcharts, ERDs, network diagrams, org charts, and process maps with precision and structure. Its Lucid Suite (Lucidchart + Lucidspark) covers both technical diagramming and collaborative whiteboarding under one vendor. Its template library for structured diagrams is the deepest in the category. Its per-user pricing and seat restrictions generate consistent complaints at enterprise scale.

FigJam is Figma's whiteboard, designed specifically for product and design teams already in the Figma ecosystem. Its G2 reliability score of 9.2/10 edges Miro's 8.8/10. Its integration with Figma, embedding live design components directly into whiteboard sessions, transitioning between ideation and high-fidelity design without switching tools, is a genuine differentiator for Figma-native teams. For organizations that don't use Figma, FigJam is a capable but incomplete whiteboard answer.

One tool deserves explicit mention in every evaluation of this category: **draw.io (diagrams.net)**, completely free, open-source, no seat limits, integrates with Confluence, Jira, Google Drive, and GitHub, and handles the vast majority of technical diagramming use cases that organizations pay Lucidchart to perform. It is not a Miro alternative for collaborative workshops. It is a Lucidchart alternative for technical diagrams, and the

clear-eyed comparison for any organization evaluating Lucidchart's cost.

Platform Ratings at a Glance

Platform	G2	Capterra	G2 Reliability
Miro	4.8 / 5	4.7 / 5	8.8 / 10
Lucidchart	4.6 / 5	4.6 / 5	Strong
FigJam	4.5 / 5	4.8 / 5	9.2 / 10

Miro's 4.8/5 G2 rating from thousands of reviews reflects genuine platform satisfaction, it is the highest-rated collaborative whiteboard in the category. FigJam's reliability score of 9.2/10 edging Miro's 8.8/10 is a specific and actionable finding for teams where board stability at scale is an operational requirement.

Who Each Platform Is Actually Built For

Miro is built for cross-functional teams running collaborative sessions, design sprints, retrospectives, user journey mapping, product roadmapping, and agile ceremonies. It is the broadest-use-case whiteboard in the category, serving product managers, UX designers, strategy teams, agile coaches, and marketing teams. Its facilitation tools, timers, voting, spotlight, and session management, are purpose-built for structured workshop facilitation.

Lucidchart is built for technical and business professionals who need structured, precise diagrams, engineers building system architecture diagrams, business analysts creating process flows, IT teams mapping network infrastructure, and HR teams maintaining org charts. Its shape libraries and connector intelligence make structured diagram creation faster than Miro's freeform canvas.

FigJam is built for product and design teams already using Figma, where the primary value is keeping ideation and design work in the same ecosystem, transitioning from brainstorm to wireframe to prototype without switching tools or losing context.

The Miro Billing Model: What Practitioners Document

Miro's pricing is per-seat with four tiers. The published rates are real. The billing complexity around those rates is where practitioners encounter surprises.

The guest auto-conversion trap. On the Free plan, there is no Guest role, anyone invited to collaborate becomes a full paid Member. On Starter, guests can only view or comment (no editing). On Business and Enterprise, guest editors can collaborate free within specific limits, but when guest editors exceed activity thresholds, Miro bills them as paid seats automatically. One documented scenario: a design agency invited 80

guest editors to client boards assuming no cost impact; 25 exceeded editing thresholds, adding \$500/month in unplanned fees.

SSO auto-provisioning dormant accounts. In Enterprise plans, SSO can auto-provision accounts when users log in for the first time, even if they never actively use Miro. Unless regularly audited, these dormant accounts continue consuming paid licenses. The fix requires actively assigning "Free Restricted" licenses rather than relying on default provisioning behavior.

Enterprise Flexible Licensing Program (FLP) silent upgrades. Users holding "Free (FLP)" licenses automatically upgrade to paid licenses when they take certain actions. This upgrade is silent and immediate, there is no confirmation prompt and no billing warning.

