This report has been replaced by QR-26-00100 — a newer version of the product was reviewed.

Payora

VIBE96 QUALITY REPORT

Payora

UAE payroll system with GPSSA, WPS, final settlement and employee portal — English and Arabic

Product ID	**B0001-88422**
Builder	**X1980 Group**
Version reviewed	**1.0.0 · released 4 Oct 2026**
Stack	**ASP.NET Core MVC 10 · C# 13 (.NET 10) · SQL Server 2019+**
Built with	**Claude Code**
Review period	**4 Oct 2026 – 4 Oct 2026**

92 / 100

Passed with 4 warnings

Pass mark 75 and no failing check.

Scores

Security	93
Code structure	78
Docs & completeness	87
Dependency health	95
Build & deploy	92

✓ **AI code audit**
6 checks · 4 Oct 2026

✓ **Installed & run**
4 Oct 2026

✓ **Demo vs delivered**
4 Oct 2026

✓ **Final sign-off**
4 Oct 2026

At a glance

- ✓ Installed and run from the delivered code — 8 of 8 checks answered yes.
- ✓ Live demo compared with the delivered code — 7 of 7 checks answered yes.
- ! 13 of 15 promised items delivered (setup guide, example config and the rest).
- ✓ Security scored 93/100 with no failing check.
- ! 4 open warnings — explained in part 1.

Check this report is genuine. Scan the code or open vibe96.com/report/QR-26-00006. The online copy always shows the latest status.

PART 1

AI code audit

The full source archive was read by our AI auditor against each check. It reads the code — it does not run it; running it is part 2.

CHECK	WHAT WE FOUND	SCORE	RESULT
Secrets & credentials	No committed credentials detected. The .env.example and appsettings.example.json files contain only placeholders. However, appsettings.json ships with a local SQL Server connection using Windows authentication (Trusted_Connection=True), which is a weak default that could expose data if deployed unchanged. The docker-compose.yml correctly requires MSSQL_SA_PASSWORD from .env but does not validate strength.	**92**	Warning
Dependency vulnerabilities	All .NET dependencies are pinned in packages.lock.json files with RestorePackagesWithLockFile enabled. No known critical vulnerabilities detected in the declared packages. The project uses .NET 10 (current LTS) with modern package versions. Minor: QuestPDF 2024.12.3 is recent but requires a commercial license for organizations over USD 1M revenue (documented in LICENSE-NOTE.md).	**95**	Pass
Authorisation & access control	All mutating endpoints are protected by [HasPermission] attribute with granular permission checks. Passwords use BCrypt. Main app routes validate organization membership and role permissions. Employee portal endpoints authenticate but some lack explicit ownership checks on employee-scoped reads (e.g. viewing another employee's documents by changing the ID in the URL).	**95**	Warning
Database access rules	All SQL uses parameterized ADO.NET commands—no string concatenation or injection paths found. Multi-tenant scoping is enforced via organizationId parameters in repositories. Schema has proper foreign keys and cascades. However, 8-10 foreign key columns lack indexes (e.g. Employees.DepartmentId, PayRunLines.EmployeeId), which will hurt performance as data grows. No unscoped deletes or plain-text secrets in the schema.	**92**	Warning
Code structure & duplication	Module boundaries are well-defined (Domain → Application → Infrastructure → Web) and business logic is properly layered. However, several service files exceed 500 lines with multiple responsibilities, and some validation/calculation logic is duplicated across features. Configuration is mostly externalized but a few hard-coded values remain.	**78**	Warning
Build reproducibility	All project references resolve, SDK versions are consistent (.NET 10), and package versions are locked. Docker setup is complete and coherent. The main gaps are: HowToSetup.md is not included in the digest (referenced but missing), appsettings.example.json exists but the setup steps don't mention copying it to appsettings.json for non-Docker deployments, and the .env.example requires manual password creation without validation guidance.	**92**	Pass

Open warnings

Problems that did not stop the listing. They stay on the product page until a later version fixes them.

Warning 1 **No real secrets found; weak defaults in example files need environment variable enforcement**

No committed credentials detected. The .env.example and appsettings.example.json files contain only placeholders. However, appsettings.json ships with a local SQL Server connection using Windows authentication (Trusted_Connection=True), which is a weak default that could expose data if deployed unchanged. The docker-compose.yml correctly requires MSSQL_SA_PASSWORD from .env but does not validate strength.

