

0.7

Pancake Hunny Process Quality Review

Overview

This is a [Pancake Hunny](#) Process Quality Review completed on September 1st 2021. It was performed using the Process Review process (version 0.7.3) and is documented [here](#). The review was performed by Nic of DeFiSafety. Check out our [Telegram](#).

The final score of the review is **34%**, a **FAIL**. The breakdown of the scoring is in [Scoring Appendix](#). For our purposes, a pass is **70%**.

Summary of the Process

Very simply, the review looks for the following declarations from the developer's site. With these declarations, it is reasonable to trust the smart contracts.

- **Here are my smart contracts on the blockchain**
- **Here is the documentation that explains what my smart contracts do**
- **Here are the tests I ran to verify my smart contract**
- **Here are the audit(s) performed on my code by third party experts**
- **Here are the admin controls and strategies**

Disclaimer

This report is for informational purposes only and does not constitute investment advice of any kind, nor does it constitute an offer to provide investment advisory or other services. Nothing in this report shall be considered a solicitation or offer to buy or sell any security, token, future, option or other financial instrument or to offer or provide any investment advice or service to any person in any jurisdiction. Nothing contained in this report constitutes investment advice or offers any opinion with respect to the suitability of any security, and the views expressed in this report should not be taken as advice to buy, sell or hold any security. The information in this report should not be relied upon for the purpose of investing. In preparing the information contained in this report, we have not taken into account the investment needs, objectives and financial circumstances of any particular investor. This information has no regard to the specific investment objectives, financial situation and particular needs of any specific recipient of this information and investments discussed may not be suitable for all investors.

Any views expressed in this report by us were prepared based upon the information available to us at the time such views were written. The views expressed within this report are limited to DeFiSafety and the author and do not reflect those of any additional or third party and are strictly based upon DeFiSafety, its authors, interpretations and evaluation of relevant data. Changed or additional information could cause such

views to change. All information is subject to possible correction. Information may quickly become unreliable for various reasons, including changes in market conditions or economic circumstances.

This completed report is copyright (c) DeFiSafety 2021. Permission is given to copy in whole, retaining this copyright label.

Chain

This section indicates the blockchain used by this protocol.

✓ **Chain:** Binance Smart Chain

Guidance:

Ethereum
Binance Smart Chain
Polygon
Avalanche
Terra

Code and Team

This section looks at the code deployed on the Mainnet that gets reviewed and its corresponding software repository. The document explaining these questions is [here](#). This review will answer the following questions:

- 1) Are the executing code addresses readily available? (%)
- 2) Is the code actively being used? (%)
- 3) Is there a public software repository? (Y/N)
- 4) Is there a development history visible? (%)
- 5) Is the team public (not anonymous)? (Y/N)

1) Are the executing code addresses readily available? (%)

✓ **Answer:** 100%

They are available at website <https://docs.pancakehunny.finance/security/contracts>, as indicated in the [Appendix](#).

Guidance:

100% Clearly labelled and on website, docs or repo, quick to find
70% Clearly labelled and on website, docs or repo but takes a bit of looking

- 40% Addresses in mainnet.json, in discord or sub graph, etc
- 20% Address found but labeling not clear or easy to find
- 0% Executing addresses could not be found

2) Is the code actively being used? (%)

✓ Answer: 100%

Activity is over 10 transactions a day on contract [HunnyPool.sol](#) (Staking contract), as indicated in the [Appendix](#).

Guidance:

- 100% More than 10 transactions a day
- 70% More than 10 transactions a week
- 40% More than 10 transactions a month
- 10% Less than 10 transactions a month
- 0% No activity

3) Is there a public software repository? (Y/N)

✓ Answer: Yes

GitHub: <https://github.com/pancakehunny/hunny>.

Is there a public software repository with the code at a minimum, but also normally test and scripts. Even if the repository was created just to hold the files and has just 1 transaction, it gets a **"Yes"**. For teams with private repositories, this answer is **"No"**.

4) Is there a development history visible? (%)

⚠ Answer: 0%

With 2 commits and 1 branch, this is a minimally developed software repository.

This metric checks if the software repository demonstrates a strong steady history. This is normally demonstrated by commits, branches and releases in a software repository. A healthy history demonstrates a history of more than a month (at a minimum).

Guidance:

- 100% Any one of 100+ commits, 10+branches
- 70% Any one of 70+ commits, 7+branches

50%	Any one of 50+ commits, 5+branches
30%	Any one of 30+ commits, 3+branches
0%	Less than 2 branches or less than 30 commits

How to improve this score:

Continue to test and perform other verification activities after deployment, including routine maintenance updating to new releases of testing and deployment tools. A public development history indicates clearly to the public the level of continued investment and activity by the developers on the application. This gives a level of security and faith in the application.

5) Is the team public (not anonymous)? (Y/N)

 **Answer:** No

For a "Yes" in this question, the real names of some team members must be public on the website or other documentation (LinkedIn, etc). If the team is anonymous, then this question is a "No".

Documentation

This section looks at the software documentation. The document explaining these questions is [here](#).

Required questions are;

- 6) Is there a whitepaper? (Y/N)
- 7) Are the basic software functions documented? (Y/N)
- 8) Does the software function documentation fully (100%) cover the deployed contracts? (%)
- 9) Are there sufficiently detailed comments for all functions within the deployed contract code (%)
- 10) Is it possible to trace from software documentation to the implementation in code (%)

6) Is there a whitepaper? (Y/N)

 **Answer:** Yes

Location: <https://docs.pancakehunny.finance/>.

7) Are the basic software functions documented? (Y/N)

 **Answer:** No

There are no software functions documented in the Pancake Hunny documentation.

How to improve this score:

Write the document based on the deployed code. For guidance, refer to the [SecurEth System Description Document](#).

8) Does the software function documentation fully (100%) cover the deployed contracts? (%)

 **Answer:** 0%

There are no software functions documented in the Pancake Hunny documentation.

Guidance:

- 100% All contracts and functions documented
- 80% Only the major functions documented
- 79-1% Estimate of the level of software documentation
- 0% No software documentation

How to improve this score:

This score can be improved by adding content to the software functions document such that it comprehensively covers the requirements. For guidance, refer to the [SecurEth System Description Document](#). Using tools that aid traceability detection will help.

9) Are there sufficiently detailed comments for all functions within the deployed contract code (%)

 **Answer:** 0%

Code examples are in the [Appendix](#). As per the [SLOC](#), there is 21% commenting to code (CtC).

The Comments to Code (CtC) ratio is the primary metric for this score.

Note: A majority of the comments in the Pancake Hunny code is the copyright disclaimer that exists in most of their authored files. Therefore, without them, they get below a 20%, meaning 0% for this metric.

Guidance:

- 100% CtC > 100 Useful comments consistently on all code
- 90-70% CtC > 70 Useful comment on most code
- 60-20% CtC > 20 Some useful commenting
- 0% CtC < 20 No useful commenting

How to improve this score