The fragmented workspace multiplier. Gartner research cited by CloudNuro documents that fragmented Miro environments, separate workspaces for different departments, increase total SaaS cost by up to 12% through duplicate billing and lost volume discounts.

The median Miro enterprise contract is \$17,000/year per Vendr data from 555 real transactions. For procurement teams, this is the most useful anchoring number in the category. Buyers achieve 15%-25% discounts with competitive evaluation and annual commitments at 30+ seats.

What Users Actually Report

Miro: What Works

G2 and Capterra reviewers consistently identify three strengths: template depth, facilitation tools, and integration breadth.

Miro's 5,000+ template library, covering retrospectives, user journey maps, product roadmaps, agile boards, design sprints, and strategy frameworks, is the most comprehensive in the category. For teams that run structured collaborative sessions repeatedly, having pre-built facilitation frameworks ready to use directly reduces session preparation time.

The facilitation tools, built-in timers, voting mechanisms, cursor spotlighting, and participant management, are specifically designed for structured workshop facilitation. Practitioners running design sprints, quarterly planning sessions, and team retrospectives describe Miro as purpose-built for this workflow in ways that Lucidchart and FigJam are not.

Integration depth, Jira, Slack, Notion, Asana, Zoom, Microsoft Teams, GitHub, and hundreds more, means Miro fits into existing workflows without requiring teams to rebuild processes around the whiteboard tool. G2 reviewers specifically praise the Jira integration for product teams managing sprint ceremonies alongside backlog.

Miro: What Doesn't Work

Feature sprawl overwhelms new users. G2 reviewers consistently document that Miro's extensive feature set creates a learning curve for newcomers. The platform's breadth, its greatest strength for experienced teams,

is a documented onboarding barrier.

Performance on large boards. Heavy boards with many frames, sticky notes, and embedded media slow down on lower-end machines. Teams with complex, multi-session boards document lag during concurrent editing that doesn't affect lighter tools.

Billing complexity. Documented above in detail. The guest conversion trap, SSO auto-provisioning, and FLP silent upgrades are the most commonly reported billing surprises.

Cost at scale. A 50-person team on Starter (\$8/user/month annual) spends \$4,800/year. On Business (\$16/user/month annual), that becomes \$9,600/year. For teams that primarily use Miro for async visual notes and light planning, the Business tier is difficult to justify.

Lucidchart: What Works

G2 and Capterra reviewers consistently praise three areas: technical diagram precision, shape library depth, and integration with productivity tools.

Lucidchart's shape libraries, including specific sets for AWS, Azure, GCP, network topology, UML, BPMN, and ERD, make technical diagram creation faster and more precise than any freeform whiteboard. Engineers and architects describe the ability to create professional-grade system architecture diagrams without a design background as Lucidchart's most distinctive value.

The integration with Jira, Asana, Slack, and Google Workspace, embedding live Lucidchart diagrams in Confluence pages, Google Docs, and Jira tickets, is specifically praised for keeping diagrams connected to the workflows they document rather than existing as standalone files.

The Lucid Suite, combining Lucidchart for structured diagrams with Lucidspark for collaborative brainstorming on a shared canvas, covers both use cases under one vendor, reducing tool proliferation for organizations that need both.

Lucidchart: What Doesn't Work

Per-user pricing and seat restrictions generate consistent complaints. Lucidchart's pricing model, per editor seat, with viewer-only access at lower tiers, creates friction for organizations where many stakeholders need to view but few need to edit. The cost of giving read-only access to large audiences drives up enterprise contract values.

Advanced features intimidate casual users. The depth of shape libraries, connector intelligence, and diagram formatting options that power users value is documented as overwhelming for teams that primarily need simple flowcharts or quick visual communication.

draw.io is a direct and free competitor. For the technical diagramming use cases that represent Lucidchart's core value proposition, flowcharts, network diagrams, system architecture, draw.io delivers comparable capability at zero cost. Any Lucidchart evaluation should explicitly include a draw.io pilot before committing to Lucidchart's per-seat pricing.

