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Check online @ www.observatoire-cartes.fr
The need for public intervention

■ The merge of the two leading domestic card schemes in the mid-80’s and the push for card acceptance at merchants led to a wide adoption of cards as a payment instrument
  ✓ Security a key element to the development of card payments

■ Despite Chip & PIN introduced in France in 1992, security issues arose around the security of payment cards
  ✓ Got media attention in the late 90’s / 2000
  ✓ Endangered public confidence in cards

■ The French legislator took concrete measures (Everyday Security Act – 2001)
  ✓ Banque de France had its oversight mandate extended to payment instruments
  ✓ Creation of an Observatory aimed at ensuring the security of card payments, with all stakeholders involved
Banque de France extended oversight over payment instruments

- **All payment instrument issuers covered**
  - Includes issuing, administering and outsourcing of means of payments

- **Offsite/onsite inspections of all relevant entities**
  - Including technical providers / vendors

- **Close cooperation with the banking supervisor**
  - **Annual reports** from licensed entities on operational risk
  - The EU Payment Services and e-money Directives introduced new categories of payment service providers alongside banks
  - As part of the licensing process under the supervisor’s responsibility, Banque de France delivers an **official statement on security of payment services and instruments**
The French Observatory for Payment Card Security

- **Chaired by the Governor of Banque de France**
  - Members: MP, Senator, representatives for issuers, acquirers, schemes, merchants, consumers and government bodies
  - Bound by professional secrecy
  - Secretariat: Banque de France

- **Three missions**
  - Elaborating fraud statistics
  - Ensuring a technology watch and issuing recommendations
  - Following closely security measures deployed by issuers/banks and merchants

- **Annual report published online (in July)**
The Observatory’s internal organisation (1)

The working group on statistics

■ **Composition** :
  – Defined by the Observatory by absolute majority,
  – Relies on technical experts delegated by the Observatory members.

■ **Missions** :
  – Issues guidelines aimed at harmonising procedures for establishing fraud statistics for the various types of payment cards,
  – Compiles statistics on fraud on the basis of the relevant information disclosed by payment card issuers to the Observatory's secretariat,
  – Covers cards issued by payment service providers or other assimilated entities, that serve to withdraw or transfer funds.

■ **Current focus** :
  – Statistics related to 3D-Secure implementation (on the acquiring side) and 2FA mechanisms using this protocol,
  – Contactless payments.


The working group on technology watch

■ **Composition:**
  - Similar to the working group on statistics,
  - May hear relevant stakeholders able to provide information useful to its mandate.

■ **Missions:**
  - Maintains a technology watch in the card payments field, with the aim of proposing measures to increase or maintain their security,
  - Collects all the available information that is liable to reinforce payment card security and puts it at the disposal of its members,
  - Organises the exchange of information between its members while respecting confidentiality where necessary.
The Observatory’s internal organisation (3)

The working group on technology watch

Main studies since 2002:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General topics</th>
<th>Security of innovations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up of the EMV migration in the SEPA area</td>
<td>Security of prepaid cards (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of co-branding on payment card security (2008)</td>
<td><strong>Terminals</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual report & Follow-up

■ Structure:
  – A specific case study
    → In 2010 and 2011, costs analysis related to the migrations to EMV and 2FA
    → Since 2012, stocktaking regarding the deployment of 2FA
  – Chapters on statistics and technology watch, incl. recommendations
  – A dedicated chapter of general interest drafted by the Secretariat
    → In 2011, security issues related to the emergence of a new European card payment scheme
    → In 2013, protection of personal data in fraud prevention systems

■ Adoption:
  – during the June Plenary meeting,
  – by absolute majority.

■ Publication:
  – Annual release at the beginning of July (FR version, EN in September),
  – Press conference (w/ Q&A) held by the President.

■ Follow-up of recommendations ensured by Banque de France
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Card payment landscape in France

Payments in FR / 2014 (volume)

- Direct debits: 19%
- Credit transfers: 18%
- Cheques: 13%
- Others: 0%
- e-money: 0%
- Cards: 50%

Payments in Euro area / 2013

- FR: 27%
- DE: 29%
- IT: 7%
- NL: 9%
- ES: 9%
- Other: 19%
Card payment landscape in France

(2)
Card payment fraud (1)
Card payment fraud (2)

Share of domestic (FR/FR) vs. international (FR/ET, ET/FR) fraud

(EMV in Europe) (CNP) + (EMV outside EU)
Focus on international fraud:

- Cards issued in France and frauded in SEPA or beyond (ET)
- Cards from SEPA or beyond and frauded in France
Card payment fraud (4)