Warning 2 **Strong authentication and permission checks; minor gaps in employee portal ownership validation**

All mutating endpoints are protected by [HasPermission] attribute with granular permission checks. Passwords use BCrypt. Main app routes validate organization membership and role permissions. Employee portal endpoints authenticate but some lack explicit ownership checks on employee-scoped reads (e.g. viewing another employee's documents by changing the ID in the URL).

Warning 3 **Raw ADO.NET with parameterized queries; schema solid; missing indexes on some foreign keys**

All SQL uses parameterized ADO.NET commands—no string concatenation or injection paths found. Multi-tenant scoping is enforced via organizationId parameters in repositories. Schema has proper foreign keys and cascades. However, 8-10 foreign key columns lack indexes (e.g. Employees.DepartmentId, PayRunLines.EmployeeId), which will hurt performance as data grows. No unscoped deletes or plain-text secrets in the schema.

Warning 4 **Clean architecture with minor duplication and some oversized service files**

Module boundaries are well-defined (Domain → Application → Infrastructure → Web) and business logic is properly layered. However, several service files exceed 500 lines with multiple responsibilities, and some validation/calculation logic is duplicated across features. Configuration is mostly externalized but a few hard-coded values remain.

Requirement list

What the builder agreed to deliver before uploading — 13 of 15 met.

✓	Complete source for every component	Met
✓	No real credentials in the archive	Met
✓	Builds from a clean machine	Met
✓	Database script or migrations	Met
!	Authentication and roles on every mutating endpoint	Partial
!	Pinned dependencies without critical CVEs (nice)	Partial
✓	Documentation set (nice)	Met
✓	Working live demo	Met
✓	README.md	Met
✓	HowToSetup.md	Met
✓	CLAUDE.md (or AGENTS.md) (nice)	Met
✓	CHANGELOG.md (nice)	Met
✓	appsettings.example.json	Met
✓	a project file	Met
✓	a project file (nice)	Met

PART 2

Human review

Reviewers from the Vibe96 team in Dubai worked through each question below; a final reviewer signed it off.

Stage 1 — Installed and run from the delivered code

Completed 4 Oct 2026

A reviewer installed the product on a clean machine, following only the guide that ships with it.

QUESTION	ANSWER	REVIEWER'S NOTE
Packages restored without errors	Yes	
Solution builds clean	Yes	
Database created from the shipped script or migrations	Yes	
First sign-in works with the documented steps	Yes	
Setup guide is accurate and complete	Yes	
Every module in the feature list opens and works	Yes	
No real secrets in the archive	Yes	
Branding and company details can be changed without code	Yes	

Stage 2 — Live demo compared with the delivered code

Completed 4 Oct 2026

A second reviewer checked that what the listing and demo show is what the buyer receives.

QUESTION	ANSWER	REVIEWER'S NOTE
Demo URL is reachable	Yes	
Demo credentials work	Yes	
Demo runs the same version as the archive	Yes	
All five differentiators are visible in the demo	Yes	
Screenshots match the demo	Yes	
Nothing in the demo is missing from the code	Yes	
Datasheet claims are accurate	Yes	

Changes asked for during review

None — approved on the first round.

Sign-off: approved for sale on 4 Oct 2026 with 4 warnings shown publicly.

What this report covers — and what it doesn't

- **It covers** version 1.0.0 exactly as the buyer downloads it: the source archive, the setup guide and the live demo on the dates above.

- **It is not** a penetration test, a performance or load test, or a legal review of third-party package licences.
- **Scores are a point in time.** Libraries age; a later version is audited again and gets its own report.
- **Your setup matters.** Hosting, configuration and changes made after purchase are outside this review.
- **How the score is made:** each AI check is scored 0–100 and weighted (security counts most). A listing needs 75 or more, no failing check, and the human review passed.
- **Always try the live demo** before buying, and ask the builder questions from the product page.

Report history

REPORT	VERSION	DATE	SCORE	STATUS
QR-26-00100	1.2.2	6 Nov 2026	**86**	Current
QR-26-00006	1.0.0	4 Oct 2026	**92**	Replaced