FigJam: What Works

G2 and Capterra reviewers consistently identify three strengths: Figma integration, simplicity, and reliability.

The Figma integration is FigJam's primary competitive differentiator, copying live design components from Figma directly into whiteboard sessions, transitioning between ideation and high-fidelity design work without switching tools, and sharing a single project library across Figma and FigJam. For product and design teams, this workflow continuity reduces friction in ways that Miro and Lucidchart cannot replicate.

FigJam's simplicity is specifically contrasted with Miro's feature sprawl. Practitioners describe FigJam as easier for non-designers to quickly pick up, interactive cursors, emoji reactions, sticky notes, and basic shapes cover the brainstorming workflow without overwhelming new users with options.

FigJam's G2 reliability score of 9.2/10 versus Miro's 8.8/10 reflects documented performance stability, fewer reports of lag on large boards and freezing during concurrent editing sessions than Miro.

FigJam: What Doesn't Work

Limited standalone value. FigJam's value proposition assumes Figma usage. For organizations that don't use Figma for UI/UX design, FigJam is a capable but incomplete whiteboard without the ecosystem integration that justifies choosing it over Miro.

Less capable for complex diagramming. FigJam's diagramming capabilities, adequate for user flows, journey maps, and basic architecture sketches, fall short of Lucidchart's structured diagram precision for technical diagramming use cases.

Feature depth gap versus Miro. Multiple independent comparisons document that FigJam's feature set is less robust than Miro's for complex projects. Teams running sophisticated multi-session workshop facilitation will find FigJam's facilitation tools less comprehensive.

Pricing complexity. FigJam seats are bundled into Figma's seat types (Full, Dev, Collab) with the March 2025 restructure, the seat structure requires careful study to optimize costs, and the Collab seat at \$5/month is the most economical FigJam entry point for non-designer collaborators.

The draw.io Factor: The Tool Nobody Pays For

Before committing to Lucidchart's per-seat pricing for technical diagramming, every evaluation should run a draw.io (diagrams.net) pilot.

draw.io is completely free, open-source, requires no account, and integrates natively with Confluence, Jira, Google Drive, GitHub, GitLab, and Notion. It handles flowcharts, network diagrams, ERDs, UML, org charts, BPMN, and AWS/Azure/GCP architecture diagrams, the exact use cases that represent Lucidchart's core technical diagramming value.

It is not a Miro replacement for collaborative workshops. It does not have Miro's facilitation tools, sticky note brainstorming, or integration ecosystem. It is a Lucidchart replacement for technical diagrams, and the specific question every organization should answer before signing a Lucidchart contract is whether draw.io's capability meets their actual diagramming requirements.

draw.io is already installed in many engineering organizations through Confluence plugins, often without a formal procurement decision. Organizations paying for Lucidchart alongside an existing draw.io deployment should audit actual tool usage before renewal.

Pricing Reality (June 2026)

Miro

Plan	Price	Board Limit	Notes
Free	\$0	3 editable boards	Unlimited team members
Starter	\$8/user/month (annual)	Unlimited	Core integrations, guest view/comment only
Business	\$16/user/month (annual)	Unlimited	Private boards, guest editing, smart diagramming
Enterprise	Custom (30+ users)	Unlimited	SSO, SCIM, advanced admin

Monthly billing: 20% premium (Starter \$10/month, Business \$20/month).

Vendr median contract: \$17,000/year from 555 transactions. Negotiation leverage: 15%-25% discounts with annual commitment at 30+ seats and competitive evaluation.