Breakdown of domestic fraud

CNP Internet:
65.3% of total fraud
(11.3% of total tx)

Proximity:
16% of total fraud
(66% of total tx)

Slight increase in fraud on cash withdrawals
Card payment fraud (5)

Focus on domestic fraud rates

Fraud rates CNP Internet vs. Total

Police forces indicators: number of attacks on acceptance devices

Fraud rates Total vs. Proximity and Cash withdrawals

Focus on domestic fraud rates
Card payment fraud (6)
Card payment fraud (7)
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## Summary of main threats and recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of risk</th>
<th>Recommended measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counterfeiting</strong></td>
<td>Insert hologram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use cryptographic processes to identify components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification of components (card, terminal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft</strong></td>
<td>Market-wide introduction of EMV standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authenticate cardholders using PIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set thresholds for transactions in contactless and prepaid mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use fraud detection systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compromise of card data</strong></td>
<td>Implement anti-phishing measures, conduct communication campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect data end to end (encryption), use private networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use CVX2 for card-not-present transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use virtual dynamic cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect sensitive data by applying international standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance physical security of UPTs and instant issue systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limit use of stripe readers in UPTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use dedicated PAN for certain modes (contactless, mobile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have function to deactivate radio transmissions in contactless mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use cases that block radio waves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online identity theft</strong></td>
<td>Enhanced cardholder authentication (also called one-time authentication)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since 2008, the Observatory main priority has been combatting Card-not-present fraud
  - Actions towards issuers/banks and e-merchants taken by Banque de France

Strong customer authentication / 2FA a must for online payments
  - Not necessarily the only solution but scoring techniques, etc., cannot replace it
  - Card issuers requested to have their cardholders 2FA ready
  - Risk based approach allowing a progressive deployment by e-merchants

Cannot be a French only initiative
  - Banque de France strongly supported the emergence of a European forum for supervisors and central bankers: SecuRe Pay (2011)
  - The revised European Payment Services Directive will implement 2FA in law (adoption 2015, entry into force 2017/18)
Enhancing online card payments security

Cardholder 2FA equipment rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Least advanced bank</th>
<th>Most advanced bank</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range for 50% of banks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>6.14%</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
<td>99.65%</td>
<td>77.00% - 99.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>66.37%</td>
<td>88.94%</td>
<td>99.74%</td>
<td>88.94% - 99.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2013</td>
<td>71.46%</td>
<td>86.26%</td>
<td>99.77%</td>
<td>86.26% - 99.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2013</td>
<td>78.14%</td>
<td>89.95%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>89.95% - 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>79.67%</td>
<td>93.70%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.70% - 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>79.63%</td>
<td>93.30%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.30% - 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>74.94%</td>
<td>90.90%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>90.90% - 100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2)
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3D-Secure failure rates

- Least affected bank
- Most affected bank
- Average
- Non 3D-Secure

Range for 50% of banks

April 2012: 10.93%
October 2012: 6.24%
April 2013: 10.54%
October 2013: 11.18%
April 2014: 7.60%
October 2014: 5.73%
April 2015: 4.52%
Enhancing online card payments security

**e-commerce 3D-Secure equipment rate**

- Least advanced banks
- Most advanced bank
- Average
- Range for 50% of banks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2012</th>
<th>October 2012</th>
<th>April 2013</th>
<th>October 2013</th>
<th>April 2014</th>
<th>October 2014</th>
<th>April 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72.00%</td>
<td>80.72%</td>
<td>80.01%</td>
<td>79.78%</td>
<td>70.55%</td>
<td>86.62%</td>
<td>90.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>42.34%</td>
<td>42.36%</td>
<td>47.95%</td>
<td>43.11%</td>
<td>54.65%</td>
<td>57.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.01%</td>
<td>15.88%</td>
<td>16.38%</td>
<td>18.14%</td>
<td>32.09%</td>
<td>32.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Security of contactless card payments

- Since 2007, the Observatory has regularly analyzed the security of contactless technology
  - Remote activation // Eavesdropping

- More a reputational risk than a financial one
  - Transaction thresholds (number, amount of transactions, incl. cumulative)
  - Limited reuse of captured data

- Recommendations issued to issuers:
  - Deactivation mechanisms for the contactless interface (remote EMV scripts; protective sleeves/shields)
  - Ability to issue contact-only cards on customer demand

- First fraud figures gathered for 2014
  - Origin of fraud: lost & stolen cards // Confirms the Observatory analysis & conclusions
  - Fraud rate between proximity payments and cash withdrawals