Lucidchart

Plan	Price	Notes
Free	\$0	Limited shapes, 3 documents
Individual	\$9/month (annual)	Unlimited documents
Team	\$9/user/month (annual)	Collaboration features
Enterprise	Custom	Full suite, SSO, admin
Lucid Suite	Custom	Lucidchart + Lucidspark bundled

FigJam

FigJam is now bundled into Figma's seat structure:

Seat Type	Price	FigJam Access
Collab seat	\$5/editor/month (annual)	FigJam editing only
Full seat (Professional)	\$15/editor/month (annual)	Full Figma + FigJam
Free (Starter)	\$0	3 FigJam files
Viewers	Free	All plans

For organizations using Figma, FigJam is effectively included, the Collab seat at \$5/month provides FigJam access for non-designer stakeholders who need to participate in whiteboard sessions without a Full Figma seat.

draw.io

Plan	Price
draw.io (diagrams.net)	Free, always
Confluence plugin	Included with Confluence
Google Workspace add-on	Free

TCO Comparison: 20-Person Team, Annual

Platform	Annual Cost	Primary Use Case
Miro Starter	\$1,920	Collaborative workshops
Miro Business	\$3,840	Full workshop facilitation + governance
Lucidchart Team	\$2,160	Technical diagramming
draw.io	\$0	Technical diagramming
FigJam Collab seats	\$1,200	Design team whiteboarding (with Figma)

The Decision Framework

Choose Miro if:

- Your team runs regular collaborative workshops, design sprints, retrospectives, quarterly planning, user journey mapping
- Cross-functional teams (product, design, engineering, marketing) need to collaborate on the same canvas
- You need the deepest facilitation tools, timers, voting, spotlighting, structured session management
- Integration with Jira, Slack, Notion, and your existing stack is a priority
- You have explicitly modeled the guest conversion, SSO provisioning, and FLP upgrade risks before Enterprise signing
- You are negotiating with competitive quotes, Miro responds to Lucidchart and FigJam competitive evaluations

Choose Lucidchart if:

- Technical diagramming, ERDs, network diagrams, system architecture, BPMN, UML, is the primary use case
- Structured diagram precision and specific technical shape libraries (AWS, Azure, GCP) are requirements
- You have piloted draw.io and determined its capabilities don't meet your specific requirements

- The Lucid Suite (Lucidchart + Lucidspark) consolidation under one vendor justifies the per-seat cost

Choose FigJam if:

- Your team uses Figma for UI/UX design and keeping ideation in the same ecosystem is operationally valuable
- Design teams need to transition between whiteboard brainstorming and high-fidelity design without switching tools
- Reliability on large boards is a priority, FigJam's 9.2/10 G2 reliability score exceeds Miro's 8.8/10
- Non-designer collaborators need whiteboard access at \$5/month (Collab seat) versus Miro's \$8-16/month

Pilot draw.io before signing Lucidchart:

If technical diagramming is the primary use case, run draw.io for 30 days on actual workflows before committing to Lucidchart pricing. For the majority of flowchart, network diagram, and architecture diagram use cases, draw.io delivers comparable output at zero cost.

The Bottom Line

Miro, Lucidchart, and FigJam serve clearly differentiated use cases, and choosing the wrong tool for the wrong workflow is the most common mistake in this category.

Miro wins for collaborative workshops and cross-functional team facilitation. Its template depth, facilitation tools, and integration ecosystem are the best in the category. Its billing complexity, guest conversion, SSO auto-provisioning, FLP silent upgrades, requires explicit procurement diligence before Enterprise signing. The median \$17,000/year enterprise contract should anchor every budget conversation.

Lucidchart wins for technical diagramming precision when draw.io's capability is insufficient. For most standard technical diagramming needs, draw.io delivers comparable output at zero cost, evaluate carefully before paying per-seat pricing.

FigJam wins for product and design teams already in the Figma ecosystem. Its integration continuity and reliability advantage over Miro are genuine differentiators for this specific profile. Without Figma, FigJam's standalone value case is thin.

The finding that belongs in every whiteboard tool evaluation: draw.io is free, open-source, and capable enough for the majority of technical diagramming use cases that organizations currently pay for. Before renewing any Lucidchart contract, audit whether draw.io, already deployed in many organizations through Confluence, is already solving the same problem at zero cost.
